

**BEFORE THE ADJUDICATING OFFICER
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE BOARD OF INDIA
[ADJUDICATION ORDER NO: Order/SD/KS/2021-22/14414]**

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

In respect of:

SHRUTI JAIN

PAN: AYDPJ7029B

FLAT NO-302, PARAS APARTMENT,
KUCHERY ROAD, RANCHI, JHARKHAND, 834001

In the matter of

Dealings in illiquid stock options at BSE

FACTS OF THE CASE

1. Securities and Exchange Board of India (hereinafter referred to as '**SEBI**') observed large scale reversal of trades in the Stock Options segment of Bombay Stock Exchange (hereinafter referred to as '**BSE**') leading to alleged creation of artificial volume in the stock options segment. In this regard, SEBI conducted an investigation into the trading activity in the illiquid Stock Options Segment at BSE for the period April 01, 2014 to September 30, 2015 (hereinafter referred to as "**Investigation Period**").
2. It was observed during the course of investigation that a total of 2,91,643 trades comprising 81.38% of all the trades executed in the Stock Options Segment by various entities at BSE during the investigation period were trades which involved reversal of buy and sell positions by the clients and counterparties in a contract on the same day.

It was also observed that the aforesaid trades resulted into alleged creation of artificial volume to the tune of 826.21 crore units in the Stock Options segment of BSE during the investigation period. In view of the large scale reversal of trades that were observed in the illiquid Stock Options segment at BSE, it is alleged that these trades were non-genuine in nature.

3. It was observed that Ms. Shruti Jain (hereinafter referred to as “**Noticee**”) was one of the various entities who indulged in the execution of alleged non-genuine trades in the Stock Options Segment at BSE during the above referred investigation period. It was observed that Noticee had entered into reversal trades with her counterparty which involved squaring off transaction with significant difference in sell value and buy value of the transaction. Therefore, it is alleged that Noticee had executed the reversal trades which were non-genuine in nature and have created false or misleading appearance of trading in terms of creation of artificial volume in the Stock Options segment at BSE and therefore, it is alleged that the Noticee has violated the provisions of Regulations 3 (a), (b), (c), (d) and Regulation 4(1), 4(2) (a) of the SEBI (Prohibition of Fraudulent and Unfair Trade Practices relating to Securities Markets) Regulations, 2003 (hereinafter referred to as “**PFUTP Regulations**”). In view of the above reasons, adjudication proceedings have been initiated against the Noticee under the provisions of section 15HA of the Securities and Exchange Board of India Act, 1992 (hereinafter referred to as ‘**SEBI Act**’).

APPOINTMENT OF ADJUDICATING OFFICER

4. The undersigned was appointed as the Adjudicating Officer, vide communique dated June 28, 2021 under Section 19 read with Section 15-I of the SEBI Act read with Rule 3 of 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 15HA of the SEBI Act for the aforementioned alleged violation of the provisions of law by the Noticee.

SHOW CAUSE NOTICE, HEARING AND REPLY

5. Show Cause Notice ref. SEBI/HO/EFD1/EFD1_DRA5/P/OW/16235/1/2021 dated July 23, 2021 (hereinafter referred to as '**SCN**') was issued to the Noticee in terms of Rule 4 of the Adjudication Rules requiring the Noticee to show cause as to why an inquiry should not be held against her and why penalty, if any, should not be imposed on the Noticee under the provisions of section 15HA of the SEBI Act. The SCN issued to the Noticee, *inter alia*, mentioned the following-:

- i. *It is noted that Noticee was one of the various entities which were indulged in execution of such alleged non-genuine trades in Stock Options Segment of BSE during the Investigation period. Following points deal with the dealings of Noticee during the Investigation period and allegations against it for execution of non-genuine trades.*

Date	Buyer	Seller	Buy Order Time	Sell Order Time	Trade Time	Trade Rate (Rs.)	Trade Quantity
13/01/2015	SHRUTI JAIN	PRAGYA COMMODITIES PRIVATE LIMITED	14:54:55.841685	14:54:54.836316	14:54:55.841685	0.05	132000
13/01/2015	PRAGYA COMMODITIES PRIVATE LIMITED	SHRUTI JAIN	14:34:01.331616	14:34:00.568634	14:34:01.331616	1.55	132000

- ii. *It is observed from the table above that the trades entered by the Noticee in the contract of "ANBK15JAN85.00PEW3" on January 13, 2015, with her counterparty viz. PRAGYA COMMODITIES PRIVATE LIMITED were reversed between the Noticee and the same counterparty on the same day resulting in reversal of trades which are, prima facie, considered to be non-genuine. Therefore, in the process artificial volume in the stock option contract at BSE has been generated by the Noticee through such non-genuine trades. From the table above, it is observed that the artificial volume created as no. of units reversed in non-genuine trades is 264000 units comprising both volume of initial trade and volume of reversal trade, while not considering the volume which is not reversed.*

- iii. *It is further observed from the trade data of the Noticee that it has allegedly entered into non-genuine trades in 1 contract wherein he executed a total of 2 trades all of which were, prima facie, non-genuine trades. In view of this, it is alleged that such fraudulent trades of the Noticee had resulted into creation of artificial volume of total 264000 units.*

- iv. *From the perusal of the trade data of the alleged non-genuine trades of the Noticee, it is observed that Noticee has allegedly executed non-genuine trades in 1 contract. The total volume of 264000 units generated by the Noticee in this 1 contract. Due to her alleged non-genuine trades, an Artificial Volume was generated by the Noticee in the Stock Option Segment of BSE. These alleged non-genuine trades, executed by Noticee in above contract, had significant differential in buy rates and sell rates considering that the trades were reversed on same day*
- v. *In view of the foregoing, it is alleged that the Noticee, by indulging in execution of reversal trades in Stock Options with same entities on the same day, which were non-genuine in nature, has created false or misleading appearance of trading in the aforementioned contracts traded in the option segment of BSE. In view of the fact that these options contracts were illiquid in nature, having very small volume in trading, the Noticee allegedly created artificial volumes in stock options which was manipulative and deceptive in nature. Therefore, in view of above, it is alleged that the Noticee has violated Regulation 3(a), (b), (c), (d), 4(1) and 4(2)(a) of PFUTP Regulations, 2003*
6. The SCN with reference number SEBI/HO/EFD1/EFD1_DRA5/P/OW/16235/1/2021 dated July 23, 2021 was issued to the Noticee via Speed Post Acknowledgement Due (SPAD), which was duly served on the Noticee as per the Tracking details obtained from the India Post website and the SCN was also sent to Noticee via email dated July 30, 2021, which was also duly delivered to the Noticee.
7. From the material available on record, it is observed that the Noticee has not submitted her reply in the matter till date.
8. In the interest of natural justice and in order to conduct an inquiry in terms of Rule 4 (3) of the Adjudication Rules, vide hearing Notice dated September 29, 2021, the Noticee was granted an opportunity of personal hearing in the matter on October 13, 2021, through the online Cisco webex platform. The said hearing Notice was delivered to the Noticee via SPAD and email dated September 30, 2021. However, the Noticee neither attend the said hearing nor submitted her reply to the SCN, despite the SCN and the hearing notice being served upon the Noticee through SPAD and email.
9. From the above, *I am of the view that the principles of natural justice have been adhered to, as the SCN and the Hearing Notice were duly served upon the Noticee and sufficient opportunity was granted to her to reply to the SCN and appear for the personal hearing.*

10. Considering the fact that the Noticee has neither filed any reply nor has availed the opportunity of personal hearing despite service of notices upon her, In view of these facts, I am constrained to view that she has nothing to submit in terms of Rule 4(7) of the Adjudication Rules and the matter may be proceeded ex parte on the basis of material available on record. In the absence of any response to the SCN, I presume that the Noticee has admitted the charges levelled against her.
11. In this regard, it is pertinent to note that the Hon'ble SAT in the matter of **Classic Credit Ltd. vs. SEBI** (Appeal No. 68 of 2003 decided on December 08, 2006) has, inter alia, observed 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".
12. Further, the Hon'ble SAT in the matter of **Sanjay Kumar Tayal & Others vs SEBI** (Appeal No. 68 of 2013 decided on February 11, 2014), has also, inter alia, observed 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 levelled against them in the show cause notices..."
13. Additionally, the same position has been reiterated by 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 observed as under: "...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...".

14. In view of the observations made by the Hon'ble SAT, I find no reason to take a different view and accordingly, I deem it appropriate to proceed against the Noticee ex parte, based on the material available on record.
15. While deciding the case, I cannot lose sight of settled position of law that the charge should be established with valid reasons and in accordance with law. I, therefore, deem it necessary to examine the charge based on the trades executed by the Noticee and the supporting material as provided in the SCN.

CONSIDERATION OF ISSUES AND FINDINGS:

16. I have taken into consideration the facts and circumstances of the case, the material available on record. It is alleged that the Noticee had executed reversal trades, which were non-genuine trades and the same has resulted in the generation of artificial volume in the Stock Option contracts at BSE. In view of the same, it is alleged that Noticee has violated the provisions of Regulations 3(a), (b), (c), (d) and Regulation 4(1), 4(2)(a) of PFUTP Regulations and, therefore, it is alleged that Noticee is liable for penalty under the provisions of Section 15HA of the SEBI Act.
17. Before moving forward, the relevant provisions of law allegedly violated by the Noticee and as mentioned in the SCN are reproduced below:--

PFUTP Regulations

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;

18. I note that the allegation against the Noticee is that, she had executed reversal trades while dealing in the stock option contracts at BSE during the IP, which were allegedly non-genuine and had resulted in the creation of artificial volume in the stock options contracts at BSE. Reversal trades are considered as those trades in which an entity reverse her 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, and allegedly lead to false or misleading appearance of trading in terms of generation of artificial volumes, hence these trades are deceptive and manipulative. From the facts/material made available on record, I find that reversal trades executed by the Noticee, which were observed in the present case, were undertaken by the Noticee with her counterparty with a predetermined arrangement to book profit or losses respectively, and therefore, the parties to the trades were not trading in the normal sense and ordinary course of business. Therefore, it is alleged that the Noticee by indulging in such reversal trades with her counterparty in the illiquid stock option segment at BSE has managed to generate artificial volume in the Stock Options segment at BSE during the investigation period.

19. In this regard, it is observed from the trade log of the Noticee that she had traded in 1 contract in the Stock Options segment of BSE during the above mentioned investigation period. The examination of the Trade log of the Noticee during the relevant period revealed that she had executed 2 non-genuine trades in 1 contract in the Stock Options segment of BSE. I note that the abovementioned trades of the Noticee had resulted in the creation of artificial volume of a total of 264000 units in the given 1 contract. Further, it is observed that the trade executed by the Noticee was squared up within a short span of time with the same counterparty i.e. trade was reversed within few minutes on the same day. Thus, it is observed that Noticee had indulged in reversal trades with her counterparty in the stock option segment of BSE and the same were non-genuine trades.
20. Further, it is observed that these trades were squared up by the Noticee with her counterparty with a significant price difference. The non-genuineness of these transactions executed by the Noticee is evident from the fact that there was no commercial basis to suddenly, within a matter of few seconds, reverse the position with her counterparty with significant price difference when the value of the underlying had not undergone any significant change. **The trade reversals in the said case points out to the fact that the parties to the transactions, including the Noticee, did not intend to transfer the beneficial ownership and through these orchestrated transactions, the intention of which was not regular trading, other investors have been excluded from participating in these trades/ contracts.** As already mentioned above, there was very little time gap between the buy and sell orders placed by the Noticee with her counterparty in different trades. The time gap between both the trades was few minutes on the same day. Given the fact that the Stock Option contracts were illiquid in nature at BSE and also in view of the observations made above, I am convinced that Noticee has entered into reversal/non-genuine trades with her counterparty and in the process also generated artificial volume in the otherwise illiquid stock option contracts at BSE.
21. To illustrate, it is observed that the Noticee had executed a total of 2 trades during the Investigation period in the contract “ANBK15JAN85.00PEW3”. The aforesaid trades

were done by the Noticee on January 13, 2015 wherein Noticee sold 132000 units to Pragya Commodities Private Limited at 14:34:00 at the rate of Rs. 1.55 per unit. The Noticee then bought 132000 units from Pragya Commodities Private Limited at 14:54:54 at the rate of Rs. 0.05 per unit. This resulted in 2 trades with total trade quantity of 264000 units at a price of Rs. 1.55 and Rs.0.05. Thus, in the above manner, the Noticee executed a total of 2 trades in the contract "ANBK15JAN85.00PEW3" and generated artificial volume of 264000 units through such non-genuine and reversal trades. It is also observed that, out of the 2 trades done through 1 unique contract, the Noticee was instrumental in contributing significantly towards the total volume recorded on BSE in the said contracts.

22. I hold that all the 2 transactions executed by the Noticee in the 1 Option Contract were synchronized trades, which were reversed within a fraction of minutes with prior meeting of mind between the parties to the trade. Needless to mention the fact that these transactions were manipulative/deceptive device with a view to create a desired loss and/or profit in the books of the party to the transactions and in the process, artificial volumes were also generated through such contracts. As per the material available, the Noticee made a profit of Rs. 1,98,000/- as result of these trades.

23. At this juncture, it is pertinent to refer to the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the matter of **Securities and Exchange Board of India v. Rakhi Trading Private Limited** (Civil Appeal Nos. 1969, 3174-3177 and 3180 of 2011 dated February 08, 2018) wherein, the Hon'ble Supreme Court while cumulatively analyzing the reversal transactions held that, price discovery system itself was affected by synchronization and rapid reverse trade, which also had the impact of excluding other investors from participating in the market. The Supreme Court, therefore found that the traders having engaged in a fraudulent and unfair trade practice while dealing in securities, are hence liable to be proceeded against for violation of Regulations 3(a), 4(1) and 4(2)(a) of the PFUTP Regulations. The Apex Court also held that "considering the reversal transactions, quantity, price and time and sale, parties being persistent in the number of such trade transactions with huge price variations, it

will be too naïve 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." The Hon'ble Apex Court has also held that in the absence of direct proof of meeting of minds, the test should be one of preponderance of probability and also stated that the conclusion has to be gathered from various circumstances like volume of trade, period of persistence of trading, particulars of buy and sell orders, proximity of time between the two and such other relevant factors.

24. In the same matter, Hon'ble Supreme Court had further stated that-

".....quantity, time and significant variation of prices, without major variation in the underlying price of the securities clearly indicate that Respondent's trades are not genuine and had only misleading appearance of trading in the securities market....."

"35.... Contextually and in simple words, it means a practice which does not conform to the fair and transparent principles of trades in the stock market. In the instant case, one party booked gains and the other party booked a loss. Nobody intentionally trades for a loss. An intentional trading for loss per se, is not a genuine dealing in securities. The platform of the stock exchange has been used for a non-genuine trade. Trading is always with the aim to make profits. But if one party consistently makes losses and that too in a pre-planned manner and rapid trades, it is not genuine....."

25. Additionally, the Hon'ble Securities Appellate Tribunal (hereinafter referred to as "SAT") in its Order dated September 14, 2020 in the matter of Global Earth Properties and Developers Pvt Ltd Vs SEBI (Appeal No. 212 of 2020) relied upon the aforesaid Order of the 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.”

26. In this context, I also find it relevant to refer to the decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of **Securities and Exchange Board of India v. Kishore R Ajmera** {(2016)} 6 SCC 368 : AIR 2016 SC 1079} wherein, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that , “ According to us, knowledge of who the 2nd party/client or the broker is, is not relevant at all. While the screen based trading system keeps the identity of the parties anonymous it will be too naïve to rest the final conclusions on the said basis which overlooks a meeting of minds elsewhere. Direct proof of such meeting of minds elsewhere would rarely be forthcoming. The test, in our considered view, is one of preponderance of probabilities so far as adjudication of civil liability arising out of violation of the Act or the provisions of the Regulations framed thereunder is concerned.....”

27. In the same matter, the Hon'ble Supreme Court, has further 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 trade effected; the period of persistence in trading in a particular scrip; the particulars of buy and sell orders, namely the volume thereof; the proximity of time between the two and such relevant factors.....”

28. The observations made in the aforesaid judgments of Hon'ble Supreme Court apply with full force to the facts and circumstances of the present case. Therefore, applying the ratio of the above judgments, I am convinced that the execution of trades by the Noticee in the illiquid options segment with such precision in terms of order placement, time, price, quantity etc. and also the fact that the transactions were reversed with the

same counterparty clearly indicates a prior meeting of mind with a view to execute the reversal trade at a pre-determined price. It is observed that in respect of these trades executed in the illiquid stock options contract, the only reason for the wide variation in prices of the same contract and execution time within seconds was a clear indication that there was pre-determination in the prices by both the counterparties when executing the trades. Thus, the nature of trading, as brought out above, clearly indicates an element of prior meeting of minds and therefore, a collusion of the Noticee with her counterparty to carry out the trades at predetermined prices. It is not possible to comprehend the reason for which the Noticee would enter into an option contract with a strike price far away from the current market price of the underlying except for the fact that Noticee wanted to execute non-genuine trades.

29. Such trading also involves an act amounting to manipulation of the price of the security in the sense that the price has been artificially and apparently prefixed. The price does not at all reflect the value of the underlying asset. It is also a transaction without any intention of performing it and without any intention of effecting a change of ownership of such securities, ownership being understood in the limited sense of the rights in the contract. By synchronization and reversal trade as has been carried out by the Noticee in the instant case, the price discovery system has been affected. Except the parties who have pre-fixed the price, nobody is in the position to participate in the trade. It also has an adverse impact on the fairness, integrity and transparency of the stock market.

30. Therefore, from the foregoing paragraphs and the observations/findings contained therein, I hold that the Noticee has violated the provisions of Regulations 3(a), (b), (c), (d), 4(1) and 4(2)(a) of PFUTP Regulations, 2003

31. In view of the above, I conclude that the Noticee is liable for monetary penalty under the provisions of Section 15HA of the SEBI Act, which reads as under :

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 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.

32. In this regard, the provisions of Section 15J of the SEBI Act and Rule 5 of the Adjudication Rules require that while adjudging the quantum of penalty, 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.

33. Clearly, from the above observations, the Noticee was instrumental in the creation of artificial volume in the illiquid stock option contracts at BSE during the investigation period by executing reversal / non-genuine transactions in the illiquid stock options segment at BSE. It is not possible from the material available on record to quantify the amount of loss caused to genuine investors as a result of the reversal trades/ non-genuine trades executed by the Noticee with her counterparty. From the manner in which Noticee executed the above mentioned transactions, the Noticee has violated the statutory provisions of law. In this context, reliance is placed upon the order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the matter of Chairman, **SEBI Vs Shriram Mutual Fund** { [2006]5 SCC 361 } – wherein the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India 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.....*”

ORDER

34. Having considered all the facts and circumstances of the case, the material available on record and the factors mentioned in the preceding paragraphs, 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.5,00,000/- (Rupees Five Lakh only) on the Noticee viz. Ms. Shruti Jain under the provisions of Section 15HA of the SEBI Act for the violation of Regulations 3(a), (b), (c), (d), 4(1) and 4(2) (a) of the PFUTP Regulations. I am of the view that the said penalty is commensurate with the default committed by the Noticee.

35. The Noticee shall remit / pay the said amount of penalty within 45 (forty five) days of the receipt of this order either by way of Demand Draft (DD) in favour of “SEBI - Penalties Remittable to Government of India”, payable at Mumbai and the said DD should be forwarded to the Division Chief, Enforcement Department - I (EFD), Division of Regulatory Action - I [EFD1-DRA-3] SEBI Bhavan, Plot No.C4-A, ‘ G’ Block, Bandra Kurla Complex (BKC), Bandra (East), Mumbai – 400 051 and also send an email to tad@sebi.gov.in with the following details:

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)	

OR

Payment can also be made online by following the below path at SEBI website www.sebi.gov.in ENFORCEMENT → Orders → Orders of AO → Click on PAY NOW or at <https://siportal.sebi.gov.in/intermediary/AOPaymentGateway.html>.

36. 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, 1992 for realization of the said amount of penalty along with interest thereon, inter alia, by attachment and sale of movable and immovable properties.

37. In terms of the provisions of Rule 6 of the Adjudication Rules, a copy of this order is sent to the Noticee viz. Ms. Shruti Jain and also to Securities and Exchange Board of India.

Place: Mumbai
Date: November 30, 2021

SANDEEP P DEORE
ADJUDICATING OFFICER