

BEFORE THE ADJUDICATING OFFICER

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE BOARD OF INDIA

[ADJUDICATION ORDER NO. Order/PB/AS/2021-22/14786]

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

Nimesh Harishkumar Vora HUF

(PAN: AADHN4442G)

In the matter of Trading in Illiquid Stock Options on BSE

BACKGROUND OF THE CASE

1. Securities and Exchange Board of India (hereinafter referred to as “**SEBI**”) observed large scale reversal of trades in stock options segment of Bombay Stock Exchange (hereinafter referred to as “**BSE**”). SEBI observed that such large scale reversal of trades in stock options lead to creation of artificial volume at BSE. In view of the same, SEBI conducted an investigation into the trading activities of certain entities in illiquid stock options at BSE for the period April 1, 2014 to September 30, 2015 (hereinafter referred to as “**IP**”).

2. Pursuant to investigation, it was observed that total 2,91,643 trades comprising substantial 81.38% of all the trades executed in stock options segment of BSE during the IP were non genuine trades. It was observed that Nimesh Harishkumar Vora HUF (PAN-AADHN4442G) (hereinafter referred to as the “**Noticee**”) was one of the various entities who indulged in execution of reversal trades in stock options segment of BSE during the IP. Such trades were observed to be non-genuine in nature and created false or misleading appearance of trading in terms of artificial volumes in stock options and therefore were alleged to be manipulative and deceptive in nature. In view of the same, SEBI initiated adjudication proceedings against the Noticee for violation of the provisions of regulations 3(a), (b), (c), (d), 4(1) and 4(2)(a) of SEBI (Prohibition of Fraudulent and Unfair Trade Practices relating to Securities Market) Regulations, 2003 (hereinafter referred to as “**PFUTP Regulations, 2003**”).

APPOINTMENT OF ADJUDICATING OFFICER

3. Shri K Saravanan was appointed as Adjudicating Officer in the matter, conveyed vide communique dated April 26, 2021, under section 19 read with section 15-I(1) of the Securities and Exchange Board of India Act, 1992 (hereinafter referred to as “**SEBI Act, 1992**”) and rule 3 of SEBI (Procedure for Holding Inquiry and Imposing Penalties) Rules, 1995 (hereinafter referred to as “**Adjudication Rules**”) to conduct adjudication proceedings in the manner specified under rule 4 of Adjudication Rules read with section 15-I(1) and (2) of SEBI Act, 1992, and if satisfied that penalty is liable,

impose such penalty deemed fit in terms of rule 5 of Adjudication Rules and section 15HA of SEBI Act, 1992. Pursuant to transfer of Shri K Saravanan, the undersigned was appointed as Adjudicating Officer in the matter, conveyed vide communique dated July 14, 2021.

SHOW CAUSE NOTICE, REPLY AND HEARING

4. A Show Cause Notice ref no SEBI/HO/A&E/EAD/PB/AS/16751/2021 dated July 28, 2021 (hereinafter referred to as “**SCN**”) was issued to the Noticee under rule 4(1) of the Adjudication Rules to show-cause as to why an inquiry should not be initiated against it and why penalty should not be imposed under section 15HA of the SEBI Act, 1992 for the violations alleged to have been committed by Noticee.

5. It was *inter alia* alleged in the SCN that the Noticee had executed 8 non genuine trades in 4 Stock Options contracts which resulted in artificial volume of total 1,92,000 units. Summary of dealings of the Noticee in 4 Stock Options contracts, in which the Noticee allegedly executed non genuine trades during the I.P, is as follows:

S. No.	Contract Name	Avg. Buy Rate (₹)	Total Buy Volume (No. of units)	Avg. Sell Rate (₹)	Total Sell Volume (No. of units)	% of Non Genuine trades of Noticee in the contract to Noticee's Total trades in the Contract	% of Non Genuine trades of Noticee in the contract to Total trades in the Contract	% of Artificial Volume generated by Noticee in the contract to Noticee's Total Volume in the Contract	% of Artificial Volume generated by Noticee in the contract to Total Volume in the Contract
1	MNML15SEP1230.00PE	21.25	24000	36	24000	100	33.33	100	37.5
2	SIEM15JUL1230.00PEW4	4.35	20000	10.75	20000	100	50	100	40
3	SRFL15AUG990.00PE	4.65	25000	12	25000	100	50	100	50
4	STAC15SEP1080.00PE	1.85	27000	5.75	27000	100	100	100	100

6. From the above table, following was noted as regard to dealings of the Noticee:

- (a) The Noticee had executed non genuine trades in 4 contracts, wherein all trades of Noticee in the said 4 contracts were non genuine trades.
- (b) No. of non-genuine trades of the Noticee had significantly contributed to total no. of trades from the market in the aforesaid contracts, as 33.33% to 100% of the trades that happened in the aforesaid contracts were due to non-genuine trades executed by the Noticee.
- (c) The entire 100% of volume generated by Noticee in the above contracts was artificial volume, and further, the percentage of artificial volume generated by the Noticee in the above contracts to the total volume from the market in said contracts were in the range of 37.5% to 100%. Therefore, substantial volume generated by the Noticee in each of the above contracts were artificial volume.
- (d) Non genuine trades executed by the Noticee in above contracts had significant difference in buy rates and sell rates considering that the trades were reversed on same day.

7. The SCN was sent to the Noticee via Speed Post Acknowledgement Due (SPAD) and via email dated July 29, 2021. However, the SCN could not be served by SPAD. Thereafter, SEBI Western Regional Office was requested to serve the SCN on Noticee vide affixture/hand delivery. The SCN was served on the Noticee vide affixture on October 15, 2021. However, no

reply was received from the Noticee as regards the SCN. Thereafter, hearing notice dated November 30, 2021 was served on the Noticee via affixture on December 09, 2021. Vide aforesaid hearing notice, Noticee was granted opportunity of personal hearing on December 27, 2021. However, no reply was received from Noticee as per the records.

8. In this regard, I find it pertinent to note that the Hon'ble Securities Appellate Tribunal (hereinafter referred to as "**SAT**") in the matter of Classic Credit Ltd. vs. SEBI (Appeal No. 68 of 2003 decided on December 08, 2006) has, *inter-alia*, held that,

"..... the appellants did not file any reply to the second show-cause notice. This being so, it has to be presumed that the charges alleged against them in the show cause notice were admitted by them".

9. The same view was reiterated by the Hon'ble SAT in the matter of Sanjay Kumar Tayal & Others vs SEBI (Appeal No. 68 of 2013 decided on February 11, 2014), wherein it was, *inter alia*, held that,

"..... appellants have neither filed reply to show cause notices issued to them nor availed opportunity of personal hearing offered to them in the adjudication proceedings and, therefore, appellants are presumed to have admitted charges leveled against them in the show cause notices...".

Accordingly, in absence of response of the Noticee to the SCN and the Notice granting opportunity of personal hearing, it may be presumed and inferred that the allegations/charges have been admitted by the Noticee.

10. Having noted the above, I also refer to the judgement of the Hon'ble SAT in the matter of Dave Harihar Kirtibhai Vs SEBI (Appeal No. 181 of 214 dated December 19, 2014), wherein the Hon'ble SAT held that

"...further, it is being increasingly observed by the Tribunal that many persons/entities do not appear before SEBI (Respondent) to submit reply to SCN or, even worse, do not accept notices/letters of Respondent and when orders are passed ex-parte by Respondent, appear before Tribunal in appeal and claim non-receipt of notice and do not appear and/or submit reply to SCN but claim violation of principles of natural justice due to not being provided opportunity to reply to SCN or not provided personal hearing. This leads to unnecessary and avoidable loss of time and resources on part of all concerned and should be eschewed, to say the least. Hence, this case is being decided on basis of material before this Tribunal..."

11. I note from the above that the SCN was served on the Noticee and opportunity of personal hearing was also granted, as per rule 7 of the Adjudication Rules. Therefore, principles of natural justice have been complied with as regards the matter. I thereby proceed to deal with the matter on merits, based on available records.

CONSIDERATION OF ISSUES AND FINDINGS

12. I have carefully perused the charges levelled against the Noticee and the documents/material available on record. The issues that arise for consideration in the present case are:

- (a) Whether the Noticee has violated provisions of regulations 3(a), (b), (c), (d), 4(1) and 4(2)(a) of PFUTP Regulations, 2003?
- (b) Does the violation, if any, attract monetary penalty under section 15HA of the SEBI Act, 1992?
- (c) If so, what would be the quantum of monetary penalty that can be imposed on the Noticee after taking into consideration the factors mentioned in section 15J of the SEBI Act, 1992?

13. Before proceeding further, I would like to refer to the relevant provisions of the PFUTP Regulations, 2003 as below:

PFUTP Regulations, 2003

3. Prohibition of certain dealings in securities

No person shall directly or indirectly—

- (a) buy, sell or otherwise deal in securities in a fraudulent manner;*
- (b) use or employ, in connection with issue, purchase or sale of any security listed or proposed to be listed in a recognized stock exchange, any manipulative or deceptive device or contrivance in contravention of the provisions of the Act or the rules or the regulations made there under;*
- (c) employ any device, scheme or artifice to defraud in connection with dealing in or issue of securities which are listed or proposed to be listed on a recognized stock exchange;*

(d) engage in any act, practice, course of business which operates or would operate as fraud or deceit upon any person in connection with any dealing in or issue of securities which are listed or proposed to be listed on a recognized stock exchange in contravention of the provisions of the Act or the rules and the regulations made there under.

4. Prohibition of manipulative, fraudulent and unfair trade practices

(1) Without prejudice to the provisions of regulation 3, no person shall indulge in a fraudulent or an unfair trade practice in securities.

(2) Dealing in securities shall be deemed to be a fraudulent or an unfair trade practice if it involves fraud and may include all or any of the following, namely:—

(a) indulging in an act which creates false or misleading appearance of trading in the securities market;

14. I note that allegation against the Noticee is that, while dealing in the stock option contracts at BSE during the IP, it had executed reversal trades which were allegedly non-genuine trades and the same had resulted in generation of artificial volume in stock option contracts at BSE. Reversal trades are considered to be those trades in which an entity reverses its buy or sell positions in a contract with subsequent sell or buy positions with the same counterparty during the same day. The said reversal trades are alleged to be non-genuine trades as they are not executed in the normal course of trading, lack basic trading rationale, lead to false or misleading appearance of trading in terms of generation of artificial volumes and hence are deceptive and manipulative.

15. I further note that pursuant to a preliminary examination conducted in the Illiquid Stock Options matter, Interim order was passed by SEBI on August 20, 2015 which was confirmed vide Orders dated July 30, 2016 and August 22, 2016. Meanwhile, SEBI initiated a detailed investigation relating to stock options segment of BSE which was completed in the year 2018. The investigation revealed that 14,720 entities were involved in executing non-genuine trades in BSE's stock option segment during the IP. The proceedings initiated vide the aforementioned Interim Order were disposed of vide Final Order dated April 05, 2018 also considering that appropriate action was initiated against the said 14,720 entities in a phased manner.
16. Further, during the course of hearing in the case of R. S. Ispat Ltd Vs SEBI, the Hon'ble SAT, vide its Order dated October 14, 2019, *inter alia* observed that "*SEBI may consider holding a Lok Adalat or adopting any other alternative dispute resolution process with regard to the Illiquid Stock Options*".
17. A Settlement Scheme was framed under the SEBI (Settlement Proceedings) Regulations, 2018, which provided one-time opportunity for settlement of proceedings in the Illiquid Stock Options matter. The said scheme was kept open from August 01, 2020 till December 31, 2020. Thereafter, Adjudication proceedings were initiated against those entities who had not availed of the opportunity of settlement.

18. As can be seen from the narration of facts in the foregoing paragraphs, pursuant to appointment of AO on July 14, 2021, SCN was issued on July 28, 2021. In compliance with principles of natural justice, the SCN was served on the Noticee vide affixture, and thereafter, an opportunity of personal hearing was scheduled on December 27, 2021 vide hearing notice dated November 30, 2021 served on the Noticee via affixture. Therefore, I note that the instant adjudication proceedings were initiated pursuant to a series of legal and judicial developments, and that the principles of natural justice were duly complied with during the course of proceedings.

19. I note from trade log of the Noticee that it had traded in 4 unique contracts in the stock options segment of BSE during the IP. It is observed that the Noticee has allegedly executed 8 non-genuine trades in the said 4 contracts. I further note that the above mentioned trades of the Noticee had resulted in the creation of artificial volume of 1,92,000 units in the said 4 contracts. Summary of non-genuine trades of the Noticee is as follows:

S. No.	Contract Name	Avg. Buy Rate (₹)	Total Buy Volume (No. of units)	Avg. Sell Rate (₹)	Total Sell Volume (No. of units)	% of Non Genuine trades of Noticee in the contract to Noticee's Total trades in the Contract	% of Non Genuine trades of Noticee in the contract to Total trades in the Contract	% of Artificial Volume generated by Noticee in the contract to Noticee's Total Volume in the Contract	% of Artificial Volume generated by Noticee in the contract to Total Volume in the Contract
1	MNML15SEP1230.00PE	21.25	24000	36	24000	100	33.33	100	37.5
2	SIEM15JUL1230.00PEW4	4.35	20000	10.75	20000	100	50	100	40
3	SRFL15AUG990.00PE	4.65	25000	12	25000	100	50	100	50
4	STAC15SEP1080.00PE	1.85	27000	5.75	27000	100	100	100	100

20. It is noted that the Noticee had executed non-genuine trades in 4 contracts, wherein the percentage of non-genuine trades of the Noticee in stock options contracts to total trades in the contracts was in the range of 33.33% to 100% in the aforesaid contracts. Further, artificial volume generated by Noticee in the contracts amounted to the entire 100% of total volume generated by it in the aforesaid contracts. It is also noted that artificial volume generated by the Noticee contributed significantly in the range of 37.5% to 100% of the total volume from the market in the said contracts. Non-genuine trades executed by the Noticee in the above contracts had significant difference in buy rates and sell rates considering that the trades were reversed on the same day.

21. I note from the trade log that the trades executed by the Noticee in a contract were squared up within a short span of time with its counterparties. To illustrate, the Noticee on June 29, 2015 at 12:12:12.67 hrs entered into 1 sell trade with counterparty viz. Ashlar Securities Private Limited for 24,000 units at the rate of ₹36 per unit in the contract MNML15SEP1230.00PE. Thereafter, on the same day, Noticee entered into 1 buy trade with same counterparty at 12:12:17.50 hrs for 24,000 units at the rate of ₹21.25 per unit in the same contract.

22. It is noted that while dealing in the said contract during the I.P., the Noticee executed reversal trades with same counterparty viz. Ashlar Securities Private Limited on the same day and with significant price difference in buy

and sell rates. Thus, the Noticee, through its dealing in the contract viz. “MNML15SEP1230.00PE” during the I.P., executed non genuine trades which was 33.33% of the total trades from the market in the said contract during the I.P., and thereby, Noticee generated artificial volume of 48,000 units which was 37.5% of the volume traded in the said contract from the market during the I.P.

23. I note that the non-genuineness of the trades executed by Noticee is evident from the fact that there was no commercial basis as to why, within a short span of time, the Noticee reversed the position with its counterparties with significant price difference. I note from the trade log of the Noticee that the time taken by the Noticee for reversing the non-genuine trades ranged from 05 seconds to 10 seconds, on the same day. Such a short span of time taken for reversing the trades in an illiquid stock option contract suggests the non-genuineness of these trades executed by the Noticee. The fact that the transactions in a particular contract were reversed with the same counterparty indicates a prior meeting of minds with a view to execute the reversal trades at a pre-determined price. Since these trades were done in illiquid option contracts, there was no trading in the said contract and hence, there was no price discovery in the strictest terms. There was wide variation in prices of the said contracts, within a short span of time, without substantial variation in the price of the underlying scrip to justify the aforesaid variation. It is a clear indication that there was pre-determination in the prices by the counterparties while executing the trades. Thus, it is observed that Noticee had indulged in reversal trades with its

counterparties in the stock options segment of BSE and the same were non-genuine trades.

24. I further note that it is not mere coincidence that Noticee could match its trades with the same counterparty with whom it had undertaken first leg of the respective trades. This is the outcome of meeting of minds elsewhere and it was a deliberate attempt to deal in such a fashion. I note in matters dealing with violation of PFUTP Regulations, 2003, the reason as regards execution of non-genuine trades might not be forthcoming. However, the correct test instead, is one of preponderance of probabilities. Here I would like to rely on the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in SEBI v Kishore R Ajmera (AIR 2016 SC 1079) decided on February 23, 2016, wherein it was held that - *"...in the absence of direct proof of meeting of minds elsewhere in synchronized transactions, the test should be one of preponderance of probabilities as far as adjudication of civil liability arising out of the violation of the Act or provision of the Regulations is concerned. The conclusion has to be gathered from various circumstances like that volume of the trade effected; the period of persistence in trading in the particular scrip; the particulars of the buy and sell orders, namely, the volume thereof; the proximity of time between the two and such other relevant factors. The illustrations are not exhaustive..."*

25. The Hon'ble Supreme Court further held in the same matter that – *"It is a fundamental principle of law that proof of an allegation levelled against a person may be in the form of direct substantive evidence or, as in many cases, such proof may have to be inferred by a logical process of reasoning from the totality of the attending facts and circumstances surrounding the allegations/charges made and*

levelled. While direct evidence is a more certain basis to come to a conclusion, yet, in the absence thereof the Courts cannot be helpless. It is the judicial duty to take note of the immediate and proximate facts and circumstances surrounding the events on which the charges/allegations are founded and to reach what would appear to the Court to be a reasonable conclusion therefrom. The test would always be that what inferential process that a reasonable/prudent man would adopt to arrive at a conclusion."

26. I note that direct evidence is not forthcoming in the present matter as regards to meeting of minds or collusion of the Noticee with other entities. However, I note that the trading behaviour of the Noticee makes it clear that aforesaid non-genuine trades could not have been possible without meeting of minds at some level. In this context, I deem it appropriate to refer to the Hon'ble SAT order dated July 14, 2006, in the case of Ketan Parekh vs. SEBI (Appeal no. 2/2004), wherein the Hon'ble SAT has held that - *"The nature of transactions executed, the frequency with which such transactions are undertaken, the value of the transactions, the conditions then prevailing in the market are some of the factors which go to show the intention of the parties. This list of factors, in the very nature of things, cannot be exhaustive. Any one factor may or may not be decisive and it is from the cumulative effect of these that an inference will have to be drawn."*

27. I place my reliance on the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter in respect of SEBI v Rakhi Trading Private Limited (Civil Appeal Nos. 1969, 3174-3177 and 3180 of 2011 decided on February 8, 2018), which had similar case facts, in which the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that -

“Considering the reversal transactions, quantity, price and time and sale, parties being persistent in number of such trade transactions with huge price variations, it will be too naive to hold that the transactions are through screen-based trading and hence anonymous. Such conclusion would be over-looking the prior meeting of minds involving synchronization of buy and sell order and not negotiated deals as per the board's circular. The impugned transactions are manipulative/deceptive device to create a desired loss and/or profit. Such synchronized trading is violative of transparent norms of trading in securities.....”

28. Further, the Hon'ble SAT in its judgement dated September 14, 2020 in the matter of Global Earth Properties and Developers Pvt Ltd relied upon the aforesaid judgement of Hon'ble Supreme Court and held that,

“It is not a mere coincidence that the Appellants could match the trades with the counter party with whom he had undertaken the first leg of respective trade. In our opinion, the trades were non-genuine trades and even though direct evidence is not available in the instant case but in the peculiar facts and circumstances of the present case there is an irresistible inference that can be drawn that there was meeting of minds between the Appellants and the counter parties, and collusion with a view to trade at a predetermined price.”

29. Therefore, the trading behaviour of the Noticee confirms that such trades were not normal and wide variation in prices of the trades in the same contract in a short time without any basis for such wide variation, all indicate

that the trades executed by the Noticee were not genuine trades and being non-genuine, created an appearance of artificial trading volumes in respective contracts. In view of the above, I find that the allegation of violation of regulations 3(a), (b), (c), (d), 4(1) and 4(2)(a) of PFUTP Regulations, 2003 by the Noticee stands established. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the matter of SEBI Vs. Shri Ram Mutual Fund [2006] 68 SCL 216(SC) decided on May 23, 2006 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 and hence the intention of the parties committing such violation becomes wholly irrelevant..."*.

30. In view of the same, I am convinced that it is a fit case for imposition of monetary penalty on the Noticee under the provisions of section 15HA of the SEBI Act, 1992 which read as under:

¹***[Penalty for fraudulent and unfair trade practices.***

15HA. If any person indulges in fraudulent and unfair trade practices relating to securities, he shall be liable to a penalty ²[which shall not be less than five lakh rupees but which may extend to twenty - five crore rupees or three times the amount of profits made out of such practices, whichever is higher].

¹ Inserted by the SEBI (Amendment) Act, 2002, w.e.f.29-10-2002.

² Substituted for the words —twenty-five crore rupees or three times the amount of profits made out of such failure, whichever is higher || by the Securities Laws (Amendment) Act, 2014, w.e.f. 08-09-2014

31. While determining the quantum of penalty under section 15HA of the SEBI Act, it is important to consider the factors relevantly as stipulated in section 15J of the SEBI Act which reads as under:-

Factors to be taken into account by the adjudicating officer.

15J. While adjudging quantum of penalty under section 15-I, 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 of an adjudicating officer 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.

32. I observe, that the material available on record does not quantify any disproportionate gains or unfair advantage, if any, made by the Noticee and the losses, if any, suffered by the investors due to such violations on part of the said Noticee. However, Noticee has entered into 8 non-genuine trades in 4 stock option contracts which demonstrates the repetitive nature of default on its part.

33. Therefore, I note that Noticee indulged in execution of reversal trades in stock options contracts in the IP which were non-genuine and created false and misleading appearance of trading in terms of artificial volumes in stock

options, leading to violation of regulations 3(a),(b),(c),(d) and 4(1),(2)(a) of the PFUTP Regulations, 2003.

ORDER

34. Having considered all the facts and circumstances of the case, the material available on record, the factors mentioned in section 15J of the SEBI Act, 1992 and in exercise of power conferred upon me under section 15-I of the SEBI Act, 1992 read with rule 5 of the Adjudication Rules, 1995, I hereby impose following penalty under section 15HA of the SEBI Act, 1992 on the Noticee:

Name of the Noticee	Violation provisions	Penalty
Nimesh Harishkumar Vora HUF PAN: AADHN4442G	regulations 3(a), (b), (c), (d), 4(1) and 4(2)(a) of PFUTP Regulations, 2003	₹5,00,000/- (Rupees Five Lakh only)

I am of the view that the said penalty is commensurate with the lapse/omission on the part of the Noticee.

35. The Noticee shall remit / pay the said amount of penalty within 45 days of receipt of this order either by way of Demand Draft in favour of “SEBI - Penalties Remittable to Government of India”, payable at Mumbai, OR 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

36. The aforesaid Noticee shall forward said Demand Draft or the details / confirmation of penalty so paid to “The Division Chief (Enforcement

Department 1 DRA-2), Securities and Exchange Board of India, SEBI Bhavan, Plot No. C – 4 A, “G” Block, Bandra Kurla Complex, Bandra (E), Mumbai – 400 051.”. The Noticee shall also provide the following details while forwarding DD / payment information:

- Name and PAN of the Noticee
- Name of the case / matter
- Purpose of Payment – Payment of penalty under AO proceedings
- Bank Name and Account Number
- Transaction Number

37. In the event of failure to pay the said amount of penalty within 45 days of the receipt of this Order, SEBI may initiate consequential actions including but not limited to recovery proceedings under section 28A of the SEBI Act, 1992 for realization of the said amount of penalty along with interest thereon, *inter alia*, by attachment and sale of movable and immovable properties.

38. In terms of the provisions of rule 6 of the Adjudication Rules, a copy of this order is being sent to the Noticee viz. Nimesh Harishkumar Vora HUF and also to the Securities and Exchange Board of India.

Date: January 27, 2022

Place: Mumbai

**PARAG BASU
ADJUDICATING OFFICER**