

BEFORE THE ADJUDICATING OFFICER
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE BOARD OF INDIA
[ADJUDICATION ORDER NO. EAD/PM-AA/AO/4/2018-19]

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 BY ADJUDICATING OFFICER) RULES, 1995

In respect of
Shri Parag Kishorekumar Ajmera
(PAN: ABIPA4469L)

In the matter of
Multi Commodity Exchange of India Limited

FACTS OF THE CASE IN BRIEF

1. Securities and Exchange Board of India (**SEBI**) conducted investigation in the scrip of Multi Commodity Exchange of India Limited (hereinafter referred to as "**Company/MCX**") for the period of April 27, 2012 to July 31, 2013. It was observed in investigation that National Spot Exchange Limited ("**NSEL**") is a wholly owned subsidiary of Financial Technologies (India) Ltd. ("**FTIL**") which also holds 26% of the shareholding in MCX. Further, all three companies, i.e. NSEL, FTIL and MCX, are under a common management with common directors and employees.
2. A Show Cause Notice dated April 27, 2012 was issued by the Department of Consumer Affairs ("**DCA SCN**") to NSEL. As per the Investigating Authority, the Unpublished Price Sensitive Information ("**UPSI**") in respect of the shares of MCX was the implication of the DCA SCN dated April 27, 2012, issued to NSEL i.e. suspension of short selling by its Members, pairing of contracts and settlement of contracts beyond 11

days and impending payment defaults by the members of NSEL and loss of reputation of Promoters and Management of MCX. It was observed that any news impacting business of NSEL will automatically impact share price of its holding company (i.e. FTIL) and associate companies (i.e. MCX) and any news impacting credentials of Promoters and Management of FTIL, NSEL and MCX will also impact the share price of MCX, therefore suspension of trading by NSEL was a negative news. As per the Investigating Authority, the UPSI came into existence on April 27, 2012, upon the issuance of the SCN to NSEL by the DCA and it ceased to exist when NSEL suspended trading in all contracts (except e-series contracts) and deferred settlement of all pending contracts on July 31, 2013.

3. FTIL being the holding company of NSEL, Directors and Officers of FTIL were reasonably expected of having access to the UPSI which emanated from its wholly owned subsidiary company i.e. NSEL. It was observed in the investigation conducted by SEBI that Shri Parag Kishorekumar Ajmera ("**Noticee**") was a senior level employee of FTIL during UPSI period i.e. he was Chief Business Officer of FTIL since November 02, 2001. Noticee was also brother of Shri Paras K Ajmera who was holding senior level position of Director-Operations and HR of FTIL since October 01, 2005. In that capacity, Noticee was reasonably expected of having access to the UPSI which emanated from NSEL and, thus, an insider under SEBI (Prohibition of Insider Trading) Regulations, 1992 (hereinafter referred to as "**PIT Regulations, 1992**").
4. It was alleged that the Noticee, being an insider, before the outbreak of NSEL irregularities avoided losses by selling 300 shares of MCX on November 30, 2012 when in possession of UPSI and thereby violated provisions of Regulation 3(i) of PIT Regulations, 1992 read with

Regulation 12(2) of SEBI (Prohibition of Insider Trading) Regulations, 2015 (hereinafter referred to as “**PIT Regulations, 2015**”).

APPOINTMENT OF ADJUDICATING OFFICER

5. The undersigned was appointed as Adjudicating Officer under section 15I of the Securities and Exchange Board of India Act, 1992 (hereinafter referred to as “**SEBI Act**”) read with rule 3 of SEBI (Procedure for Holding Inquiry and Imposing Penalty by Adjudicating Officer) Rules, 1995 (hereinafter referred to as the ‘**Adjudication Rules**’) to inquire into and adjudge under section 15G of the SEBI Act the alleged violations of provisions of Regulation 3(i) of PIT Regulations, 1992 read with Regulation 12(2) of PIT Regulations, 2015 by the Noticee.

SHOW CAUSE NOTICE, REPLY AND PERSONAL HEARING

6. A Show Cause Notice no. EAD/AO-PM/AA/OW/31610/2017 dated December 14, 2017 (hereinafter referred to as “**SCN**”) was issued to the Noticee under Rule 4 of the Adjudication Rules to show cause as to why an inquiry should not be initiated and penalty be not imposed under section 15G of the SEBI Act, 1992 for the alleged violations specified in the SCN.
7. Vide letters dated January 12 and March 20, 2018, Joby Mathew & Associates, Advocates, filed reply to the SCN on behalf of the Noticee. The summary of submissions is as follows:
 - *Whole Time Member-- (WTM) of SEBI had vide an Ex-parte order dated August 2, 2017 initiated a proceeding against certain individuals wherein it was alleged that the said individuals had traded in the scrip of MCX on the basis of UPSI and the period of UPSI alleged in the said proceeding was the same as in the subject show cause notice. Further, it is a*

matter of record that the said proceedings have been concluded by the WTM's order on January 5, 2018.

- *The WTM has arrived at a conclusion that i) the UPSI arose as a result of a Show Cause Notice ("SCN") dated April 27, 2012 that was issued by the department of Consumer Affairs to NSEL and ii) the UPSI period ceased to exist on October 03, 2012 when the information and implication of the said SCN was published in the Economic Times.*
 - *It is pertinent to note that upon perusal of the subject SCN, it is SEBI's own case that our client had sold only 300 shares of MCX on November 30, 2012 and therefore in view of the findings recorded by the WTM, the said trades by our client cannot be said to be based on or during UPSI. Since the allegations in the said WTM's proceedings are identical to the allegations in the subject proceedings against our client, the subject proceedings deserve to be dropped and may not be proceeded. In view of the said findings, it is also clear that the trades entered into by our client are not in violation of Regulation 3(i) of PIT Regulations, 1992 or any provisions of law.*
 - *You have recently exonerated other noticees without imposing any penalty in connected proceedings arising out of the same set of events. It is now an admitted position that UPSI period ceased to exist on October 03, 2012 when the information and implication of the said SCN was published in the Economic Times. Since our client had entered into the sale of 300 shares of MCX on November 30, 2012, he had traded in the scrip when the UPSI period had ceased to exist. It is therefore our legitimate expectation that the proceedings against our client also be dropped, since his sale of 300 shares of MCX on November 30, 2012 also arises in the same of events as the other noticees.*
8. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, reply of Noticee and the Order dated January 05, 2018 by the WTM of SEBI under sections 11(1), 11(4)(b) and 11B of SEBI Act in the scrip of MCX, the undersigned is of the opinion that the present matter can be decided on

the basis of facts/materials available on record without personally hearing the Noticee.

CONSIDERATION OF ISSUES AND FINDINGS

9. The issues that arise for consideration in the present case are :
- I. Whether Noticee avoided losses by selling 300 shares of MCX on November 30, 2012 when in possession of UPSI and thereby violated provisions of Regulation 3(i) of PIT Regulations, 1992? and
 - II. Does the violation, if any, attract monetary penalty under section 15G of SEBI Act?
10. Before moving forward, it is pertinent to refer to the relevant provisions of PIT Regulations, 1992 which reads as under:-
- “Prohibition on dealing, communicating or counselling on matters relating to insider trading.***
- 3. No insider shall—***
- (i) either on his own behalf or on behalf of any other person, deal in securities of a company listed on any stock exchange when in possession of any unpublished price sensitive information; or”***
11. I have perused the written submissions of the Noticee, documents available on record and the WTM order dated January 05, 2018 in the same matter in different proceedings. Having considered the same, I record my findings hereunder.
12. I find that Noticee was Chief Business Officer of FTIL since November 02, 2001 and also brother of Shri Paras K Ajmera who was holding senior level position of Director-Operations and HR of FTIL since October 01, 2005. In that capacity, Noticee was reasonably expected of having access to the UPSI which emanated from NSEL. Further, the transactions in question i.e. sale of 300 shares of MCX on November 30, 2012 as specified in the SCN is also a matter of record.

13. Noticee has brought to my attention the fact that WTM of SEBI vide Order dated January 05, 2018 under sections 11(1), 11(4)(b) and 11B of SEBI Act, on the same set of facts and allegations, had exonerated certain individuals in a separate proceedings against them in the scrip of MCX and the period of UPSI was the same as in the SCN in the instant adjudication proceedings. I note that in the said WTM order, there was a specific finding with regard to the periodicity of the UPSI which is as under:

“25. Having answered the first issue in the affirmative, the next issue for consideration is whether the “price sensitive information” was unpublished during the period of investigation. In this regard, it is noted that on October 3, 2012 an article appeared in the Economic Times, a widely distributed financial newspaper, which contained information relating to the issuance of SCN dated April 27, 2012 to NSEL, majority of the contents of the SCN, allegations against NSEL with regard to violation of conditions of DCA notification dated June 5, 2007 and the gist of NSEL’s reply to the SCN. The article also covered the possible action that could be taken by DCA against NSEL i.e. withdrawal of exemption granted to NSEL vide the notification dated June 5, 2007.

26. On a careful perusal of the newspaper article dated October 3, 2012, I find that the publication of the said article made the following information public:

- DCA had issued a show cause notice dated April 27, 2012 to NSEL hereby it had found fault with certain types of contracts which were being traded on NSEL.*
- There were allegations against NSEL that it was permitting short selling on its platform. It was also alleged that NSEL did not have a stock check facility for validating a member's position.*
- SCN also alleged that all contracts traded on NSEL with a settlement period exceeding 11 days were in violation of the provisions of FCRA.*
- The conduct of NSEL was allegedly in violation of the conditions stipulated in the DCA notification dated June 5, 2007.*

- NSEL had filed its reply to the SCN issued by DCA.
- In the event of NSEL failing to file a satisfactory explanation, DCA would withdraw the exemption granted vide notification dated June 5, 2007 without any further communication.

27. In my view, a reader of the newspaper article dated October 3, 2012 (containing the information noted above) could have deduced the implications of the SCN dated April 27, 2012 to a lesser or greater extent depending on his/her exposure to the subject matter covered in the newspaper article. In my view, the newspaper article was not speculative in nature as it published precise facts relating to the issuance of SCN and also brought out specific contents of the SCN summarizing the allegations levelled against NSEL and the possible consequences thereof. The article categorically mentioned that failure on part of NSEL to provide a satisfactory explanation to the allegations levelled in the SCN would result in withdrawal of exemption granted to NSEL vide notification dated June 5, 2007. The said withdrawal of exemption in turn would have had a cascading effect on the contracts being traded on NSEL, payment defaults in relation thereto and the eventual loss to the reputation of the promoters / management of NSEL. Considering the above, I find that the price sensitive information, relating to the implication of the SCN dated April 27, 2012 became public from the time when the article relating to the SCN dated April 27, 2012 appeared in Economic Times on October 3, 2012, and as such ceased to be UPSI from that date. Accordingly, the period during which the period the UPSI existed was from the issuance of the SCN to its publication i.e. from April 27, 2012 to October 3, 2012.”

14. I note that in the said order, WTM, inter alia, held that since those individuals did not trade in the shares of MCX when in possession of UPSI, the violation of regulation 3(i) of the PIT Regulations, 1992 cannot be established against them. I have also gone through the charges leveled against the Noticee in the SCN which have arisen out of the same set of facts identical to that of in the WTM Order and I do not find any reason to disagree with the view taken by the WTM about the

periodicity of UPSI i.e. from April 27, 2012 to October 3, 2012. Since there was no UPSI in existence at the time of sale of 300 shares of MCX on November 30, 2012 by the Noticee, therefore, I am inclined to conclude that violation of Regulation 3(i) of the PIT Regulations, 1992 by the Noticee as alleged in the SCN dated December 14, 2017 do not stand established. Since the alleged violation is not established against the Noticee, Issue No. 2 requires no consideration.

ORDER

15. For the aforesaid reasons, Show Cause Notice EAD/AO-PM/AA/OW/31610/2017 dated December 14, 2017 alleging violations of provisions of Regulation 3(i) of PIT Regulations, 1992 read with Regulation 12(2) of PIT Regulations, 2015 by the Noticee i.e. Shri Parag Kishorekumar Ajmera, is disposed of without imposition of any penalty.

16. In terms of rule 6 of the Adjudication Rules, copies of this order are sent to Noticee and also to the Securities and Exchange Board of India.

Date: April 27, 2018
Place: Mumbai

Prasanta Mahapatra
Adjudicating Officer