

BEFORE THE ADJUDICATING OFFICER
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE BOARD OF INDIA
[ADJUDICATION ORDER NO. Order/SM/DD/2022-23/18386]

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. Vijendra Bisht
[PAN: BAGPB4169Q]

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**) (collectively called '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. Vijendra Bisht (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

‘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 his 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
	April- June, 2018	
Mr. Vijendra Bisht	77,73,939	5

- b) It was observed from the table above that in the calendar quarter ending on June 2018, the total traded value of the securities traded by Noticee in the scrip of Titan was Rs 77,73,939/-. It was also observed that on 5 occasions in the aforesaid calendar quarter, Noticee’s traded value of Titan securities exceeded rupees ten lakhs. Therefore, for the 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 five 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, and digitally signed email dated August 12, 2021 and 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 email and letter dated August 24, 2021, Noticee submitted his reply to the SCN.
7. Thereafter, in the interest of natural justice, vide hearing notice dated July 14, 2022, Noticee was granted an opportunity of personal hearing before the undersigned on August 02, 2022. The aforesaid hearing notice was sent to Noticee through SPAD and also through digitally signed email on July 15, 2022 and was duly served upon him. Noticee appeared for hearing on the scheduled date and reiterated the earlier submissions by him. Due to difficulties in view of the Covid-19 pandemic, hearing was conducted through video conferencing.
8. The submissions by Noticee are summarized hereunder:-
- a. He does not come under the category of 'designated person' or 'person having access to UPSI' and is not required to obtain pre-clearance for trading.
 - b. During the period of transactions, he not in possession of any unpublished price sensitive information which may have unduly benefitted him.
 - c. He was working as an employee in the position of engineer at the Watch assembly plant of Titan.
 - d. The traded amount was quite high as transactions were done in the intra-day category, but had incurred losses for the same.

- e. He did not have any intention to violate PIT Regulations or Code of Conduct by any means at the time of the transactions.

CONSIDERATION OF ISSUES, EVIDENCE AND FINDINGS

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

- I. Whether Noticee has violated Regulation 7(2)(a) of PIT Regulations?
- II. Does the violation, if any, attract monetary penalty under Section 15A(b) of SEBI Act?
- III. 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.I- 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 at the relevant time. 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:-

Date	Segment	Buy Qty	Buy Value/Sum of Notional Day Buy Value (Rs.)	Sell Qty	Sell Value/Sum of Notional Day Sell Value (Rs.)	Gross Value/Gross Notional Value (Notional Day Buy Value + Notional Day Sell Value) (Rs.)	Cumulative Value (Rs.)
2-Apr-18	Cash	100	94,282	100	94,638	188,919	188,919
3-Apr-18	Cash	220	205,408	150	139,372	344,780	533,699
4-Apr-18	Cash	200	184,446	200	180,600	365,046	898,746
5-Apr-18	Cash	350	320,525	350	318,351	638,876	1,537,622
6-Apr-18	Cash	400	376,427	450	417,778	794,205	2,331,827
9-Apr-18	Cash	250	240,263	270	261,083	501,345	2,833,172
10-Apr-18	Cash	150	144,413	150	143,950	288,363	3,121,534
11-Apr-18	Cash	250	244,988	250	242,555	487,543	3,609,077
12-Apr-18	Cash	200	195,398	200	196,644	392,042	4,001,118
13-Apr-18	Cash	200	197,295	200	197,800	395,095	4,396,213
16-Apr-18	Cash	200	196,000	200	195,005	391,005	4,787,219
17-Apr-18	Cash	250	249,538	250	245,870	495,408	5,282,626
18-Apr-18	Cash	325	320,258	325	321,386	641,644	5,924,270
19-Apr-18	Cash	500	480,320	500	481,290	961,610	6,885,880
20-Apr-18	Cash	100	95,588	100	95,300	190,888	7,076,768
23-Apr-18	Cash	50	48,313	50	48,174	96,487	7,173,254
24-Apr-18	Cash	20	19,220	10	9,673	28,893	7,202,147
26-Apr-18	Cash	-	-	10	9,690	9,690	7,211,837
10-May-18	Cash	30	29,564	-	-	29,564	7,241,401
11-May-18	Cash	50	48,100	80	77,615	125,715	7,367,116
30-May-18	Cash	100	91,003	100	90,725	181,728	7,548,845
4-Jun-18	Cash	25	22,125	25	22,357	44,482	7,593,327
6-Jun-18	Cash	100	90,033	100	88,800	178,833	7,772,160
19-Jun-18	Cash	1	889	1	891	1,779	7,773,939
	Total	4,071	3,894,393	4,071	3,879,546	7,773,939	

12. From the above table, I note that during the period April 02 to April 05, 2018, on a cumulative basis, the value of trades by Noticee in the securities of Titan amounted to Rs 15,37,622/- on April 05, 2018. On perusal of trades of Noticee, I further note that from April 06 to April 09, 2018, on a cumulative basis, Noticee traded in the securities of Titan for a value of Rs.12,95,550/- on April 09, 2018. Similarly, on perusal of trades of Noticee for the period from April 10 to April 12, 2018, I note that on a cumulative basis, Noticee traded in the securities of Titan for a value of Rs.11,67,946/- on April 12, 2018. Again, for the period April 13 to April 17, 2018, on a cumulative basis, Noticee had traded in the securities of Titan for an amount of Rs. 12,81,508/- on April 17, 2018 and for the period from April 18 to April 19, 2018, the traded of securities of Titan transacted by Noticee was Rs. 16,03,254/- on April 19, 2018.
13. Therefore, I observe that the value of total transactions by Noticee on each of the aforesaid five occasions exceeded rupees ten lakhs. On perusal of the submissions made by Noticee, I note that he has not disputed the impugned transactions by him in the scrip of Titan as specified above.
14. In terms of the 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 above 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.
15. In his submissions, Noticee has contended that he was not a 'designated person' or 'person having access to UPSI' and was not required to obtain pre-clearance for trading. In this regard, I note that in terms of Regulation 7(2)(a) of PIT Regulations, requisite disclosures are to be made by 'promoter', 'employee' or 'director' 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 triggered because as an employee, the total traded value of Noticee's transactions in the securities of Titan exceeded ten lakh rupees on the aforesaid five occasions.

The submission of Noticee that he was not a 'designated person' or 'person having access to UPSI' is not tenable since the aforesaid regulation would be applicable to him as an employee of Titan. Therefore, I do not find any merit in this contention of Noticee.

16. In his reply, Noticee has also contended that he was not part of senior management of Titan nor did possess any unpublished price sensitive information about the company. I find that these submissions by Noticee are not relevant to the allegations of his failure to make requisite disclosures in terms of Regulation 7(2)(a) of PIT Regulations. Therefore, I am not inclined to consider this contention of Noticee. I also note from his submissions that he has accepted the default on his part.

17. In view of the above, I conclude that the allegation that Noticee has violated Regulation 7(2)(a) of PIT Regulations on five occasions stands established.

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

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

19. 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....."*

20. 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.III - What should be the quantum of monetary penalty?

21. 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 by the adjudicating officer.

Section 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.*

22. 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.
23. 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 five (5) occasions.

ORDER

24. 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. Vijendra Bisht, 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.
25. 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.

26. 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, 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)	

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

Place: Mumbai

Date: August 19, 2022

**SOMA MAJUMDER
ADJUDICATING OFFICER**