

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

**Appeal No. 6380 of 2025**

|                    |    |            |
|--------------------|----|------------|
| Mukul Singh        | :  | Appellant  |
|                    | Vs |            |
| CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai | :  | Respondent |

**ORDER**

1. The appellant had filed an application dated March 25, 2025 (received by SEBI on April 04, 2025) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 ("**RTI Act**"). The respondent, by a letter dated April 09, 2025, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal dated April 30, 2025 (received by the Office of Appellate Authority on May 06, 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. **Requests in the application** - The appellant, vide his application dated March 25, 2025, sought the following information:
  - a) *Certified copies of the action taken with regard to policy no. **U105096021***
  - b) *Certified copies of the action taken with regard to policy no **U105185324***
  - c) *Certified copies of the action taken with regard to his online application (**L6WZ4KPX2C**) made before SEBI.*
  - d) *Address of the SEBI Local Office, Dehradun.*
  - e) *Name and address of the Appellate Authority.*
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**"). Further, the respondent informed that Justice (Retd.) R. M. Lodha Committee was constituted by an order dated February 02, 2016, passed by 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. 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** - The appellant has merely reiterated the contents of his application in appeal.
5. I have perused the requests made by the appellant and the response provided by the respondent. I note that information pertaining to query nos. a, b and c 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." Further, I note that name and address of the Appellate Authority was mentioned in the reply of the respondent. I also note that name and addresses of the offices of SEBI is available on SEBI website and hence, is in the public domain. In view of these observations, I find that no further interference of this forum is necessary.
6. Additionally, 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

**RUCHI CHOJER**

Date: June 03, 2025

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