

**BEFORE THE ADJUDICATING OFFICER
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE BOARD OF INDIA
[ADJUDICATION ORDER NO. Order/AS/RM/2024-25/31222]**

**UNDER SECTION 15-I OF SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE BOARD OF INDIA ACT,
1992 READ WITH RULE 5 OF SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE BOARD OF INDIA
(PROCEDURE FOR HOLDING INQUIRY AND IMPOSING PENALTIES) RULES,
1995**

In respect of:

Lalita Chowdhary

PAN: ACOPC0249F

In the matter of dealing in Illiquid Stocks Options at BSE

FACTS OF THE CASE IN BRIEF

1. Securities and Exchange Board of India (hereinafter referred to as “**SEBI**”), observed large scale reversal of trades in the Illiquid Stock Options (hereinafter referred to as “**ISO**”) segment of Bombay Stock Exchange (hereinafter referred to as “**BSE**”) leading to creation of artificial volume. Reversal trades are the trades in which an entity reverses its buy or sell positions in a contract with subsequent sell or buy position with the same counter party. The said reversal trades are alleged to be non-genuine trades as they lack basic trading rationale and allegedly lead to false or misleading appearance of trading leading to generation of artificial volume. In view of the same, such reversal trades are alleged to be deceptive and manipulative in nature. On account 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/IP**”).

2. Pursuant to investigation by SEBI, it was observed that during IP, a total of 2,91,744 trades comprising substantial 81.40% of all the trades executed in Stock Options of BSE were trades which involved reversal of buy and sell positions by the clients and counterparties in a contract. The investigation revealed that 14,720 entities were involved in executing non-genuine trades in BSE's Stock Options segment during the investigation period. It was observed that **Lalita Chowdhary (PAN – ACOPC0249F)** (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 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 and 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**”).

APPOINTMENT OF ADJUDICATING OFFICER

3. SEBI appointed Ms. Anupma Chadha as Adjudicating Officer (AO) in the matter vide communique dated September 27, 2021 under Section 19 read with Section 15-I of SEBI Act read with Rule 3 of SEBI (Procedure for Holding Inquiry and Imposing Penalties) Rules, 1995 (hereinafter referred to as “**Adjudication Rules**”) to inquire and adjudge under section 15HA of SEBI Act. Pursuant to transfer of cases, the undersigned was appointed as AO in the matter vide communique dated September 13, 2024.

SHOW CAUSE NOTICE, REPLY AND HEARING

4. Based on the findings by SEBI, Show Cause Notice dated November 01, 2021 (hereinafter referred to as “**SCN**”) was issued to the Noticee under Rule 4(1) of Adjudication Rules to show cause as to why an inquiry should not be held and

penalty should not be imposed on it for the alleged violations of the provisions of Regulations 3(a), (b), (c), (d), 4(1) and 4(2)(a) of the PFUTP Regulations.

5. It was alleged in the SCN that the Noticee is one of the entity who indulged in reversal trades in unique contracts with same counter party on the same day. Trades of the Noticee in the contract of JPPW15MAR20.00CE are tabulated as under:

Avg. sell rate (₹)	Total sell volume (no. of units)	Avg. buy rate (₹)	Total buy volume (no. of units)	Total volume (no. of units)	% of Artificial volume generated by the Noticee in the contract to Noticee's Total volume in the contract	% of Artificial volume generated by the Noticee in the contract to Total volume in the contract
1.7	240000	0.05	240000	480000	100.00	41.03

6. Following are the observation from the trades executed by the Noticee in the contract of JPPW15MAR20.00CE:
- The Noticee executed trade reversal through two non-genuine transactions on 17th March 2015 and all the transactions were with same counter party i.e., SARU COPPER ALLOY SEMIS PRIVATE LIMITED;
 - The Noticee sold 240000 units at a price of Rs.1.7/- per unit at 11:22:30.062602 hrs on 17th March 2015 to SARU COPPER ALLOY SEMIS PRIVATE LIMITED;
 - The Noticee bought all the units sold i.e., 240000 units through one buy order for 240000 units @ Rs.0.05/- per unit at 11:27:23.876074 hrs on the same day from SARU COPPER ALLOY SEMIS PRIVATE LIMITED;
 - Noticee executed the buy and sell trades with a price difference of Rs.1.65/- per unit within a span of 5 minutes;
 - Since Noticee traded in one contract i.e., JPPW15MAR20.00CE, 100% of his trade was in the said contract;

f) Total artificial trade volume of Noticee was 41.03% of the total volume traded in the contract of JPPW15MAR20.00CE.

7. It was alleged that the Noticee, by indulging in execution of non-genuine reversal of trades in Stock Options with the same entity on the same day, created false and misleading appearance of trading in stock options and therefore allegedly violated provisions of Regulations 3(a), (b), (c), (d), 4(1) and 4(2)(a) of the PFUTP Regulations.
8. The SCN was duly served to Noticee through SPAD, with acknowledgement on records. However, the Noticee did not respond to the SCN.
9. Further, Post SCN Intimation dated August 12, 2022 (hereinafter referred as PSI) issued to Noticee inter-alia reiterated that the Noticee had executed non genuine trades in Stock Options Contract creating artificial volume and the allegations against the Noticee. Further, the para 2 in the Part B of the above referred PSI, Noticee was informed that SEBI introduced a Settlement Scheme i.e. SEBI Settlement Scheme, 2022 (hereinafter referred to as “**Settlement Scheme 2022**”) in terms of Regulation 26 of the Securities and Exchange Board of India (Settlement Proceedings) Regulations, 2018 (hereinafter referred to as “**Settlement Regulations**”). It was further informed that the Settlement Scheme, 2022 provided a one-time opportunity to the entities against whom proceedings had been initiated and appeals against the said proceedings are pending before any forum or authority. The scheme commenced from August 22, 2022 and closed on November 21, 2022. The PSI was issued through SPAD to the Noticee, which returned undelivered.
10. 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”.

11. However, it was observed that Noticee did not avail the Settlement Scheme 2022, in view of which, the adjudication proceeding against the Noticee was resumed.
12. Subsequently, a Hearing Notice dated May 30, 2023 was issued to the Noticee informing about the opportunity of personal hearing on June 26, 2023; through SPAD and email. The Hearing notice sent through SPAD was returned undelivered, but the hearing notice was duly served to the Noticee through email. However, the Noticee did not avail the opportunity of personal hearing before the AO.
13. Another opportunity of hearing on July 03, 2023 was granted to Noticee vide Hearing Notice dated May 30, 2023. The Hearing notice duly served to the Noticee through email. However, the Noticee did not avail the opportunity of personal hearing before the AO.
14. Subsequently, a second Post SCN Intimation dated March 06, 2024 (Second PSI), was issued to the Noticee through SPAD and email dated March 06, 2024 wherein it was informed to the Noticee that SEBI introduced another Settlement Scheme i.e. SEBI Settlement Scheme, 2024 (hereinafter referred to as “**Settlement Scheme 2024**”) in terms of Regulation 26 of Settlement Regulations. It was informed that the Settlement Scheme, 2024 provided opportunity to the entities against whom proceedings had been initiated and appeals against the said proceedings are pending before any forum or authority. The scheme commenced from March 11, 2024 to May 10, 2024. The second PSI was duly served to the Noticee through SPAD.

15. Further, vide Public Notice dated May 08, 2024, the Settlement Scheme 2024 was extended till June 10, 2024 by SEBI.

16. It is observed that Noticee did not avail the settlement scheme and accordingly, the adjudication proceeding against the Noticee was resumed. However, since no response to SCN, PSI and Second PSI was received from Noticee, as an abundant caution, the SCN and Hearing Notice were served to Noticee in terms of Rule 7 of Adjudication Rules, by way of publication in newspapers where the Noticee was last known to have resided. Therefore, the notice regarding issuance of SCN cum Hearing Notice was published in newspapers 'The Times of India' (English), 'Kolkata City' (Hindi) and 'Aajkaal' (Bengali) in their Kolkata editions on November 28, 2024. It was also published in the said newspaper publications that the SCN has been published / uploaded on www.sebi.gov.in under the section "Enforcement: Unserved Summons/ Notices" and Noticee was advised to submit his reply to the SCN within 14 days from the date of the said publication. However, Noticee did not furnish any response / reply to the SCN. Vide the said newspaper publication, an opportunity of personal hearing was also granted to the Noticee on December 02, 2024 in person at 'SEBI Bhavan II, C-7, G Block, BKC, Bandra (E) Mumbai 400051' or if Noticees so desire, through online platform. However, the Noticee also failed to appear for the scheduled hearing on December 02, 2024.

CONSIDERATION OF ISSUES AND EVIDENCE

17. I have carefully perused the charges levelled against the Noticee in the SCN, its reply and the material / documents available on record. In the instant matter, the following issues arise for consideration and determination:-

- I. **Whether the Noticee has violated Regulations 3(a), (b), (c), (d) and 4(1) and 4(2)(a) of PFUTP Regulations?**

- II. **Do the violations, if any, on the part of the Noticee attract monetary penalty under section 15HA of SEBI Act?**
- III. **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?**

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

Relevant provisions of PFUTP Regulations

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 recognised 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 recognised 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 recognised stock exchange in contravention of the provisions of the Act or the rules and the regulations made thereunder.*

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) and 4(2)(a) of PFUTP Regulations?

19. I note that sufficient opportunities have been provided to the Noticee to represent his case by way of reply to the SCN and also by way of personal hearing. However, it is a matter of record that Noticee has failed to furnish his replies to the SCN and also failed to appear for personal hearing before the undersigned. Therefore, in the absence of reply to the SCN from Noticee and his failure to avail the multiple opportunities of personal hearing for making any submission in response to the allegation levelled in the SCN, I am inclined to presume that the Noticee has nothing to offer in his defense and therefore, they have admitted to the allegations levelled against them in the SCN.

20. In this context, Hon'ble SAT in the matter of **Sanjay Kumar Tayal vs SEBI** (Appeal 68 of 2013), *vide* Order dated February 11, 2014 held that:

“appellants have neither filed reply to show cause notices issued to them nor availed opportunity of personal hearing offered to them in the adjudication proceedings and, therefore, appellants are presumed to have admitted to the charges levelled against them in the show cause notice.”

21. I also refer to the judgment of Hon'ble SAT dated December 08, 2006 in the matter of **Classic Credit Ltd. v SEBI** (Appeal No. 68 of 2003) wherein, it is observed that:

“... the appellants did not file any reply to the second show-cause notice. This being so, it has to be presumed that the charges alleged against them in the show cause notice were admitted by them”.

22. Further, the same position is reiterated by the Hon'ble SAT in the matter of **Dave Harihar Kirtibhai Vs SEBI** (Appeal No. 181 of 214 dated December 19, 2014), wherein the Hon'ble SAT observed as under:

“...further, it is being increasingly observed by the Tribunal that many persons/entities do not appear before SEBI (Respondent) to submit reply to SCN or, even worse, do not accept notices/letters of Respondent and when orders are passed ex-parte by Respondent, appear before Tribunal in appeal and claim non-receipt of notice and do not appear and/or submit reply to SCN but claim violation of principles of natural justice due to not being provided opportunity to reply to SCN or not provided personal hearing. This leads to unnecessary and avoidable loss of time and resources on part of all concerned and should be eschewed, to say the least. Hence, this case is being decided on basis of material before this Tribunal...”

23. In view of the aforesaid observations made by the Hon'ble SAT, I find no reason to take a different view and accordingly, I deem it appropriate to proceed against the Noticee ex-parte based on the material available before me.

24. I note that it is alleged that the Noticee, while dealing in the stock option contracts at BSE during the IP, had executed reversal trades which were allegedly non-genuine trades 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.

25. From the documents on record, I note that the Noticee was one of the entities who had indulged in creating artificial volume of 4,80,000 units through 2 non-genuine trades in a Stock Option contract during IP. The summary of trades is given below:

Contract name	Avg. buy rate (₹)	Total buy volume (no. of units)	Avg. sell rate (₹)	Total sell volume (no. of units)	% of Artificial volume generated by the Noticee in the contract to Noticee's Total volume in the contract	% of Artificial volume generated by the Noticee in the contract to Total volume in the contract
A	B	C	D	E	G	H
JPPW15M AR20.00C E	0.05	240000	1.7	240000	100.00	41.03

26. On March 17, 2015, at 11:22:30.06 hrs, the Noticee entered into a sell trade with the counterparty Saru Copper Alloy Semis Private Limited for 2,40,000 units at Rs. 1.7/- per unit. On the same day, within few minutes, the Noticee entered into a buy trade with the same counterparty at 11:27:23.87 hrs for 2,40,000 units at Rs. 0.05/- per unit. It is noted that while dealing in the said contract during the IP, the Noticee executed a total of 2 trades (1 buy trade and 1 sell trade) with same counterparty viz. Saru Copper Alloy Semis Private Limited on the same day and with significant price difference in buy and sell rates. Thus, Noticee, through its dealing in the contract viz. JPPW15MAR20.00CE during the IP, executed 2 non-genuine trades and thereby, the Noticee generated artificial volume of 4,80,000 units.

27. 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 the same counterparty with significant

price difference on the same day. 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 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 counterparty in the stock options segment of BSE and the same were non-genuine trades. Thus submissions of Noticee is devoid of merits.

28. It is also noted that it is not mere coincidence that the Noticee could match his trades with the same counterparty with whom he had undertaken first leg of the respective trades. The fact that the transactions in a particular contract were reversed with the same counterparty for the same quantity of units, indicates a prior meeting of minds with a view to execute the reversal trades at a pre-determined price. It is further noted that direct evidence is not forthcoming in the present matter as regards to meeting of minds or collusion with other entities inter-alia the counterparties or agents/fronts. However, trading behaviour as noted above make it clear that aforesaid non-genuine trades could not have been possible without meeting of minds at some level.

29. Here I would like to rely on the following judgement of Hon'ble Supreme Court in **SEBI v Kishore R Ajmera** (AIR 2016 SC 1079), 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.

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.”

30. The observations made in the aforesaid judgment 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, it is observed 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 short span of time 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.

31. It is also relevant to refer to judgment of the Hon'ble Securities Appellate Tribunal in the matter of **Ketan Parekh vs SEBI** (in Appeal No. 2 of 2004; date of decision July 14, 2006):

“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.”

32. In this regard, reliance is placed on 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 on similar factual situations, which *interalia* states 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.....”

33. 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) and (d), 4(1), 4(2)(a) of PFUTP Regulations by the Noticee stands established.

Issue No. 2: Do the violations, if any, on the part of the Noticee attract monetary penalty under section 15HA of SEBI Act?

34. 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 and in terms of the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the matter of **SEBI Vs. Shriram Mutual Fund** [2006] 68 SCL 216 (SC) decided on May 23, 2006, wherein it was 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. A breach of civil obligation which attracts penalty in the nature of fine under the provisions of the Act and the Regulations would immediately attract the levy of penalty irrespective of the fact whether contravention must made by the defaulter with guilty intention or not.”* 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 No. 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?

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

Factors to be taken into account while adjudging quantum of penalty.

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.]

36. As established above, the trades by the Noticee were non-genuine in nature and created a misleading appearance of trading in the aforesaid contract. I note that 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 amount of disproportionate gain or unfair advantage resulting from the artificial trades between the counter parties or the consequent loss caused to investors as a result of the default. Further, the material available on record does not demonstrate any repetitive default on the part of the Noticee. However, considering that the 2 non-genuine trades entered by the Noticee led to creation of artificial trading volumes which had the effect of distorting the market mechanism in the Illiquid Stock Options segment of BSE, I find that the aforesaid violations were detrimental to the integrity of securities market and therefore, the quantum of penalty must be commensurate with the serious nature of the aforesaid violations.

ORDER

37. In view of the above, after considering all the facts and circumstances of the case and the factors mentioned in the provisions of Section 15J of the SEBI Act, I, in exercise of the powers conferred upon me under Section 15-I of the SEBI Act read with Rule 5 of the Adjudication Rules, conclude that the proceedings against the Noticee stands established in terms of the provisions of the SEBI Act. Hence, in view of the charges established under the provisions of the SEBI Act, I, hereby impose monetary penalty of **₹ 5,00,000/- (Rupees Five Lakh only)** on the Noticee (Lalita Chowdhary) under section 15HA of SEBI Act for the violation of Regulations 3(a), (b), (c) and (d), 4(1), 4(2)(a) of PFUTP Regulations. I am of the view that the said penalty is commensurate with the violations committed by Noticee.

38. The Noticee shall remit/pay the said amount of penalty within 45 days of receipt of this order in either of the way, such as by following the path at SEBI website www.sebi.gov.in,

ENFORCEMENT >Orders >Orders of AO> PAYNOW;

39. 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 of Noticee.

40. 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 SEBI.

Date: February 28, 2025
Place: Mumbai

ASHA SHETTY
ADJUDICATING OFFICER