

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

Appeal No. 6595 of 2025

Sharda Jangir : Appellant
Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated September 16, 2025 (received by the respondent through RTI MIS Portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated September 19, 2025, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/25/00278) dated October 16, 2025. 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 September 16, 2025, sought the following information:

“I have invested in PACL (PACL certificate number U11010xxxxx and U11010xxxxx). SEBI is handling the refund process. I have applied for refund through www.sebipaclrefund.co.in timely. But now when I am checking the status of the refund both my certificates the status is being shown (attached) is that Your application (PACL Certificate No. U11010XXX) could not be processed further as against the said PACL Certificate Land has been allotted as per the data provided by PACL Ltd. I confirm that I have not received any LAND or any sum of money from PACL or their agent for both my certificates. I have invested my hard earned money of Rs 30000 which was supposed to double in 2015. Please assist in this matter and process my refund or provide the details of LAND which being provided as per PACL, to who it is provide, location etc.”

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

Further, 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 refused access to the information requested.
5. I have perused the application and the response provided thereto. I note that the respondent has categorically stated that the requested information is not available with SEBI. I note that the respondent can only provide information that is available in the records. In this context, I note that the Hon'ble Central Information Commission in the matter of *Sb. 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. 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: November 04, 2025

RUCHI CHOJER

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