

BEFORE THE ADJUDICATING OFFICER
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE BOARD OF INDIA
[ADJUDICATION ORDER NO. EAD/PM-AA/AO/30/2017-18]

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 Anjani Sinha
(PAN: AJJPS1231P)

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 As per the Investigating Authority, the Unpublished Price Sensitive Information ("**UPSI**") in respect of the shares of MCX was the implication of the DCA SCN dated April 27, 2012, issued to NSEL i.e.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. It was observed that Shri Anjani Sinha ("**Noticee**") worked as CEO of NSEL during 2006 to October 2013 and became Managing Director of NSEL in 2012 and continued in that capacity till October 2013. Being CEO and MD of NSEL during *UPSI* period, he was well aware of all the developments in NSEL, right from issuance of SCN by DCA to NSEL till suspension of trading by 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 2,000 shares of MCX on March 13/14 2013 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/31621/2017 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 letter dated December 26, 2017, Noticee filed reply to the SCN and the summary of his submissions is as follows:
- *In May 2013, I was in need of funds and at that time, I was in possession of 31462 shares of MCX, which were held in my demat account. I sold 1000 shares each of MCX on 13.5.2013 and 14.5.2013 through stock market transactions out of total number of 31462 shares held by me, which is less than 10 % of my total holding on that day.*
 - *During the alleged “investigation period”, that is April 2012 to July 2013, I was working in NSEL and had no direct or indirect relation with MCX. Hence, I am not an “insider” with respect to MCX under PIT Regulations, 1992.*

- *During the Investigation period (i) I was employed only in NSEL; (ii) I was not having any position in MCX or FTIL; and (iii) MCX had no stake in NSEL and NSEL had no stake in MCX. Therefore, on parity ground, I should be exonerated from insider trading allegations, just like MCX employees, having no connection with NSEL, have been exonerated for the same.*
- *In the instant case, the information pertaining to Show Cause Notice dated April 27, 2012 is not directly or indirectly related with MCX, because the said notice is not issued to MCX. The definition of Price Sensitive Information given in the Regulation does not extend to information pertaining to other companies having common directors or common shareholders or companies under the same management, rather it is exclusively confined to the company itself.*
- *I sold total number of 2000 shares on 13th -14th May, 2013. During that period, I had no fresh information, which was not already in public domain. In fact, there was no fresh development relating to NSEL post October 3, 2012 (when NSEL sent Exchange communication regarding show cause notice) till 14th May, 2013 (when I sold 2000 shares). There was no price sensitive trigger on 13th and 14th May, 2013, which was supposed to influence price of MCX scrip or, for that matter, to induce me to sale my MCX shares. Hence, the sale of 2000 shares of MCX on 13th-14th May, 2013 by me was not based on any price sensitive information, rather it was just to meet my funds requirement.*
- *The basic premise of SEBI order is based on the fact that DCA issued a Show cause notice on NSEL on April 27, 2012 and this was a price sensitive information with respect to MCX scrip and that this fact about show cause notice was known to me and not to the general public. If, for the sake of argument, it is assumed to be so, I should have sold my 2000 shares (or for that matter I should have sold my entire holding of 31462 shares) in April 2012 itself. There was no reason for me to wait for more than 1 year to sell my shares. In fact, price of MCX scrip at that time was higher, compared to the price ruling on 13th-14th May, 2013.*

- *Further, Regulation 2(k) of SEBI (Prohibition of Insider Trading Regulations) 1992 defines “unpublished” as “information which is not published by the company or its agents and is not specific in nature.” On one hand, show cause notice and its publication is not an information pertaining to MCX and so there is no question of MCX being required to publish or do anything relating to show cause notice issued to NSEL. On the other hand, NSEL has published and widely disseminated information relating to show cause notice issued by DCA, its reply to the same and also the current status of the matter on 3rd October, 2012. Hence, post 3rd October, 2012, by no stretch of imagination, information pertaining to show cause notice issued to NSEL can be construed as “unpublished information” within the meaning of Regulation 2 (k) of the Regulations.*
 - *It is relevant to note here that the “Exchange communication sent by NSEL to all its members and also disseminated through its website in public domain is not a speculative or vague report. The Exchange communication sent by NSEL is very specific, categorical and to the point. Hence, NSEL communication dated 3rd October, 2012 is not speculative in nature and hence not covered by the Explanation to Regulation 2 (k) of the Regulations.*
 - *In the instant case, I was neither a director of MCX nor an officer of MCX. I did not have any access to internal information of MCX. Hence, I am not a connected person within the meaning of Regulation 2 (c) of the Regulations. I am not a “person deemed to be a connected person” as per Regulation 2 (h) of the SEBI PIT Regulations, 1992.*
 - *I am neither an Insider, nor a connected person nor a person deemed to be connected person within the meaning of PIT Regulations 1992 nor was I in possession of any unpublished price sensitive information pertaining to MCX. Hence, I have not violated any provision relating to Regulation 3 (1).*
8. I note that an Order dated January 05, 2018 (**WTM order**) has been passed by the WTM of SEBI under sections 11(1), 11(4)(b) and 11B of

SEBI Act in the scrip of MCX and the said order is arisen from the same set of facts as in the instant adjudication proceeding. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, reply of Noticee and the WTM Order dated January 05, 2018, 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 2,000 shares of MCX on March 13/14 2013 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 CEO and MD of NSEL during UPSI period and in that capacity was reasonably expected of having access to the UPSI which emanated from NSEL. Further, the transactions in question i.e.

sale of 2,000 shares of MCX on March 13/14 2013 as specified in the SCN have also not been disputed.

13.I note that WTM of SEBI vide Order dated January 05, 2018 in a separate proceedings against the noticee under sections 11(1), 11(4)(b) and 11B of SEBI Act, on the same set of facts and allegations, had exonerated him of the charges leveled against him. 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 Noticee 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 him. 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 2,000 shares of MCX on March 13/14 2013 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/31621/2017 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 Anjani Sinha, 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: January 30, 2018
Place: Mumbai

Prasanta Mahapatra
Adjudicating Officer