

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

Appeal No. 6779 of 2026

Kari 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 26, 2026 responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/26/00090) 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 RTI Act 2005, please provide the following information:

1. Provide the receipt-wise breakdown of the principal amount accepted and rejected by the Committee for my claim.

2. State the specific reasons for the rejection of receipts that were not considered for the refund.

3. Is the current payment a full and final settlement, or is there any further payment pending for the remaining amount?

4. As the portal shows No Deficiency, why was the full principal amount not credited? I have attached my PACL Certificate and the list of receipts for your reference.”

3. **Reply of the Respondent** –The respondent, in response to queries in 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** – 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. 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. The appellant, in his appeal, has contended that his application ought to have been transferred to Justice (Retd.) R. M. Lodha Committee, if the requested information is available with the said Committee. On consideration, 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. In this context, I note that 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 find that no further intervention of this forum is necessary in this regard.
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