

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

Appeal No. 6788 of 2026

Meena Kumari : Appellant
Vs
CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated January 13, 2026 (received by SEBI on January 16, 2026) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated January 28, 2026 responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal dated February 26, 2026 (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/P/26/00016, received by the Office of Appellate Authority on March 04, 2026). 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, vide her application dated January 13, 2026 sought the following information:

“ i) Present legal and administrative status of PACL (Pearls Agrotech Corporation Limited) under SEBI.

(ii) Current status of refund/ payment process of PACL (Pearls Agrotech Corporation Limited) investors whose policies were matured before 2015.

(iii) Whether my aforesaid policies as mentioned at para-2 above are recorded with SEBI/Justice RM Lodha Committee/ any other authority which involved into the refund/ payment process of PACL (Pearls Agrotech Corporation Limited) investors. If yes, what is the status at present.

(iv) Reason for delay in payment despite the submission of original bonds on completion policies maturity i.e in the year 2014.

(v) Expected timeline to release of maturity amount in my case

(vi) Name, designation and contact detail of the authority/office/nodal officer currently responsible for processing PACL (Pearls Agrotech Corporation Limited) investors' refunds."

3. **Reply of the Respondent** –The respondent, in response to queries in the application, informed that the information sought is not available with SEBI. However, the respondent also 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 the 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 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 24, 2026

RUCHI CHOJER

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