

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

**Appeal No. 5894 of 2024**

|                      |    |            |
|----------------------|----|------------|
| Dr. R. Sudalai Kannu | :  | Appellant  |
|                      | Vs |            |
| CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai   | :  | Respondent |

**ORDER**

1. The appellant had filed an application dated November 11, 2023 (received by SEBI on November 15, 2023) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated November 30, 2023, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal dated January 08, 2024 (received by the Office of Appellate Authority on January 16, 2024). 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. **Request in the application-** The appellant, in his application dated November 11, 2023, sought certain information regarding the extent/area of ownership of land, claimed by M/s. PACL or its Associates, situated at Unnankulam – Revenue Village, Moolaikaraipatti – SRO, Nanguneri – Taluk, Tirunelveli – District, Tamil Nadu.
3. **Reply of the Respondent** - The respondent, in response to the application, informed that the information sought is not available with Securities and Exchange Board of India (hereinafter referred to as “**SEBI**”). However, the respondent informed that Justice (Retd.) R. M. Lodha Committee was constituted by an order dated February 02, 2016, passed of the Hon’ble Supreme Court of India and that the same is not a Public Authority within the meaning under section 2(h) of the RTI Act. Hence, the said Committee would not fall within the purview of the said Act. Further, the respondent provided the link for accessing the details of the Committee, for further communication. The respondent also provided the links for accessing the details with respect to Public Notices, Press Releases, Status Report and FAQs etc. related to PACL matter.

4. **Ground of appeal-** On perusal of the appeal, it appears that the appellant is not satisfied with the response provided by the respondent. The appellant, in his appeal has, *inter alia*, submitted that as SEBI is the custodian of all the title deeds of PACL properties and has constituted the Hon'ble R.M. Lodha Committee and also has to settle the amount to the investors after selling PACL properties, it is difficult to accept that the information sought in the application is not available with SEBI.
5. I have perused the requests made by the appellant and the response provided by the respondent. The respondent, in his response, has categorically mentioned that the requested information is not available with SEBI. 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 informed the appellant that the aforesaid committee is not a Public Authority within the meaning under section 2(h) of the RTI Act. Hence, the said Committee would not fall within the purview of the said Act. Further, I note that the Hon'ble Central Information Commission (hereinafter referred to as "**CIC**") 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.*" In view of these observations, I do not find any deficiency in the response.
6. Notwithstanding the above, I note that the respondent has provided the links for accessing the contact details of the Committee, 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: February 01, 2024

**B RAJENDRAN**

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