

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

Appeal No. 5760 of 2023

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

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application (Reg. No. SEBIH/R/P/23/00208) dated “June 2023” (received by SEBI on June 13, 2023) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated June 22, 2023, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal dated July 18, 2023 (received by the Office of Appellate Authority on July 24, 2023). 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. **Requests made in the application-** The appellant, vide request no. (i), sought the details and numbers of claims of Postal Linked Insurance (PLI) deposited with SEBI till date. Vide request number (ii), the appellant sought the status of three claims pertaining to PLI. However, it is observed from the Annexure enclosed with the application that the claims pertain to PACL Ltd.
3. The respondent, in response to the requests pertaining to PLI, informed that the information does not pertain to SEBI. With respect to the requests pertaining to PACL Ltd., the respondent informed that the information sought by the appellant, is not available with SEBI. However, the appellant was advised to contact the Justice (Retd.) R. M. Lodha Committee. The respondent also provided the link for accessing the details of the Committee, for further communication. Further, the respondent also provided the links for accessing the details with respect to Public Notices, Press Releases, Status Report and FAQs etc. related to refund in the matter of PACL refund.
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, submitted that no complete information has been provided to the appellant.

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 requests pertaining to PLI does not pertain to SEBI. Further, the respondent informed that the requested information pertaining to PACL Ltd., 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. Further, I note that the Hon'ble CIC 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." In view of these observations, I do not find any deficiency in the response.
6. Further, the appellant, in his appeal, sought the details and numbers of claims of PACL Ltd. deposited with SEBI till date. I note that the respondent has already informed regarding unavailability of the information related to refund in the matter of PACL Ltd. Further, the respondent has also provided the links for accessing the contact details of the Committee, Status Reports, FAQs, Press Releases and Public Notices pertaining to the refund in 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: August 23, 2023

B RAJENDRAN

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