

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

Appeal No. 6491 of 2025

Anita Devi : Appellant
Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated July 08, 2025 (received by the respondent through RTI MIS Portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated July 10, 2025, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/25/00185) dated July 19, 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 her application dated July 08, 2025, sought the following information:

“ The date of land allotment recorded in SEBI/PACL records.

The address, location, or plot number of the land allegedly allotted under the above certificate. The type of documents PACL provided to SEBI to justify this land allotment.

Whether any registry, possession, or physical handover of land was documented under my name or certificate.

If available, a copy or reference number of the land allotment letter or deed.”

3. **Reply of the Respondent** –The respondent, in response to the application, informed that the information sought is not available with SEBI. Additionally, 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 filed the appeal on the ground that he was provided incomplete, misleading or false information.
5. 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. 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 06, 2025

RUCHI CHOJER

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