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

Appeal No. 6893 of 2026

Sunil Kumar	:	Appellant
	Vs	
CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai	:	Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated May 17, 2026 received by SEBI through RTI MIS portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 ("**RTI Act**"). The respondent, by a letter dated May 20, 2026 responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal dated May 21, 2026 (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/26/00192). 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 May 17, 2026 sought the following information:

" I am seeking information regarding various discrepancies observed in PACL refund claim applications.

Several PACL registration numbers have either received partial payments or have been marked with remarks such as incorrect or illegible certificate, despite submission of valid documents and in some document showing wrong bank details. Details are as follows

…..

Kindly provide the following information:

Reason for partial payment.

Basis/calculation of paid amount.

Status of pending balance.

Expected payment timeline.

Reason for invalid/illegible remark.

Re-upload/reverification facility availability.

Copy of deficiency/verification report.

Eligibility for reconsideration/review.

what supporting document required if bank account name not matching with pacl certificate."

3. **Reply of the Respondent** – The respondent, in response to the application, informed that all communication regarding refund status is handled by Justice (Retd.) R. M Lodha Committee and advised appellant to approach Justice (Retd.) R. M Lodha Committee. 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** – 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. I note 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. 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 18, 2026

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