

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

Appeal No. 6604 of 2025

Shaik Moulali : Appellant
Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated October 23, 2025 (received by the respondent through RTI MIS Portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated October 31, 2025, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/25/00283) dated October 31, 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 October 23, 2025, enclosed along with his application a document titled “*Government of Andhra Pradesh- Rural Prohibited Property Report* and also sought the following information:

“1,3,13-1,13-2,17,18,19,31,32,33-1,36,173,174,175,177,193-
1,1934,1941,194/2,194/3,195,203/1,203/2,240,205,206,207,212

The above survey numbers and the area allotted to them were allotted by the Andhra Pradesh Government to the poor people of the village from 1969 to 1976 , in the Kothapalli village revenue. After that in 2023, the Andhra Pradesh Governmentga... lands are in the list of prohibited lands in the Stamps and Registrations Department.Canyoupleasetellmein...”

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** – The appellant, has not specified any ground for filing the appeal.
5. I have perused the application and the response provided thereto. On consideration, I note that the respondent has clearly stated 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. I note that the responsibility of disposal of the properties and repayment to investors with respect to PACL matter, 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 link 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: November 26, 2025

RUCHI CHOJER

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