

**BEFORE THE APPELLATE AUTHORITY
(Under the Right to Information Act, 2005)
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE BOARD OF INDIA**

Appeal No. 6684 of 2026

Bapu Tukaram Nale

: Appellant

Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai

: Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated December 29, 2025 (received by the respondent through RTI MIS Portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 ("RTI Act"). The respondent, by a letter dated January 06, 2026, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/26/00007) dated January 07, 2026. I have carefully considered the application, the response and the appeal and find that the matter can be decided based on the material available on record.
2. **Queries in the application** - The appellant, in his application dated December 29, 2025, sought the following information:

"1 Current status of my PACL refund claim. 2 Whether my claim is verified approved or rejected. 3 Whether my claim is included in any payment batch. 4 Reason for delay in payment till date. 5 Expected timeline for release of my refund amount."
3. **Reply of the Respondent** - The respondent, in response to queries in the application, informed that the information sought is not available with SEBI. Further, the respondent has informed that the details of PACL Matters-Public Notices, Press Releases, Status Report and FAQs etc. are available on SEBI website.
4. **Ground of appeal** – The appellant has filed the appeal on the ground that he was provided incomplete, misleading or false information.
5. I have perused the application and the response provided thereto. The respondent, in his response, has categorically mentioned that the requested information is not available with SEBI. In this context, I note



that the Hon'ble Central Information Commission in the matter of *Sh. Pattipati Rama Murthy vs. CPIO, SEBI* (Decision dated July 8, 2013), held: "... if it (SEBI) does not have any such information in its possession, the CPIO cannot obviously invent one for the benefit of the Appellant. There is simply no information to be given." Accordingly, I do not find any deficiency in the response of the respondent.

6. The appellant, in his appeal, has requested that his application be transferred to concerned public authority under section 6(3) of RTI Act, if the information sought is not available with SEBI. I note that the responsibility of disposal of the properties and repayment to investors, is entrusted with the Justice (Retd.) R. M. Lodha Committee (under the Chairmanship of Hon'ble Mr. Justice R.M. Lodha, former Chief Justice of India), which has been constituted, pursuant to the order dated February 2, 2016 of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. Further, Hon'ble CIC in its decision in *M Shanmugam v CPIO, Pearls Agrotech Corporation Ltd. & Or.* (Date of decision: 14.03.2024) had accepted the contention of the respondent that the Justice Lodha Committee is not public authority under section 2(h) of the RTI Act. Accordingly, I find that no further intervention of this forum is necessary.
7. In view of the above observations, I find that there is no need to interfere with the decision of the respondent. The appeal is accordingly dismissed.

Place: Mumbai

Date: February 02, 2026



APPELLATE AUTHORITY UNDER THE RTI ACT
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE BOARD OF INDIA