

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

Appeal No. 6519 of 2025

Pravila Devi : Appellant

Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

ORDER

1. The appellant had filed an application dated August 05, 2025 (received by the respondent through RTI MIS Portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated August 12, 2025, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/25/00212) dated August 13, 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 August 05, 2025, sought the following information:

“ I am an investor in PACL Ltd. The investment receipt is in the name of Pravila Devi with Certificate Number U259268XXX On the SEBI portal, the status of this investment shows Land Allotted due to which my refund claim process could not proceed further. I request you to kindly provide the following information under the Right to Information Act, 2005:

- 1. What is the location (state, district, tehsil, and village) of the land that has been allotted against the above certificate number?*
- 2. Is there any plot number, survey number, or any document related to the allotted land?*
- 3. Is the said land physically existing or has it only been allotted on paper? ”*

3. **Reply of the Respondent** –The respondent, in response to the application, informed that the information sought is not available with SEBI. The respondent also 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 she 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. Patriate 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. The appellant, in her appeal, has requested that if SEBI does not hold the information, her application be transferred to the concerned custodian/committee under section 6(3) of RTI Act. 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. In this context, I note that the Hon’ble CIC in its decision in *M Shanmugam v CPIO, Pearls Agrotech Corporation Ltd. & Or.* (Date of decision: 14.03.2024) had accepted the contention of the respondent that the Justice Lodha Committee is not a “public authority” under section 2(h) of the RTI Act. Hence, the said committee does not fall under the purview of the RTI Act. Accordingly, I find that no further action is warranted in this regard.
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 :September 09, 2025

RUCHI CHOJER

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