

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

**Appeal No. 6558 of 2025**

Amber Arunam : Appellant  
Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

**ORDER**

1. The appellant had filed an application dated August 18, 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 09, 2025, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/25/00244) dated September 15, 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 August 18, 2025, sought the following information:

*“ I am filing this RTI on behalf of my mother, Manjula Sinha, who had invested Rupees 50,000 in PACL Ltd. Her PACL Certificate Number is UXXXXXX8. As per the SEBI refund portal, land has been allotted instead of refund. I request the following information under the RTI Act, 2005:*

*1. Complete details of land allotted against this certificate.*

*2. Whether land has been registered or handed over to her.*

*3. What is the process to verify or claim the land?*

*4. If land is not acceptable, how can she claim monetary refund?”*

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 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** – On perusal of the appeal, it appears that the appellant is not satisfied with the response of the respondent.
5. I have perused the application and the response provided thereto. 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: October 09, 2025**

**RUCHI CHOJER**

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