

**BEFORE THE ADJUDICATING OFFICER
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE BOARD OF INDIA
(ADJUDICATION ORDER NO: Order/AS/VC/2022-23/25355)**

UNDER SECTION 15-I 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

**Late Punam Chand Chhajer
(PAN: ACPPC6482R)**

In the matter of dealings in Illiquid Stock Options at BSE

BACKGROUND OF THE CASE

1. As part of ongoing surveillance, Securities and Exchange Board of India (hereinafter referred to as '**SEBI**') came across large scale reversal of trades in Stock Options segment of Bombay Stock Exchange (hereinafter referred to as "**BSE**"). Subsequently, SEBI conducted an investigation into trading activity in Illiquid Stock Options at BSE for the period between April 01, 2014 to September 30, 2015 (hereinafter referred to as '**investigation period**').
2. Pursuant to investigation, it was observed that during the investigation period, a total of 2,91,744 trades comprising 81.41% of all the trades executed in BSE Stock Options Segment were trades which involved reversal of buy and sell positions by the clients and counterparties in a contract. The reversal trades involved squaring off transactions, but with significant difference in the sell value and buy value of the transactions. The aforesaid reversal trades allegedly resulted into generation of artificial volumes. Late Punam Chand Chhajer (hereinafter referred to as '**Noticee**') was one among the entities who indulged in reversal trades, which allegedly created false and misleading appearance of trading, generating artificial volumes in the Stock Options segment of BSE during the

investigation period. The Noticee was alleged to have engaged in reversal trades through 2 trades in 1 unique contract, which led to generation artificial volume of 1,00,000 units. These trades of the Noticee involved reversal with the same counterparty on the same day, but at a different prices. The trades entered by the Noticee were reversed on the same day with same counterparty at a substantial price difference without any basis for significant changes in the contract price which indicates that these trades were artificial and non- genuine in nature.

APPOINTMENT OF ADJUDICATING OFFICER

3. In this connection, SEBI had initiated adjudication proceedings against Noticee, under SEBI (Procedure for Holding Inquiry and Imposing Penalties) Rules, 1995 (hereinafter referred to as '**Adjudication Rules**') for allegedly violating Regulations 3(a),(b),(c),(d) and 4(1), 4(2)(a) of SEBI (Prohibition of Fraudulent and Unfair Trading Practices relating to Securities Markets) Regulations, 2003 (hereinafter referred to as '**PFUTP Regulations**'), in the matter of trading in illiquid stock options at BSE. Vide order dated July 02, 2021, Mr. Subash Chandra Sethy was appointed as Adjudicating Officer under Section 15-I of the Securities and Exchange Board of India Act, 1992 (hereinafter referred to as '**SEBI Act**') to inquire into and adjudge the alleged violations by the Noticee and determine whether penalty under Section 15HA of the SEBI Act is liable to be imposed. Subsequently, vide order dated March 17, 2023, the matter was transferred to the undersigned.

SHOW CAUSE NOTICE, REPLY AND HEARING

4. A Show Cause Notice no. SEBI/HO/EFD-1/FMD1/SCS/202122692/1 dated September 06, 2021 (hereinafter referred to as '**SCN**') was served on the Noticee, in terms of the provisions of rule 4 of the Adjudication Rules read with section 15-I of the SEBI Act, requiring the Noticee to show cause as to why an inquiry should not be held against him in terms of Adjudication Rules read with section 15-I of the SEBI Act, and penalty, if any, should not be imposed on Noticee under section 15HA of the SEBI Act for the aforesaid alleged contraventions done by him.

5. The undersigned notes from records that Anil Jain, stated to be son of the Noticee, has informed erstwhile AO vide letter dated February 10, 2022 and subsequently vide email dated September 02, 2022 that Punam Chand Chhajer (Noticee) had passed away on August 14, 2017 and also provided a copy of notarized death certificate issued by the Department of Health and Family Welfare, Government of West Bengal, to this effect. The detail of death of Noticee has been verified from the website of Kolkata Municipal Corporation.
6. Before proceeding further in the matter on merit, it would be in the fitness of things to first decide as to whether on the death of the Noticee, the present adjudication proceedings against him would continue or abate.
7. In this context, it is worth mentioning that in **Girijanandini Vs Bijendra Narain** (AIR 1967 SC 2110), the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that in case of personal actions, i.e., the actions where the relief sought is personal to the deceased, the right to sue will not survive to or against the representatives and in such cases the maxim *actio personalis moritur cum persona* (personal action dies with the death of the person) would apply. It is also relevant to refer to the decision of Hon'ble Securities Appellate Tribunal in **Chandravadan J. Dalal vs. SEBI** (Appeal No. 35/2004 decided on June 15, 2005) wherein it was held that:

“The appeal abates since the appellant during the pendency of the appeal died on 29th November 2004. The appeal accordingly abates. The penalty imposed on the original appellant being personal in nature also abates.”
8. In view of the foregoing, I am of the view that the instant adjudication proceedings against the Noticee are liable to be abated without going into the merits of the case qua him and the SCN dated September 06, 2021 issued against him is disposed of accordingly.

9. In terms of the provisions of Rule 6 of the Adjudication Rules, a copy of this order is being sent to SEBI and to the last known address of deceased Noticee as well as to Anil Jain, who is stated to be son of the deceased Noticee.

Place: Mumbai

Date: March 31, 2023

ASHA SHETTY

ADJUDICATING OFFICER