

BEFORE THE ADJUDICATING OFFICER
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE BOARD OF INDIA
[ADJUDICATION ORDER NO. Order/GR/PU/2023-24/ 29426]

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
Jadav Bhupendrakumar Ramabhai (HUF)
(PAN: AADHJ9616G)

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 of 2,91,744 trades comprising 81.40% of all the trades executed in stock options segment of BSE during the IP were allegedly non genuine trades. The aforesaid alleged non-genuine trades resulted into creation of artificial volume in stock options segment of BSE during the IP. It was observed that **Jadav Bhupendrakumar Ramabhai HUF** (PAN – **AADHJ9616G**) (hereinafter

Adjudication Order in respect of Jadav Bhupendrakumar Ramabhai (HUF) in the matter of trading in Illiquid Stock Options at BSE

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 alleged 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, deceptive in nature. In view of the same, SEBI initiated adjudication proceedings against the Noticee for alleged 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) Regulations, 2003 (hereinafter referred to as “PFUTP Regulations, 2003”).

APPOINTMENT OF ADJUDICATING OFFICER

3. The undersigned was appointed as Adjudicating Officer in the matter, conveyed vide communique dated July 27, 2021, under Section 19 read with Section 15-I(1) of the SEBI 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 as deemed fit in terms of Rule 5 of Adjudication Rules and Section 15HA of SEBI Act, 1992.

SHOW CAUSE NOTICE, REPLY AND HEARING

4. A Show Cause Notice dated August 04, 2022 (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 the Noticee.

5. It was *inter alia* alleged in the SCN that the Noticee had executed 4 non-genuine trades in 2 Stock Options contract which resulted in artificial volume of total 1,15,500 units. Summary of dealings of the Noticee in the said Options contracts, in which the Noticee allegedly executed non-genuine trades during the I.P, is as follows:

S. N o.	Contract Name	Avg. Buy Rate (Rs)	Total Buy Volume (No. of units)	Avg. Sell Rate (Rs)	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	DABU15FE B265.00CE	1.6	55000	5.7	55000	100	50	100	50
2	DRRL15MA R3350.00C EW2	45	2750	135	2750	100	33.33	100	33.33

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

- The Noticee had executed alleged non genuine trades in 2 contracts, wherein all the trades of Noticee in the said contracts were allegedly non-genuine trades.
- No. of alleged non-genuine trades of the Noticee had significantly contributed to total no. of trades from the market in the above contracts, was in the range of 33.33% to 50% of the trades that happened in the said contracts were due to non-genuine trades executed by the Noticee.
- 100% of volume generated by Noticee in the above contract was alleged to be artificial volume, and further, the percentage of alleged artificial

volume generated by the Noticee in the above contract to the total volume from the market in said contracts was in the range of 33.33% to 50%. Therefore, the Noticee allegedly generated artificial volume in the above contracts.

7. The SCN with reference no. EAD/EAD-4/ADJ/GR/PU/35260/1/2022 was served on the Noticee via digitally signed email dated August 04, 2022. The proof of service is on record.

8. The aforesaid SCN was served to the Noticee which along with indicating the nature of offence alleged to have been committed by the Noticee, also intimated to the Noticee regarding the SEBI Settlement Scheme, 2022. The intimation regarding settlement scheme given to the Noticee is as follows:

8.1. SEBI has framed the SEBI Settlement Scheme, 2022 pursuant to the Order dated May 13, 2022 passed by the Hon'ble Securities Appellate Tribunal, wherein the following directions were issued to SEBI:

"17. We are, thus, of the opinion that SEBI should reconsider and seriously give a thought in coming out with a fresh scheme under Clause 26 of the Settlement Regulations, 2018. Such scheme can be a onetime scheme for this class of person. The terms of settlement should be attractive so that it could attract the noticees / entities to come forward and settle the matter which will ameliorate the harassment of penalty proceedings to the noticees and at the same time would help to clear the backlog of these pending matters before various AOs."
(Emphasis Supplied)

8.2. In compliance with the above directions of the Hon'ble Securities Appellate Tribunal, SEBI has introduced a one-time settlement scheme called the SEBI Settlement Scheme, 2022, in terms of Regulation 26 of the Securities and Exchange Board of India (Settlement Proceedings) Regulations, 2018 in the matter of Illiquid Stock Options. The said

scheme proposes payment of Settlement Amount as per the details given below:

S No	Number of Contracts*	Settlement Amount (Rs.)
1	1-5	1,00,000/-
2	6-50	2,00,000/-
3	51 and above	5,00,000/- base amount + 10,000 per contract

* You may refer to the relevant Annexure/table of the SCN which contains a summary of the contracts you entered to determine the applicable slab for settlement.

8.3. The period of the SEBI Settlement Scheme, 2022 will commence on August 22, 2022 and will close on November 21, 2022, so as to provide an opportunity for settlement to the entities who have executed reversal trades in the stock options segment of BSE during the period April 01, 2014 to September 30, 2015, against whom enforcement proceedings have been initiated and are pending. In case you wish to avail the benefit of the said Scheme, you may access the details of the said Scheme, which would be available on the website of SEBI i.e. www.sebi.gov.in, during the said period.

8.4. Necessary application for settlement may be filed within the validity period of the scheme and payment of the settlement amount shall be made online. Additionally, for any clarification in regard to settlement scheme, you may refer to the FAQs at SEBI website or send email to scheme2022@sebi.gov.in

8.5. In case you do not wish to avail of the facility under the SEBI Settlement Scheme, 2022, the adjudication proceedings in respect of the allegations contained in Part A of the SCN shall resume. Accordingly, an inquiry shall be held against you in terms of Adjudication Rules read with section 15-I of the SEBI Act, and penalty, if any, shall be imposed under section 15HA of the SEBI Act. In such case, you are called upon to file your reply within 30 days of receipt of this Show Cause Notice.

8.6. Pursuant to that, vide public notice dated November 21, 2022, it was advertised/informed that “Considering the interest of entities in availing

the Scheme, the competent authority has extended the period of the Scheme till January 21, 2023”

9. However, it was observed that Noticee did not avail the SEBI Settlement Scheme, in view of which, the adjudication proceeding against the Noticee was resumed.
10. Since, it was observed that the Noticee did not submit its reply to the SCN, in the interest of natural justice, it was provided an opportunity of hearing on May 30, 2023 sent via e-mail dated May 10, 2023 and via SPAD, both of which were duly delivered. The Noticee accordingly submitted its reply dated May 15, 2023, in the matter. Further, the Noticee appeared for the scheduled hearing on May 30, 2023 in the matter vide its the authorized representative (AR) and reiterated the submissions made vide its reply dated May 15, 2023.
11. Summary of the reply dated May 15, 2023, are as under:
 - 11.1. *Noticee has requested for certain documents, data and cross examination of counterparties, BSE and counterparty broker, which has not been provided to the Noticee, and has caused it grave prejudice.*
 - 11.2. *It was submitted that the Noticee has made a loss by execution of the trades and no one would like to incur losses voluntarily. Adverse inference is therefore farfetched and absurd.*
 - 11.3. *The Noticee contended that the SCN has been issued after an inordinate delay of 7 years, which is beyond the limitation period of 3 years. Hence, the SCN is bad in law, illegal and void ab initio. In this regard, the Noticee quoted from Hon’ble Supreme Court’s decision in the matter of Lakhmani Mewal Das [103 ITR 437 (SC)], Ganga Saran & Sons (P) Ltd. vs. ITO 130 ITR 1(SC), etc., including decisions of certain High Courts.*

- 11.4. *The Noticee contended that BSE and the trading member are necessary party to the proceedings and hence, it has filed an impleadment application dated November 11, 2021 against BSE with SEBI, and requested SEBI to provide a reasonable Order with respect to the same. Noticee also asked for details of actions taken by SEBI against BSE and its officials in the matter of trading in illiquid stock options. In this regard, the Noticee quoted from decision by Hon'ble Madras High Court in the matter of Madras Stock Exchange Ltd. V S R Rajkumar and also from Hon'ble SAT's decision in Religare Securities Ltd. V SEBI.*
- 11.5. *No adverse inference could be drawn against the Noticee as BSE and SEBI had permitted trading in options for 'far months' with a strike price which are at large variance to current market price.*
- 11.6. *The Noticee has not caused any loss to the investors. Noticee has not acted to the detriment of the securities market and has conducted all its operations with integrity. Noticee contended that he has not made any disproportionate gain or gained any unfair advantage.*
- 11.7. *The scrip was liquid in nature. BSE had not issued any list of illiquid scrips of stock options contracts, like it does in cash segment.*
- 11.8. *Noticee contended that the trading member didn't collect margin with respect to the trade, and SEBI has not relied upon any order placement proof for the allegations made in the SCN.*
- 11.9. *BSE is the first level regulator and BSE and the Clearing Corporation had not objected to the trades at the time they were executed, and the trades were cleared.*
- 11.10. *Noticee stated that he is unable to trace from records whether the trades were undertaken by Noticee or on Noticee's behalf.*
- 11.11. *The SCN is violative of Article 20(1) of the constitution as it is trying to penalize the Noticee for violation of law which was not in force at the time of the alleged transaction. Therefore, the Noticee contended that the SCN issued by SEBI is unconstitutional and against the object*

clause of SEBI Act, 1992, as it has initiated investigation against an investor, based on pure conjectures and surmises.

- 11.12. Noticee contended that even if it is assumed that the trades were synchronized/reversed, it was in nature of negotiated deals, and hence, permissible. The doctrine of preponderance of probabilities should not be applied in such a way that an innocent person suffers.*
- 11.13. Noticee stated that it has not been charged for price manipulation, hence allegations for causing artificial volume are inconsequential.*
- 11.14. SEBI has not alleged 'inducement' or 'intent' for it to be considered as 'fraudulent'. In this regard, the Noticee relied upon and quoted from Hon'ble Supreme Court's judgement in Union of India v Chaturbhai M Patel & Co. [AIR 1976 SC 712] and Hon'ble SAT's judgement in the case of KSL & Industries Limited v SEBI [2005 (59) SCL 1 SAT] among others.*
- 11.15. Noticee contended that Provisions of PFUTP Regulations do not apply to investors and SEBI is not empowered to punish investors.*
- 11.16. The Noticee executed anonymous screen based trading, where the buyer will not be aware of the seller. Noticee has no connection and has not colluded with the Counter-party, and there is no evidence showing connection. As the counterparty was unknown, there was no meeting of minds. The Noticee has relied upon and quoted Hon'ble SAT's judgments in the matter of Nishit M Shah HUF v SEBI dated January 16, 2020 (Appeal No. 97 of 2019), also the cases of S P J Stock Brokers Private Limited and H B Stockholdings Limited including other cases, in this regard.*
- 11.17. Besides recording common generic allegations against the Noticee, no observation on Noticee's specific role in alleged reversal has been mentioned in the Show Cause Notice. Therefore, it is vague and does not specify the charges, which is bad in law.*

- 11.18. BSE, vide Notice No. 20160308-33 dated March 08, 2016, announced that it has introduced measure for prevention of reversal trades in Equity Derivative Segment w.e.f. from March 14, 2016. Thus, in case of potential reversal trade, second leg (latest leg) of a reversal trade shall automatically be cancelled by exchange in an on-line real time basis on trading system. The Noticee submitted that because on-line preventive measure and check & balance did not exist at relevant point of time to avoid inadvertent reversal trades, the reversal trades could not be considered as unlawful at the time when trades were executed.
- 11.19. Noticee contended that Regulations 3(a), (b),(c),(d) and 4(1), 4(2)(a) of the SEBI (Prohibition of Fraudulent and Unfair Trading Practices relating to Securities Markets) Regulations, 2003 did not apply to the investors before the 2019 amendment of Section 11B of SEBI Act, 1992. Hence, the same are also not applicable to the Noticee.
- 11.20. Noticee contended that it was responsibility of brokers to stop any manipulative trades and has enclosed SEBI Circular ISD/CIR/RR/AML/1/06 dated January 18, 2006; Subject: Guidelines on Anti Money Laundering Standards, for reference. The Noticee relied upon and quoted Hon'ble SAT's judgement in the case of Marwadi Shares & Finance Limited v SEBI. It is therefore the responsibility of BSE to monitor such trades and prevent them.
- 11.21. Noticee submitted that SEBI has failed to protect the interest of investors by not charging BSE and the broker.
- 11.22. Noticee also referred to the SEBI AO Order dated January 20, 2022 in the case of Neha Sethi and requested to not impose penalty upon it.
- 11.23. The Noticee has stated that the reversal trades alleged in the instant case has already been adjudicated upon and order have been passed by other AO's in the matter of Mahakaleshwar Mines & Metals Pvt. Ltd., Concord Vinimay Pvt. Ltd., Giriraj Stock Broking and Geometry Vanijya

Pvt. Ltd., and consequently any successor in the office of AO cannot adjudicate the same trades.

CONSIDERATION OF ISSUES AND FINDINGS

12. I have carefully perused the charges levelled against the Noticee, its reply 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?

14. 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;

Issue No 1 : Whether the Noticee has violated provisions of Regulations 3(a), (b), (c), (d) and Regulation 4(1) & 4(2)(a) of PFUTP Regulations, 2003?

15. Before proceeding to the merits of the case, I shall deal with the contention of delay. I 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 investigation period. 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.

During the course of hearing in the case of *R. S. Ispat Ltd Vs SEBI*, the Hon'ble Securities Appellate Tribunal (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*”.

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. Adjudication proceedings were initiated against those entities who had not availed of the opportunity of settlement.

Further, another settlement scheme was introduced pursuant to the order of Hon'ble SAT dated May 12, 2022. The details of SEBI settlement scheme is given at paragraph 8 above.

16. I further note that there are no timelines prescribed in the SEBI Act, 1992 for the purpose of identifying trades as non-genuine. I note that the investigation as regards violation of PFUTP Regulations, 2003 is an exhaustive and time consuming process, which may require detailed analysis of the case facts. In this regard, I feel it is pertinent to note that, in the matter of **SEBI Vs Bhavesh Pabari** (2019) SCC Online SC 294, the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India has, *inter alia*, held that:

“There are judgments which hold that when the period of limitation is not prescribed, such power must be exercised within a reasonable time. What would be reasonable time, would depend upon the facts and circumstances of the case, nature of the default/statute, prejudice caused, whether the third-party rights had been created etc.”

17. In this regard, I note that the Hon'ble SAT in the matter of **Pooja Vinay Jain vs SEBI** (Appeal No. 152 of 2019 decided on March 17, 2020) held that, *"The record would show that all the documents concerning the defense of the appellant were filed by her before the AO. Therefore, for want of any prejudice the proceedings cannot be quashed simply on the ground of delay in launching the same"*. Further, I note I also note that the Hon'ble SAT in the matter of **Bipin R Vora vs SEBI** (decided on March 22, 2006) held that, *"As regards the plea of delay and laches and submission that the show cause notice is barred by limitation, I do not find any merit in these contentions as the time and efforts involved in an investigation though may vary from case to case, generally investigations per-se is a time consuming process which invariably involve collection, scrutiny and careful examination of voluminous records/ order-trade details of all the concerned including the exchanges/recording of statements etc. and therefore no time limit can be fixed in this regard to enable a regulator to take appropriate disciplinary action for the safeguard and improvement of the system/market"*.
18. As can be seen from the narration of facts in the foregoing paragraphs, pursuant to appointment of AO on July 27, 2021, SCN dated August 04, 2022 was issued to the Noticee. Thereafter, upon closure of the subsequent SEBI Settlement scheme, 2022 on January 21, 2023, and in compliance with principles of natural justice, an opportunity of personal hearing was scheduled on May 30, 2023. In view of the above, and considering the facts and circumstances, I note that there was no delay in the issuance of SCN in the matter as argued by the Noticee, so the contentions of the Noticee in this regard are without merits.
19. I shall now proceed to deal with the transactions executed by the Noticee in the alleged non-genuine trades.

20. The Noticee contended that cross-examination of counter-party and relevant officials of the BSE would enable it to demonstrate that there was nothing amiss in its trade as they were settled in the normal course of business by the BSE. The Noticee has placed reliance on the Hon'ble Supreme Court's judgment in the case of **Price Waterhouse Coopers Vs. SEBI in Civil Appeal No. 6003-6004 of 2012** and **Andaman Timber Industries vs. CCE (Supreme Court)** in support of its contentions in relation to cross-examination. In this regard, it is stated that the question of cross-examining anyone may arise only if a proceeding is based on reliance upon recorded statements of persons. Further, the right of cross-examination cannot be claimed in the instant proceeding because no statement of any party or counter-party or broker/ dealer has either been recorded or relied upon in the captioned proceeding. Thus, cross-examination could not be granted as a matter of right in the instant proceeding. Here, I would like to rely on the judgment of the Hon'ble SAT in the matter of **Anant R Sathe Vs. SEBI** (Appeal No. 150 of 2020), wherein, vide Order dated July 17, 2020, SAT reaffirmed the principle elucidated in the judgment of Shruti Vora's case, which has been reproduced herein above and held that: *"the Authority is required to supply the documents that they rely upon while serving the show cause notice which in the instant case has been done and which is sufficient for the purpose of filing an efficacious reply in his defence"*. Also, considering the fact that no statement has been relied upon, in the matter, I note that the principles of natural justice have been complied with, the contentions of the Noticee in this regard are without merits.

21. 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 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.

22.I note from the trade log of the Noticee that it had traded in 2 contracts in the stock options segment of BSE during the IP. It is observed that the Noticee had allegedly executed 4 non-genuine trades in 2 contracts. I further note that the above mentioned trades of the Noticee had resulted in the creation of artificial volume of 1,15,500 units in the said contracts. Summary of non-genuine trades of the Noticee is as follows:

S. No.	Contract Name	Avg. Buy Rate (Rs)	Total Buy Volume (No. of units)	Avg. Sell Rate (Rs)	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	DABU15FE B265.00CE	1.6	55000	5.7	55000	100	50	100	50
2	DRRL15MA R3350.00C EW2	45	2750	135	2750	100	33.33	100	33.33

23.It is noted that the Noticee had allegedly executed non-genuine trades in said contracts, wherein the percentage of alleged non-genuine trades of the Noticee in stock options contracts to total trades in the contracts was in

the range of 33.33% to 50% in the aforesaid contracts. Further, alleged artificial volume generated by Noticee in the contracts amounted to 100% of total volume generated by it in the contracts. It is also noted that alleged artificial volume generated by the Noticee contributed was in the range of 33.33% to 50% of the total volume from the market in the said contracts.

24. The details of squaring up done by the Noticee in the contract 'DABU15FEB265.00CE' are as given below :

Trade Date	Client Name	CP Client Name	Trade Time	Trade Rate (Rs.)	Traded Quantity	Buy/Sell by the Noticee
20/02/2015	JADAV BHUPENDRA KUMAR RAMABHAI (HUF)	COSMIC INFORMATION AND TECHNOLOGY LTD	11:37:41	1.6	55000	Buy
20/02/2015	COSMIC INFORMATION AND TECHNOLOGY LTD	JADAV BHUPENDRA KUMAR RAMABHAI (HUF)	11:37:48	5.7	55000	Sell

i. As can be seen from the table above, the trades executed by the Noticee in the contract were squared up within a short span of time, with the same counterparty. The Noticee on February 20, 2015 at 11:37:41 hrs entered into a buy trade with counterparty viz. Cosmic Information and Technology Ltd., for 55000 units at the rate of ₹ 1.6 per unit in the above contract. Thereafter, on the same day, Noticee entered into sell trade at 11:37:41 hrs with counterparty viz. Cosmic Information and Technology Ltd., for 55000 units at the rate of ₹ 5.7 per unit.

ii. These trades were entered into with the same counterparty in the same contract. It is noted that while dealing in the said contract during the IP,

the Noticee executed reversal trades with same counterparty viz. with counterparty viz. Cosmic Information and Technology Ltd., on the same day, with significant price difference. Thus, the Noticee, through its dealing in the contract viz. 'DABU15FEB265.00CE' during the I.P., executed non genuine trades which was 50% of the total trades from the market in the said contract during the I.P., and thereby, Noticee generated artificial volume of 110000 units which was 50% of the volume traded in the said contract from the market during the I.P.

25. The Noticee has contended that the derivative contracts were highly liquid on the date of trades, so that as the contracts were liquid, matching with same counterparties in buy and sell trades was possible. It was also contended that the Noticee has made a loss by execution of the trades and no one would like to incur losses voluntarily. Adverse inference is therefore farfetched and absurd. Noticee stated that it has not been charged for price manipulation, hence allegations for causing artificial volume are inconsequential. Here, I note that the market volume only in the impugned contract is relevant as regards instant considerations, so that the artificial volume generated by Noticee as a proportion of total market volume in the contract was in the range of 33.33% to 50%. I note that Noticee's trades, although few in number, contributed substantially to total market volume in said contract indicating that the stock options segment of BSE was illiquid as regards the aforesaid contracts. Further, assuming the scrip was liquid, I note that it is not possible to reverse trades with the same person, within a few seconds, without prior meeting of minds. Also, the fact that the Noticee has incurred a considerable loss as a result of the said reversal trades without any reason, defies market rationality when looked along with the attending circumstances. Therefore, the Noticee's trades were manipulative and intended to create misleading appearance of trading, so that contentions of Noticee in this regard are liable to be rejected.

26. The Noticee submitted that BSE and SEBI have themselves permitted trading in options for far months with a strike price which may be at large variance to current market price. The Noticee also submitted that its trades in stock options segment were executed on scrips which were not illiquid, if one were to observe the trade volume in the underlying scrip in which the Noticee had traded. The Noticee further contended that even if it is assumed that the trades were synchronized/reversed, it was in nature of negotiated deals, and hence, permissible. The non-genuineness of these transactions executed by the 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 was very short and 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 counterparties 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 contract, there was negligible trading in the said contract and hence, there was no price discovery in the strictest terms. The wide variation in the prices of the said contract, 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 counterparties in the stock options segment of BSE and the same were non-genuine trades.

27. The Noticee contended that BSE and the trading member are necessary party to the proceedings and hence, it has filed an impleadment application

dated November 11, 2021 against BSE with SEBI, and requested SEBI to provide a reasonable order with respect to the same. The Noticee also sought for details of actions taken by SEBI against BSE and its officials in the matter of trading in illiquid stock options. The notice also contended that no adverse inference could be drawn against the Noticee as BSE and SEBI had permitted trading in options for 'far months' with a strike price which are at large variance to current market price. In this regard, the Noticee quoted from decision by Hon'ble Madras High Court in the matter of Madras Stock Exchange Ltd. V S R Rajkumar and also from Hon'ble SAT's decision in Religare Securities Ltd. V SEBI. In this regard, it may be noted that the remit of the current proceedings are in terms of the order appointing the AO dated June 21, 2021 already made available to the Noticee. Given the above the proceedings cannot travel beyond the authority granted therein. Thus, impleading BSE or taking action against BSE or stock broker is not within the authority of the current proceedings.

28. The SCN is violative of Article 20(1) of the constitution as it is trying to penalize the Noticee for violation of law which was not in force at the time of the alleged transaction. Therefore, the Noticee contended that the SCN issued by SEBI is unconstitutional and against the object clause of SEBI Act, 1992, as it has initiated investigation against an investor, based on pure conjectures and surmises. I note that the amendment by the Finance Act, 2018 with effect from March 08, 2019 pertains to imposition of penalty under Section 11B of the SEBI Act, 1992. The imposition of penalty for violations of the SEBI (Prohibition of Fraudulent and Unfair Trading Practices relating to Securities Markets) Regulations, 2003, under Adjudication proceedings has already been prescribed under Section 15HA of the SEBI Act, 1992 and applicable for all persons dealing in the security market. Hence, the contention of the Noticee, is not tenable.

29. Noticee has contended that the trades executed were subject to regulatory supervision of BSE, the first level regulator and the Clearing Corporation, who had not objected. So the impugned trades which were cleared as genuine. Further, the Noticee contended that SEBI has failed to protect the interest of investors by not charging BSE and the broker. In this regard, I note that stock exchanges merely provide a platform for carrying out the trades and the clearing corporation affiliated with exchange handles the confirmation, settlement and delivery of transactions, however, the obligation to ensure genuineness of trades as regards instant considerations lies squarely on the Noticee and the Noticee is bound to comply PFUTP Regulations, 2003. Thus, that the absence of any preventive mechanism cannot be a ground to absolve Noticee from its obligation to ensure genuineness of trades executed on exchange platform. Further, I also note that, the considerations in the present matter are limited to allegations levied only against the Noticee. Therefore, I reject the contentions of Noticee in this regard.

30. The Noticee has stated that it had executed anonymous screen based trading, where the buyer will not be aware of the seller. Noticee has no connection and has not colluded with the Counter-party, and there is no evidence showing connection. As the counterparty was unknown, there was no meeting of minds. The Noticee has relied upon and quoted Hon'ble SAT's judgments in the matter of Nishit M Shah HUF v SEBI dated January 16, 2020 (Appeal No. 97 of 2019), also the cases of S P J Stock Brokers Private Limited and H B Stockholdings Limited including other cases, in this regard. I note that it is not mere coincidence that the Noticee could match its trades with the same counterparty with whom it had undertaken first leg of the respective trades. Also, 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. This is

the outcome of meeting of minds elsewhere and it was a deliberate attempt to deal in such a manner. I note in matters dealing with violation of PFUTP Regulations, 2003, the reason as regards execution of non-genuine trades might not be immediately 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-
"...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...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..."

31. 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.”

32. 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 minds with a view to execute the reversal trades at a pre-determined price. The only reason for the wide variation in prices of the same contract, within seconds/minutes was a clear indication that there was pre-determination in the prices by both the counterparty 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 its counterparty to carry out the trades at pre-determined prices.

33. Further, Noticee has also contended that SEBI has not alleged 'inducement' or 'intent' for it to be considered as 'fraudulent'. In this regard, the Noticee relied upon and quoted from Hon'ble Supreme Court's judgement in **Union of India v Chaturbhai M Patel & Co.** [AIR 1976 SC 712] and Hon'ble SAT's judgement in the case of **KSL & Industries Limited v SEBI** [2005 (59) SCL 1 SAT] among others. The Noticee also contended that Regulations 3(a), (b),(c),(d) and 4(1), 4(2)(a) of the SEBI (Prohibition of Fraudulent and Unfair Trading Practices relating to Securities Markets) Regulations, 2003 did not apply to the investors before the 2019 amendment of Section 11B of SEBI

Act, 1992 and SEBI is not empowered to punish investors. Hence, the same are also not applicable to the Noticee.

37. In this regard, I note the following from the judgement of the Hon'ble SAT in the matter of **Ketan Parekh vs SEBI** (supra):

In other words, if the factum of manipulation is established it will necessarily follow that the investors in the market had been induced to buy or sell and that no further proof in this regard is required. The market, as already observed, is so wide spread that it may not be humanly possible for the Board to track the persons who were actually induced to buy or sell securities as a result of manipulation and law can never impose on the Board a burden which is impossible to be discharged. This, in our view, clearly flows from the plain language of Regulation 4 (a) of the Regulations.

35. I also place my reliance on the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter 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 SC 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....."*

39. 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 Hon'ble Supreme Court judgement in the matter of **SEBI v Rakhi**

Trading Private Limited (Civil Appeal Nos. 1969, 3174-3177 and 3180 of 2011 decided on February 8, 2018), and held that, *"It is not a mere coincidence that the Appellants could match the trades with the counter party with whom it 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."* Therefore, the contentions of Noticee in this regard are without any merits.

37. With respect to Noticee's contention that no penalty should be imposed on it for the reversal trades as in the case of Neha Sethi, it may be mentioned that facts of the present case are different from the facts of the case of Neha Sethi. Further, I find it relevant to refer to the case of AO Order of Radha Malani dated September 06, 2021, against which the appeal was filed and Hon'ble SAT vide Order dated November 24, 2021, has upheld the AO Order wherein penalty was imposed even for single reversal trade. Hence, the contention of the Noticee is not tenable.

38. The Noticee has further contended that the allegations to have been violated specified in the instant SCN are general and vague. I note that the Noticee has been alleged to have executed non-genuine reversal trades, leading to creation of false or misleading appearance of trading in terms of artificial volume in the stock options and resulting in violation of Regulations 3(a),(b),(c),(d) and 4(1),(2)(a) of the PFUTP Regulations, 2003. I note that the aforesaid charges against the Noticee and the provisions of PFUTP Regulations, 2003 alleged to be violated as stated above have been cogently spelt out in the SCN served on the Noticee and in the above

mentioned paras, therefore, the contentions of the Noticee in this regard are liable to be rejected.

39. The Noticee has stated that the reversal trades alleged in the instant case has already been adjudicated upon and order have been passed by other AO's in the matter of Mahakaleshwar Mines & Metals Pvt. Ltd., Concord Vinimay Pvt. Ltd., Giriraj Stock Broking and Geometry Vanijya Pvt. Ltd., and consequently any successor in the office of AO cannot adjudicate the same trades. In this regard, I note that with regard to the orders mentioned above, adjudication proceedings were initiated against Concord Vinimay Pvt. Ltd., Giriraj Stock Broking and Geometry Vanijya Pvt. Ltd., for the violation Broker Regulations, in their capacity of a stock broker, while, adjudication proceeding was initiated against Mahakaleshwar Mines & Metals Pvt. Ltd., to ascertain the role played by it, in the capacity of trader/client and subsequent violations pertaining to the SEBI (PFUTP) Regulations, with regard to the trades alleged in the instant case. This does not prevent SEBI from initiating the instant proceedings against the Noticee for its violation in the capacity of trader/client and subsequent violations pertaining to the SEBI (PFUTP) Regulations in the instant trades. Further, in the instant case, I note that while the trades are same, the cause of action is different as the parties had acted in different capacities owing to the different roles played by them in the said trades, thereby attracting violations under two separate regulations. Therefore, the submission of the Noticee in this regard, cannot be accepted as it is without any merit.

40. Therefore, the trading behaviour of the Noticee confirms that such trades were not normal indicating 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.

Issue No 2: Does the violation, if any, attract monetary penalty under Section 15HA of the SEBI Act, 1992 ?

45. Considering the findings that the Noticee as mentioned above has executed non-genuine trades resulting in the creation of artificial volume, thereby violating the provisions of Regulation 3(a), (b), (c) & (d) & Regulation 4(1) and 4(2)(a) of the PFUTP Regulations, 2003 and in terms of the judgment of 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...*” I am convinced that it is a fit case for imposition of monetary penalty under the provisions of Section 15 HA of 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.

Issue 3: 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?

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

Adjudication Order in respect of Jadav Bhupendrakumar Ramabhai (HUF) in the matter of trading in Illiquid Stock Options at BSE

15J. *While adjudging quantum of penalty under [15-I or section 11 or section 11B, the Board or 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 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.]

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, the Noticee has entered into 4 non-genuine trades which demonstrates the violation of PFUTP Regulations, 2003.

ORDER

46. 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
Jadav Bhupendrakumar Ramabhai (HUF) PAN:AADHJ9616G	Regulations 3(a), (b), (c), (d), 4(1) and 4(2)(a) of PFUTP Regulations, 2003	₹ 5,00,000/- (Rupees Five Lakhs only)

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

47. The Noticee shall remit / pay the said amount of penalty within 45 days of receipt of this order either 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

48. 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.
49. 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: September 26, 2023

Place: Mumbai

G. RAMAR

ADJUDICATING OFFICER