

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

Appeal Nos. 6693, 6694, 6695 & 6696 of 2026

Premchand Gupta : Appellant
Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”), which was transferred to the respondent from Registrar of Companies & Official Liquidator, Rajasthan on January 8, 2026. The respondent, by a letter dated January 12, 2026, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed four identical appeals (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/26/00015, Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/26/00016, Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/26/00017 & Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/26/00018) dated January 12, 2026 against the said response. 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 January 08, 2026 sought the following information:

“I am an investor in PACL Ltd (Certificate No. U1714xxxxx). The claim portal shows land allotted against my certificate, but I have no details. Under RTI Act 2005, I seek.

1. *Complete land details allotted against Certificate U1714xxxxx including full address, plot number, scheme name, allotment date, and copy of allotment letter sent to me.*
2. *Current status of my refund claim and rejection reason.*
3. *Proof that I was informed about this land allotment.*
4. *Steps to claim refund if land is disputed.”*

3. **Reply of the Respondent** – The respondent, in response to the queries in the application, informed that the information sought is not available with SEBI. The respondent also informed that the details of PACL matters – Public Notices, Press Release, 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 refused access to information requested.
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 (**CIC**) 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 contended that the respondent had failed to transfer his application under section 6(3) of RTI Act. 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. I also note that the 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 warranted.
7. In view of the above observations, I find that there is no need to interfere with the decision of the respondent. The appeals are accordingly dismissed.

Place: Mumbai

Date: February 09, 2026

RUCHI CHOJER

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