

**BEFORE THE ADJUDICATING OFFICER
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE BOARD OF INDIA
[ADJUDICATION ORDER NO. Order/AK/RS/2021-22/15129/1]**

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

ARUNA MODI

(PAN: AGHPM9945R)

In the matter of Dealings in Illiquid Stock Options at 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 “**Investigation Period**”).
2. Pursuant to the investigation, it was observed that total 2,91,744 trades comprising 81.40% of all trades executed in stock options segment of BSE during the Investigation Period were non-genuine trades, which involved reversal of buy and sell positions by the clients and counterparties in a contract on the same day. 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 alleged to be manipulative and deceptive in nature.

3. It was observed that Aruna Modi, PAN no. AGHPM9945R (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 Investigation Period. 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**”).

APPOINTMENT OF ADJUDICATING OFFICER

4. The undersigned has been appointed as the Adjudicating Officer under section 15I read with 15HA of the SEBI Act, 1992 (hereinafter referred to as “**SEBI Act**”) and Rule 3 of SEBI (Procedure for Holding Inquiry and Imposing Penalties by Adjudicating Officer) Rules, 1995 (hereinafter referred to as “**Adjudication Rules**”), vide order dated September 20, 2021, to conduct adjudication proceedings in the manner specified under Rule 4 of Adjudication Rules read with section 15I of SEBI Act, and if satisfied that penalty is liable, impose such penalty as deemed fit in terms of Rule 5 of Adjudication Rules and Section 15HA of SEBI Act.

SHOW CAUSE NOTICE, REPLY AND HEARING

5. Show Cause Notice bearing reference no. SEBI/HO/MRD/DSA/OW/AK/RS/2021/36042/1 dated December 07, 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 the Noticee and why penalty should not be imposed upon the Noticee as per Section 15HA of the SEBI Act for the violations alleged to have been committed by the Noticee.
6. It was, *inter alia*, alleged in the SCN that the Noticee, through her trades, had indulged in creation of artificial volume of 10,00,000 units through 2 non-genuine trades in one stock option contract during the Investigation Period.

7. The SCN dated December 07, 2021 issued to the Noticee was sent via Speed Post Acknowledgement Due ('SPAD') and via email dated December 08, 2021 at rjndrmodi@yahoo.com - the email provided by the noticee in her KYC application. The SCN was delivered to the Noticee on December 10, 2021.
8. The Noticee responded to the SCN vide letter dated January 3, 2022, wherein she denied all allegations and *inter alia* made the following contentions:
 - a. The Noticee had carried out trading only on one day in total out of the total investigation period. The same is apparently insufficient to warrant any kind of artificial volume creation.
 - b. The Noticee is a regular investor in the Stock Market, and the alleged volume is nearly NIL percentage of noticee's total trading, which thus cannot be alleged to be manipulative.
 - c. The alleged trades were carried out on the anonymous and electronic trading platform, which doesn't allow the identification of the counter-party. Here, orders match on a price-time priority basis and hence it is not possible to match trades with a particular counter-party.
 - d. The SCN fails to provide evidence on any nexus between the noticee and the counter-party.
 - e. No evidence has been provided in the SCN that Noticee's trading has led to creation of artificial volume and no figure of artificial volume has been provided to allege any kind of wrong doing.
 - f. The noticee invests based on suggestion of its broker on the products available on BSE's electronic trading platform. The buy & sell orders were placed by noticee's broker by looking at the trend and that the noticees does not have any role to play in this regard.
 - g. With state of art surveillance system employed by BSE, no alert/ warning/ caution etc. was issued by BSE/SEBI to me, at the time of carry-out such trades.
 - h. Noticees trades have not caused any loss to any investors and has not adversely affected any market participants or the integrity of securities market.

9. In the interest of natural justice, an opportunity of personal hearing was granted to the Noticee, vide letter dated January 03, 2022, to appear before me on January 20, 2022, through the online Webex platform. Advocate Rasika Ghatge appeared as the Authorized Representative ('AR') on behalf of the Noticee on the stipulated date of hearing. During the course of hearing, the AR reiterated the submissions made by the Noticee in her reply to the SCN. The same was also confirmed by the AR, vide e-mail dated January 21, 2022.
10. Subsequently, the Noticee made additional submissions, through her letter dated January 24, 2022, received, vide email dated January 24, 2022. The Noticee while referring to the order dated January 20, 2022 passed by the Adjudicating Officer in the case of Neha Sethi, highlighted that in a similar matter of Illiquid Stock Options the proceedings were dropped. It is further mentioned that grounds of proceedings against Neha Sethi are also present in the case of Noticee, in respect of alleged trades being one-off transactions, no evidence of collusion with counter-party, broker dealing on behalf of the noticee, trades on existing trading platform having possibility of same counter-party, etc. Considering the same, SEBI has thereby been requested to drop the proceedings in the instant matter and no monetary penalty may be imposed against the Noticee.

CONSIDERATION OF ISSUES AND FINDINGS

11. 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 regulations 3(a), (b), (c), (d), 4(1) and 4(2)(a) of PFUTP Regulations?
 - (b) Does the violation, if any, attract monetary penalty under Section 15HA of the SEBI Act?

- (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?

12. Before proceeding further, I would like to refer to the relevant provisions of the PFUTP Regulations 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.*

13. I note that the allegation against the Noticee is that, while dealing in the stock option contracts at BSE during the Investigation period, the Noticee had executed reversal trades which were allegedly non-genuine trades and the same have resulted in the 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 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 & manipulative.

14. I note from the trade log that during the investigation period the Noticee had executed 2 trades in one contract in stock options segment of BSE. I further note that the above-mentioned trades of the Noticee had resulted in the creation of volume of a total of 10,00,000 units in the said one contract. Summary of the trades executed by Noticee in the contract during the investigation period, along-with the corresponding order details, are as follows:

Stock Option Contract	Buy Quantity	Sell Quantity	No. of alleged trades executed by the entity in the contract	Total number of trades executed by the Entity in the Contract	Total number of trades executed in the contract	Volume generated by Entity through the alleged trades in the Contract	Total volume generated by Entity in the Contract	Total volume in the Contract	% of alleged trades of Entity in the contract to Entity's total trades in the Contract	% of alleged trades of Entity in the contract to Total trades in the Contract	% of Volume generated by Entity through the alleged trades in the contract to Entity's Total Volume in the Contract	% Volume generated by Entity through the alleged trades in the contract to Total Volume in the Contract
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
VOLT15MA R270.00CE	5,00,000	5,00,000	2	2	18	10,00,000	10,00,000	66,82,000	100%	11.11%	100%	14.97%

Trade Date	Scrip Name	Strike Price	Buy Client Name	Sell Client Name	Buy Order Time	Sell Order Time	Trade Time	Buy Order Rate	Sell Order Rate	Trade Rate	Buy Order Qty	Sell Order Qty	Traded Qty
20/03/2015	VOLT15MA R270.00CE	27000.0	SANJAY KUMAR MAHIPAL	ARUNA MODI	13:46:05.72 2327	13:46:06.38 4026	13:46:06.38 4026	4.0	4.0	4.0	5,00,000	5,00,000	5,00,000
			ARUNA MODI	SANJAY KUMAR MAHIPAL	13:52:59.43 8605	13:52:58.94 3790	13:52:59.43 8605	10.0	10.0	10.0	5,00,000	5,00,000	5,00,000

* Note: "Traded Quantity" or "unit" refers to lot size in contract multiplied by number of contracts traded.

15. It is noted that the Noticee had executed 2 trades in one contract of 'VOLT15MAR270.00CE' on March 20, 2015, which led to generation of volume of 10,00,000 units (buy side + sell side). The percentage of the aforesaid trades of the Noticee in stock options contracts to total trades in the said contracts is 11.11%. Further, percentage of volume generated by the Noticee in the contract to the total volume in the contracts is 14.97%. These trades executed by the Noticee in the above contract involved a significant difference in buy rates and sell rates and were reversed on same day.
16. It is noted 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 counterparty. It is noted that while dealing in the said contract during the Investigation Period, the Noticee executed two reversal trades (1 buy trades + 1 sell trade) with same counterparty, viz. Mr. Sanjay Kumar Mahipal, on the same day and with significant price differential in buy and sell rate. On March 20, 2015 at 13:46:05.722327 hrs, the counterparty of the Noticee placed the buy limit order for 5,00,000 units of the contract "VOLT15MAR270.00CE" for Rs. 4 per unit. The Noticee on the same day i.e. March 20, 2015 at 13:46:06.384026 (i.e. within a second of the order placed by counter-party) placed a sell limit order of 5,00,000 units of the said contract at Rs. 4 per unit. Accordingly, a trade for 5,00,000 units was executed between the Noticee and the counterparty at Rs. 4 per unit at 13:46:06.384026. Thereafter, on the same day, counterparty of the Noticee, at 13:52:58.943790 hrs placed a sell limit order of 5,00,000 units of the said contract at the rate of Rs. 10 per unit and the Noticee placed a buy limit order of 5,00,000 units of the said contract at the rate of Rs. 10 per unit at 13:52:59.438605 (i.e. within a second of the order placed by counter-party) on the said day. Accordingly, a trade for 5,00,000 units was executed between the Noticee and the counterparty at Rs. 10 per unit at 13:52:59.438605. Thus, the Noticee, through its dealing in the contract viz. "VOLT15MAR270.00CE" during the Investigation period, executed two trades which were 11.11% of the total trades in the market in the said contract during the Investigation period, and

thereby, Noticee generated volume of 10,00,000 units, which is 14.97% of the volume traded in the said contract during the Investigation period.

17. The non-genuineness of these transactions executed by the Noticee is evident from the fact that in both the trades mentioned above, the Noticee and the counterparty placed limit orders with the same order quantity, at the same price and almost at the same time (less than one second difference between their order time in both the instances). Further, there was no commercial basis as to why, within a short span of time (less than seven minutes), the Noticee reversed the position with her counterparty with significant price difference. I note from the trade log of the Noticee that the time taken by the Noticee for reversing her non-genuine trades is around 7 minutes. Such a short span of time taken for reversing the trades in an illiquid stock option contract at a significant difference in buy rates and sell rates suggests the non-genuineness of these trades executed by the Noticee. Further, the fact that the transactions in a particular contract were reversed with the same counterparty indicates a prior meeting of mind with a view to execute the reversal trades at a pre-determined price. Since these trades were done in illiquid option contracts, there was little trading in the said contract and hence, there was hardly/no price discovery in the strictest terms. The wide variation in prices of the said contracts, within a short span of time, 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 counterparty in the stock options segment of BSE and the same were non-genuine trades.

18. Now I proceed to address the issues raised by the Noticee. The Noticee has contended that it had no knowledge of counterparty to the trades. I note that it is not mere coincidence that Noticee could match her trades (with the corresponding price and quantity, in both the trades, entered by both the Noticee and counterparty being equal and with less than one second difference between their limit order time) 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. Here I would like to rely on the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in SEBI v Kishore R Ajmera (AIR 2016 SC 1079), 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..."*

19. 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."*

20. Additionally, the Hon'ble 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”.

21. The Noticee has contended that its alleged trades in the option segment of BSE were executed on the anonymous and electronic trading platform screen based trading platform provided by BSE where the automated system itself matches orders on a price-time priority basis and the identity of the counterparty remain undisclosed and, hence, the question of any non-genuine trade did not arise at all unless it was proved that such trades were executed by the Noticee in connivance with any counterparty. I note that direct evidence is not forthcoming in the present matter as regards to meeting of minds or collusion of the Noticee with her counterparty. 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. It is noted that in the screen based trading, the manipulative or fraudulent intent can be inferred from various factors such as conduct of the party, pattern of transactions, etc. Further, in the absence of direct proof of meeting of minds, the conclusion can be derived from various circumstances like volume of trade, period of persistence of trading, particulars of buy and sell orders, proximity of time and such other relevant factors. 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 observed 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."*

22. Further, 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), in which the Hon'ble Supreme Court observed that - *"the 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 PFUTP Regulations". The Apex Court also observed 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....."*

23. Reliance is also placed upon the observations of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of SEBI vs. Rakhi Trading Private Ltd. (supra) where the Hon'ble Apex Court stated at Para 35 and Para 41 of that said Order that - *"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 loss and that too in pre-planned and rapid reverse trades, it is not genuine; it is an unfair trade practice"... "The stock market is not a platform for any fraudulent or unfair trade practice. The field is open to all the investors. By synchronization and rapid reverse trade, as has been carried out by the traders in the instant case, the price discovery system itself is 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."*

24. Noticee has also submitted that no data/ evidence related to artificial volume creation by the Noticee has been provided in the SCN, to allege any kind of wrong doing. In this regard, I note that along with the SCN alleging artificial volume created by the Noticee, all information pertaining to the allegations was provided to the Noticee. Therefore, I don't find any merit in the plea of the Noticee.
25. The noticee has further contented that that the said transactions were carried out by her on the advice of her broker, and that the buy & sell orders were placed by Noticee's broker with no role played by the noticee. I note that the noticee is contesting here that the alleged trades were unauthorised transactions executed by the broker on her behalf. However, no evidence in this regard is provided by the noticee *inter alia* contesting execution of these unauthorised trades by the broker at the time they were executed. Hence, I do not find any merit in her contention.
26. The Noticee has contended that it executed its trades on the platform of stock exchange without any alarm being raised by the surveillance system of the exchange. I note that while stock exchange provides a platform for carrying out the trades, the obligation to ensure genuineness of trades lies primarily on the individuals who trade on the stock exchange platform.
27. Noticee has contended that no loss was caused to any investors. I note that in the instant matter, the allegations pertaining to the violation of impugned provisions of PFUTP Regulations, 2003 are not contingent upon any losses incurred by investors. Therefore, I note that contentions of Noticee in this regard are without merits.
28. The Noticee has further contented that she has traded only on 1 day and that the volumes of the alleged trades is negligible portion to her total trading volume in the stock market. I note that the Noticee's trades in the impugned contract contributed 14.97% to the total market volume generated during the

Investigation Period in said contract, hence the Noticee contributed substantially to artificial volume in such contract. Therefore, I note that aforesaid contention of the Noticee is without merits.

29. I noted that to support the assertion of the Noticee that her trades are not non-genuine in nature, reference has been drawn to the order passed by Ld. Adjudication officer in case of Neha Sethi (order dated January 20, 2022) where in it was held that 'one-off transactions of two trades executed on the same day, purchasing & selling 36000 quantity in a stock option contract on stock exchange platform and earning profit of INR 1 lakh, cannot be termed as non-genuine trade, especially given that while trading in an illiquid contracts there are more chances of getting the trade squared off with the same party and that there was no evidence of collusion with the counter-party'. However, I note that the facts and circumstances in the aforesaid case are different from the facts in the instant case and hence a view needs to be taken based on the facts of the instant case.

30. The trading behaviour of the Noticee confirms that such trades were not normal and quantity of order placed by the Noticee and the counterparty, the common rate at which the limit orders were placed, placement of orders almost at the same time, the wide variation in prices of the trades in the same contract in almost no time without any basis for such wide variation, all indicate that the trades executed by the Noticee were not genuine and being non-genuine, created an appearance of artificial trading volumes in the said contract. 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 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) 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..."*.

31. 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, 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. 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.

33. Generally, there is nil or negligible participation of the public in the trading in illiquid stock option contracts. When the impact of artificial volume created by the two counterparties is seen as a whole, it is not possible from the material on record to quantify the loss caused to investors as a result of the said trades. Though the records available before me does not mention about amount of gain/loss of the entities involved in the said non-genuine trades, including the

Noticee, however, it is worth considering that entities involved in these non-genuine trades have either booked gains or loss.

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 and in exercise of the powers conferred upon me under Section 15-I of the SEBI Act read with Rule 5 of the Adjudication Rules, I hereby impose a penalty of **Rs. 5,00,000/- (Rupees Five Lakhs only)** on the Noticee viz. **Aruna Modi** under the provisions of Section 15HA of the SEBI Act. I am of the view that the said penalty is commensurate with the commission/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 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 or at <https://siportal.sebi.gov.in/intermediary/AOPaymentGateway.html>. In case of any difficulties in payment of penalties, the Noticee may contact the support at portalhelp@sebi.gov.in.

36. In case the payment is made by Demand Draft, the Noticee shall forward said Demand Draft or the details / confirmation of penalty so paid to the “The Division Chief, EFD-1, DRA-I, SEBI, SEBI Bhavan 2, Plot No. C –7, “G” Block, Bandra Kurla Complex, Bandra (E), Mumbai –400 051”. The Noticee shall provide the following details while forwarding DD/ payment information:

- a) Name and PAN of the entity
- b) Name of the case / matter
- c) Purpose of Payment – Payment of penalty under AO proceedings

- d) Bank Name and Account Number
- e) Transaction Number
- f) Date of payment
- g) Amount paid

37. 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.

38. In terms of the provisions of Rule 6 of the Adjudication Rules, a copy of this order is being sent to the Noticee and also to the Securities and Exchange Board of India.

Date: February 25, 2022

Place: Mumbai

AMIT KAPOOR

ADJUDICATING OFFICER