

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

Appeal No. 6941 of 2026

Vikram Singh : Appellant

Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application (received by SEBI on April 22, 2026) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated May 05, 2026, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal dated June 06, 2026 (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/P/26/00037; received by the Office of Appellate Authority on June 22, 2026). I have perused the application, the response of the respondent 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, sought information relating to refund to investors in the PACL matter.
3. **Reply of the Respondent** – The respondent, in response to the application, informed that the information sought is not available with SEBI. Notwithstanding the aforesaid, the respondent 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** – On perusal of the appeal, it appears that the appellant is not satisfied with the response of the respondent.
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 requested the instant forum to direct the respondent to transfer his application to the concerned public authority under Section 6(3) of the 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 do not find any deficiency in the action of the respondent.
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: July 20, 2026

RUCHI CHOJER

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