

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

**Appeal No. 6632 of 2025**

Lalmuni Devi : Appellant

Vs

CPIO, SEBI, Mumbai : Respondent

**ORDER**

1. The appellant had filed an application dated November 21, 2025 (received by the respondent through RTI MIS Portal) under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (“**RTI Act**”). The respondent, by a letter dated November 25, 2025, responded to the application filed by the appellant. The appellant filed an appeal (Reg. No. SEBIH/A/E/25/00306) dated November 25, 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. **Query in the application** - The appellant, in her application dated November 21, 2025, sought the following information.

*“I am an investor in PACL INDIA LIMITED Company. My policy number is U096511963. I have deposited RS 14925 rupees in this policy. I have twice updated my account passbook and uploaded it to the [sebiacrefund.co.in](http://sebiacrefund.co.in) website, yet my money has not been refunded. Therefore, I request you to kindly arrange for my refund as soon as possible.*

*Name-LALMUNI DEVI*

*REGISTRATION -U096511963*

*A/C NO. XXXXXXXX*

*IFSC- xxxxxxxxxx”*

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 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 (**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.” Accordingly, I do not find any deficiency in the response of the respondent.
6. The appellant, in her appeal, has requested for transfer of her application to the concerned public authority. 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, 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 public authority under section 2(h) of the RTI Act. In light of the aforesaid, I find that no further intervention of this forum is warranted.
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: December 12, 2025

**RUCHI CHOJER**

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