

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

**Appeal No. 6778 of 2026**

Bir Bahadur Sahni

:

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/26/00089) 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 his application dated February 22, 2026, sought the following information:

*“Under the Right to Information Act, 2005, I am seeking the following specific details regarding my PACL refund claim:*

*1. My application status for BIR BAHADUR SAHNI (Reg. No: U30606xxxx) states that bank details are incorrect or not in the investor name. Please provide the exact technical or clerical reason for this rejection (e.g., IFSC mismatch, name spelling difference, or blurred document).*

*2. Please provide a copy of the verification report or remarks recorded by the processing officer regarding the bank documents (passbook) uploaded in my application.*

*3. If the rejection is due to a name mismatch, please clarify if a name mentioned as a joint holder is acceptable as per current Committee guidelines. 4. What is the scheduled date or timeline for the next Edit/Rectification window for investors with claims in my category to correct these specific bank errors?*

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 he 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**