

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

**Appeal No. 6889 of 2026**

K.A Poullose

:

Appellant

Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai

:

Respondent

**ORDER**

1. The appellant had filed an application dated April 27, 2026 (received by SEBI through RTI MIS portal) 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 May 18, 2026 (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/26/00186). 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 dated April 27, 2026, sought the following information:

*“I am an investor in PACL India Limited holding Registration Number U273xxxxxxx. I am seeking information under the RTI Act 2005 regarding my refund status. The PACL refund portal shows that land has been allotted against my certificate. I have never applied for or accepted any land allotment.*

*I request the following information:*

*1. Full details of the land alleged to have been allotted against my registration number.*

*2. Certified copies of documents proving such allotment or my acceptance of the same.*

*3. Procedure to rectify this status in your records.*

*I have attached my PACL Certificate for your reference. Kindly provide the requested information.”*

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 *Sb. 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. Notwithstanding the above, 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 respondent has provided the links for accessing Status Reports, FAQs, Press Releases and Public Notices pertaining to the matter of PACL Ltd., which are already available in the public domain. The appellant may be guided accordingly.
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: June 12, 2026**

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