

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

Appeal No. 6777 of 2026

Tetari Devi

: Appellant
Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai

: Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated February 22, 2026 (received by SEBI through RTI MIS portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated February 25, 2026 responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/26/00088) dated February 26, 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 her application dated February 22, 2026, sought the following information:

“I am an investor in PACL and seek the following information under the Right to Information Act, 2005: My PACL Registration Number is U30626xxx Investor Name: TETARI DEVI). Currently, upon checking the payment status, the deficiency Incorrect/Illegible Certificate is displayed.

1.Despite several windows/periods provided by the Justice (Retd.) R.M. Lodha Committee for rectifying applications, I have logged into the portal repeatedly but have never been provided with an Edit or Re-upload option. What is the specific technical or administrative reason for this?

2.Please clarify when the Edit option will be activated for this specific registration number so that I may upload the correct documents.

3.If rectification is not possible through the online portal, can I send certified copies of my original documents to the Committee via post? If yes, please provide the designation, address of the concerned officer, and the required procedure.”

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 Notice, 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 she was refused access to the 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 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: March 16, 2026

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