

BEFORE THE ADJUDICATING OFFICER
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE BOARD OF INDIA
[ADJUDICATION ORDER NO. Order/SM/DD/2022-23/18016]

UNDER SECTION 15-I OF SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE BOARD OF INDIA ACT, 1992, READ WITH RULE 5 OF SEBI (PROCEDURE FOR HOLDING INQUIRY AND IMPOSING PENALTIES) RULES, 1995

In respect of

Mr. Nagaraja Ravichandran
[PAN: BVPPR8784M]

In the matter of Titan Company Limited

FACTS OF THE CASE IN BRIEF

1. Securities and Exchange Board of India (hereinafter referred to as '**SEBI**') received a letter from Titan Company Limited (hereinafter referred to as '**Company/Titan/TCL**') wherein the company intimated SEBI about contravention of SEBI (Prohibition of Insider Trading) Regulations, 2015 (hereinafter referred to as '**PIT Regulations**') and Company's Code of Conduct for Prevention of Insider Trading by some of its designated persons/employees. The securities of Titan are listed on BSE Ltd (**BSE**) and the National Stock Exchange of India Ltd (**NSE**). BSE and NSE together will be referred to as "**Exchanges**".
2. Thereafter, SEBI conducted an investigation in the scrip of Titan and observed several non-compliances of PIT Regulations during the period April 01, 2018 to March 31, 2019 (hereinafter referred to as '**Investigation Period/IP**') by employees and designated persons of TCL including Mr. Nagaraja Ravichandran (hereinafter referred to as '**Noticee/by name**'). Therefore, SEBI initiated adjudication proceedings against Noticee under the provisions of Section 15A(b) of Securities and Exchange Board of India Act, 1992 (hereinafter referred to as

Adjudication Order in respect of Mr. Nagaraja Ravichandran in the matter of Titan Company Ltd.

‘SEBI Act’) for alleged violation of Regulation 7(2)(a) of PIT Regulations by Noticee.

APPOINTMENT OF ADJUDICATING OFFICER

3. Vide order dated March 02, 2021, SEBI appointed the undersigned as Adjudicating Officer under Section 15I of the SEBI Act read with Section 19 of the SEBI Act and Rule 3 of the SEBI (Procedure for Holding Inquiry and Imposing Penalties) Rules, 1995 (hereinafter referred to as ‘**Adjudication Rules**’) to inquire into and adjudge under the provisions of Section 15A(b) of SEBI Act, the aforesaid alleged violation by Noticee.

SHOW CAUSE NOTICE, REPLY AND PERSONAL HEARING

4. A show-cause notice dated August 09, 2021 (hereinafter referred to as ‘**SCN**’) was issued to Noticee under Rule 4 of the Adjudication Rules to show-cause as to why an inquiry should not be initiated against Noticee and penalty, if any, not be imposed upon him under the provisions of Section 15A(b) of SEBI Act for the aforesaid violation alleged to have been committed by him.
5. The allegations levelled against Noticee in the SCN are as under:

- a) During the course of investigation, it was observed that Noticee had traded in the securities of the Titan during the Investigation Period. Details of her trading are as under:

Name of Noticee	Total Traded Value (BSE+NSE) (in Rs.)	No. of occasions on which traded value exceeded Rs. 10 lakh
	July - Sep 2018	
Mr. Nagaraja Ravichandran	1,93,58,275/-	4

- b) It was observed from the table above that in the calendar quarter ending on September 2018, the total traded value of the securities traded by Noticee in the scrip of Titan was Rs 1,93,58,275/-. It was observed that on each of the aforesaid four occasions in the aforesaid calendar quarter, Noticee’s traded value of securities in Titan exceeded rupees ten lakhs. Therefore, for the *Adjudication Order in respect of Mr. Nagaraja Ravichandran in the matter of Titan Company Ltd.*

aforesaid transactions, which were in excess of the limit specified in Regulation 7(2)(a) of PIT Regulations, Noticee was required to make disclosure in terms of the aforesaid regulation. In this regard, in reply to a query by SEBI, TCL vide email dated October 28, 2020, confirmed that it had not received any disclosures from Noticee.

- c) In view of the above observations, it was alleged that Noticee has violated Regulation 7(2)(a) of PIT Regulations, on four occasions by not making disclosures as required in terms of aforesaid regulation.
6. The SCN was sent to Noticee through Speed Post Acknowledgement due (herein after referred to as '**SPAD**') on August 09, 2021 as well as through digitally signed email dated August 12, 2021. The SCN sent through digitally signed email was duly served on Noticee. Noticee was given fourteen (14) days' time to make his submissions in respect of the allegations made in the SCN. Vide letter dated August 18, 2021, Noticee submitted his reply to the SCN.
7. Thereafter, in the interest of natural justice, vide hearing notice dated February 21, 2022, Noticee was granted an opportunity of personal hearing before the undersigned on March 28, 2022. The aforesaid hearing notice was sent to Noticee through SPAD and also through digitally signed email on February 22, 2022, and was duly served upon her. Noticee appeared for hearing on the scheduled date and reiterated her earlier submissions. Due to difficulties in view of the Covid-19 pandemic, hearing was conducted through video conferencing.
8. The relevant submissions by Noticee are summarized hereunder: -
- a. He is working as a Senior Engineer in the maintenance and utility department at Coimbatore unit and not aware of the new products, sales figures and marketing information's.
 - b. He doesn't have any contact with the senior management officials and not aware of any unpublished news.
 - c. He ended up making loss of Rs. 11,100/-.
 - d. He was not aware that the turnover in trading in derivatives would be so high.

- e. He was also not aware that he had to inform the transaction exceeding Rs.10 Lakh to the company.

CONSIDERATION OF ISSUES, EVIDENCE AND FINDINGS

9. I have carefully perused the charges levelled against Noticee, submissions filed by Noticee and other documents/ evidence available on record. The issues that arise for consideration in the present case are:

- 1) Whether Noticee has violated Regulation 7(2)(a) of PIT Regulations?
- 2) Does the violation, if any, attract monetary penalty under Section 15A(b) of SEBI Act?
- 3) If the answer to issue no. 2 is in affirmative, then what should be the quantum of monetary penalty?

10. Before moving forward, it is pertinent to refer to the relevant provision of the PIT Regulations which was in force at the time of impugned transactions, which are reproduced as under:

Relevant provisions of PIT Regulations:

Disclosures by certain persons.

7(2) continual disclosure.

(a) Every promoter, employee and director of every company shall disclose to the company the number of such securities acquired or disposed of within two trading days of such transaction if the value of the securities traded, whether in one transaction or a series of transactions over any calendar quarter, aggregates to a traded value in excess of ten lakh rupees or such other value as may be specified;

Issue No.1- Whether Noticee has violated Regulation 7(2)(a) of PIT Regulations?

11. I note from the available records that Noticee was one of the employees of Titan. While in employment of Titan, Noticee had transacted in securities of Titan as

seen from the details extracted from the trade log obtained from Exchanges, which are given below: -

Name of Noticee	Total Traded Value (BSE+NSE) (in Rs.)	No. of occasions on which traded value exceeded Rs. 10 lakh
	July - Sept 2018	
Mr. Nagaraja Ravichandran	1,93,58,275/-	4

12. On perusal of the trading details of Noticee for the quarter July to September 2018, I note that the total value of securities of Titan traded by Noticee amounted to Rs. 27,43,125/- on September 12, 2018. I further note that during the same quarter, i.e., July to September 2018, value of trades by Noticee in the securities of Titan amounted to Rs 20,79,750/- on September 14, 2018. I further note that during the same quarter, value of trades by Noticee in the securities of Titan amounted to Rs 55,32,000/- on September 18, 2018 and similarly, I further note that the value of trades by Noticee in the securities of Titan amounted to Rs 82,90,800/- on September 19, 2018. From the submissions made by Noticee, I note that he has not disputed the impugned transactions in the scrip of Titan as specified above. I also note that his transactions on each of the aforesaid occasions exceeded rupees ten lakhs.

13. In terms of Regulation 7(2)(a) of PIT Regulations, Noticee, being an employee of the company, was required to make disclosures to Titan, for each of the aforesaid transactions within two (2) working days. However, there is no evidence available on record to show that Noticee had made any disclosures in terms of the aforesaid regulation for the aforesaid transactions. Further, from the available records, I note that Titan vide email dated October 28, 2020, has confirmed that it had not received any disclosures from Noticee.

14. I note from the submissions of Noticee that he has admitted to the default on his part, terming it as his first transaction in the derivative segment and being unaware of trading in derivatives. Noticee has also contended that he did not have access to any unpublished news or important information related to Titan and he

was a junior employee in the company. In this regard, I note that Regulation 7(2)(a) of PIT Regulations requires that requisite disclosures are to be made based on every event of either acquisition or disposal of securities in excess of the limits specified therein in terms of number/value/percentage. In the instant matter, disclosure requirements in terms of Regulation 7(2)(a) of PIT Regulations were mandated because the total traded value of Noticees transactions in the securities of Titan exceeded ten lakh rupees on the aforesaid four occasions irrespective of designation or not having knowledge of sensitive information, etc as is being contended by Noticee. Therefore, I find that this contention of Noticee is not relevant to the allegation of his failure to make requisite disclosures in terms of Regulation 7(2)(a) of PIT Regulations.

15. In his reply, Noticee has also contended that he was not aware of the provisions of PIT Regulations. In this regard, I note that statement made by Noticee is not justified. As postulated by legal maxim “ignorantia juris non excusat”, ignorance of law is no excuse and everyone is presumed to know the law of the land. A person cannot defend his illegal actions by stating that he was not aware his actions were illegal, even if he honestly believed that they were not breaking the law. Therefore, I do not find any merit in this contention of Noticee. As regards his contention about incurring losses in these transactions, I find that the requirement of disclosure under Regulation 7(2)(a) of PIT Regulations is not contingent on gains or losses made in the transactions and therefore, I find that this contention of Noticee is devoid of any merit. I note from his submissions that Noticee has admitted to the default on his part.

16. In view of the above and considering that Noticee has admitted to the default, I conclude that the allegation that Noticee has violated Regulation 7(2)(a) of PIT Regulations on four (4) occasions, stands established.

Issue No. 2- Does the violation attract monetary penalty under Section 15A (b) of SEBI Act?

17. In this regard, I place reliance on the order of the Hon’ble SAT in the matter of Virendrakumar Jayantilal Patel vs. SEBI (Appeal No. 299 of 2014 order dated October 14, 2014), wherein Hon’ble SAT held that “..... *obligation to make Adjudication Order in respect of Mr. Nagaraja Ravichandran in the matter of Titan Company Ltd.*

disclosures within the stipulated time is a mandatory obligation and penalty is imposed for not complying with the mandatory obligation.”

18. I note that the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the matter of SEBI v/s Shri Ram Mutual Fund [2006] 68 SCL 216(SC) held that *“In our considered opinion, penalty is attracted as soon as the contravention of the statutory obligation as contemplated by the Act and the Regulations is established.....”*.

19. Therefore, in view of the above judgments and considering that Noticee violated Regulation 7(2)(a) of PIT Regulations, as established in the foregoing paragraphs, I find that Noticee would be liable for monetary penalty under Section 15A (b) of the SEBI Act. The text of Section 15A(b) of the SEBI Act is reproduced below:

SEBI Act

Penalty for failure to furnish information, return, etc.

15A. *If any person, who is required under this Act or any rules or regulations made there under,—*

(b) to file any return or furnish any information, books or other documents within the time specified therefore in the regulations, fails to file return or furnish the same within the time specified therefore in the regulations, he shall be liable to a penalty which shall not be less than one lakh rupees but which may extend to one lakh rupees for each day during which such failure continues subject to a maximum of one crore rupees;

Issue No.3 - What should be the quantum of monetary penalty?

20. While determining the quantum of penalty under Section 15A(b) of the SEBI Act, it is important to consider the factors as stipulated in Section 15J of the SEBI Act, which reads as under:-

SEBI Act

Factors to be taken into account while adjudging quantum of penalty.

Section 15J - *While adjudging quantum of penalty under section 15-I or section 11 or section 11B, the Board or the adjudicating officer shall have due regard to the following factors, namely:-*

- (a) the amount of disproportionate gain or unfair advantage, wherever quantifiable, made as a result of the default;*
- (b) the amount of loss caused to an investor or group of investors as a result of the default;*
- (c) the repetitive nature of the default.*

Explanation- *For the removal of doubts, it is clarified that the power to adjudge the quantum of penalty under sections 15A to 15E, clauses (b) and (c) of section 15F, 15G, 15H and 15HA shall be and shall always be deemed to have been exercised under the provisions of this section.*

21. In view of the charges established and the facts and circumstances of the case, the quantum of penalty would depend on the factors referred in Section 15-J of the SEBI Act, stated as above. In the instant case, it is not possible from the material on record to quantify the amount of disproportionate gain or unfair advantage resulting from the default of Noticee in making disclosures or the consequent loss caused to investors as a result of the default.
22. However, with respect to the disclosure violations by Noticee, I note that the purpose of these disclosures is to bring about transparency in the transactions of Directors/ Promoters/Acquirers/ employees and assist the Regulator to effectively monitor the transactions in the market. Hon'ble SAT in the case of **M/s. Coimbatore Flavors & Fragrances Ltd. & Ors vs SEBI (Appeal No. 209 of 2014 order dated August 11, 2014)**, has held that "*Undoubtedly, the purpose of these disclosures is to bring about more transparency in the affairs of the companies. True and timely disclosures by a company or its promoters are very essential from two angles. Firstly; investors can take a more informed decision to*

invest or not to invest in a particular scrip secondly; the Regulator can properly monitor the transactions in the capital market to effectively regulate the same."

Hon'ble SAT, in the aforesaid order, has articulated the importance of true and timely disclosures. Further, I find that Noticee has violated the provisions of Regulation 7(2)(a) of PIT Regulations on four (4) occasions.

ORDER

23. Having considered all the facts and circumstances of the case, the material available on record, the submissions made by Noticee and also the factors mentioned in Section 15J of the SEBI Act, as enumerated above, I, in exercise of the powers conferred upon me under Section 15-I of the SEBI Act read with Rule 5 of the Adjudication Rules, hereby impose a penalty of Rs. 1,00,000/- (Rupees One Lakh only) on Noticee i.e. Mr. Nagaraja Ravichandran, under the provisions of Section 15A(b) of SEBI Act. I am of the view that the said penalty is commensurate with the lapse/omission on the part of Noticee.

24. Noticee shall remit / pay the said amount of penalty within 45 days of receipt of this order through online payment facility available on the website of SEBI, i.e., www.sebi.gov.in on the following path, by clicking on the payment link: ENFORCEMENT -> Orders -> Orders of AO -> PAY NOW. In case of any difficulties in payment of penalties, Noticee may contact the support at portalhelp@sebi.gov.in.

25. The said confirmation of e-payment made in the format as given in table below should be sent to "The Division Chief, EFD – DRA - I, Securities and Exchange Board of India, SEBI Bhavan II, Plot no. C- 7, "G" Block, Bandra Kurla Complex, Bandra (E), Mumbai - 400 051" and also to e-mail id:- tad@sebi.gov.in

1. Case Name:	
2. Name of payee:	
3. Date of payment:	
4. Amount paid:	
5. Transaction no.:	
6. Bank details in which payment is made:	

7. Payment is made for: (like penalties/ disgorgement/ recovery/ settlement amount and legal charges along with order details)	
--	--

26. In the event of failure to pay the said amount of penalty within 45 days of the receipt of this Order, recovery proceedings may be initiated under Section 28A of the SEBI Act for realization of the said amount of penalty along with interest thereon, *inter alia*, by attachment and sale of movable and immovable properties of Noticee.

27. In terms of the provisions of Rule 6 of the Adjudication Rules, a copy of this order is being sent to Noticee viz. Mr. Nagaraja Ravichandran and also to SEBI.

Place: Mumbai

Date: July 27, 2022

**SOMA MAJUMDER
ADJUDICATING OFFICER**