

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE BOARD OF INDIA

ORDER

UNDER SECTION 12(3) AND SECTION 19 OF SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE BOARD OF INDIA ACT, 1992 READ WITH REGULATION 27 OF SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE BOARD OF INDIA (INTERMEDIARIES) REGULATIONS, 2008

In respect of –

Ganesh Commodities Private Limited

[Registration No. INZ000025034]

In the matter of National Spot Exchange Limited

BACKGROUND

1. Securities and Exchange Board of India (hereinafter be referred to as “**SEBI**”) initiated enquiry proceedings against Ganesh Commodities Private Limited (hereinafter be referred to as “**Noticee**” / “**Ganesh**”), registered with SEBI as a commodity derivatives broker under the SEBI (Stock Brokers) Regulations, 1992 (hereinafter be referred to as “**Stock Broker Regulations**”), for the alleged violations of Regulations 5(e), 9(b) and 9(f) read with Clause A(1), A(2) and A(5) of Schedule II of the Stock Broker Regulations read with Schedule II of the SEBI (Intermediaries) Regulations, 2008 (hereinafter be referred to as “**Intermediaries Regulations**”).
2. The Noticee was a Trading and Clearing Member of the National Spot Exchange Limited (hereinafter be referred to as “**NSEL**”), which was incorporated in May, 2005 as a spot exchange for trading in commodities. NSEL organised trading in commodities after it was granted exemption from certain provisions of Forward Contracts (Regulation) Act, 1952 (hereinafter be referred to as, “**FCRA**”) by the Department of Consumer Affairs of the Ministry of Consumer Affairs, Food and Public Distribution, Government of India, vide Gazette Notification No. SO 906(E) dated June 05, 2007 (hereinafter referred to as “**2007 Exemption Notification**”), in exercise of powers conferred under Section 27 of FCRA subject to certain

conditions which, *inter alia*, included “*no short sale by members of the exchange shall be allowed; that all outstanding positions of the trade at the end of the day shall result in delivery and that all information or returns relating to the trade as and when asked for shall be provided to the Central Government or its designated agency*”.

3. In September 2009, NSEL allegedly introduced the concept of '*paired contracts*', i.e., buying and selling the same commodity through two different contracts at two different prices on its platform wherein investors could buy a short duration settlement contract and sell a long duration settlement contract and vice versa at the same time. It entailed occurrence of Buy Trades (T+2 / T+3) and Sell Trades (T+25 / T+36) on the same day at different prices on the platform of NSEL.
4. On February 06, 2012, the erstwhile Forward Markets Commission (hereinafter referred to as “**FMC**”) was appointed by the Department of Consumer Affairs, Government of India as the ‘designated agency’, authorizing it to collect the trade data from NSEL and to examine the same for taking appropriate measure, if needed, to protect investors’ interest. The FMC had accordingly, *inter alia*, called for the trade data from NSEL in the prescribed reporting formats. After analysing the trade data received from the NSEL, the FMC passed Order No. 4/5/2013-MKT-1/B dated December 17, 2013 in the matter (hereinafter referred to as “**FMC Order**”) wherein it was, *inter alia*, observed that 55 contracts offered for trade on the NSEL platform were in violation of the relevant provisions of the FCRA and that the condition of ‘*no short sale by members of the exchange shall be allowed*’ was being not complied with by NSEL and its members. FMC further observed that the ‘*paired contracts*’ offered for trading in the NSEL platform were in violation of the provisions of the FCRA and also in violation of the conditions specified by the Government of India in its 2007 Exemption Notification.
5. On perusal of the FMC Order, I note that the FMC had, *inter alia*, observed that the following conditions stipulated in the 2007 Exemption Notification were violated by NSEL:

a. **Short Sale**

NSEL had not made it mandatory for the seller to deposit goods in its warehouse before taking a sell position. Hence, the condition of “*no short sale by members of the NSEL shall be allowed*” was not being met by the NSEL and its trading/clearing members who traded in the paired contracts during the relevant period.

b. **Contracts with Settlement Period going beyond 11 days**

Some of the contracts offered for trade on NSEL had settlement periods exceeding 11 days and therefore, such contracts were “*non-transferable specific delivery*” contracts under the FCRA. As per the FCRA, the “*ready delivery contracts*” were required to be settled within 11 days of the trade and hence, the contracts traded on the NSEL which provided settlement schedule for a period exceeding 11 days were not allowed under the aforesaid Notification.

6. Hence, it was alleged that NSEL organised trading in ‘*paired contracts*’ in violation of the 2007 Exemption Notification. It was also alleged that the Trading Members and Clearing members of the NSEL facilitated and/or participated in trading in such paired contracts which were in alleged violation of the 2007 Exemption Notification. Thus, by participating in / facilitating trading in paired contracts, such entities, allegedly, had acted in a manner detrimental to the interest of the securities market.
7. As per the information available with SEBI, the Noticee, being a Trading Member and Clearing member of the NSEL, participated / facilitated the trading in paired contracts on the platform of NSEL in alleged violation of the provisions of Regulation 9(b) and 9(f) read with Clauses A(1), A(2) and A(5) of Schedule II of the Stock Broker Regulations. Based on this information, SEBI was *prima facie* satisfied that there were sufficient grounds to enquire into whether the Noticee, is a ‘*fit and proper person*’ to continue to hold certificate of registration as Trading and Clearing Member in terms of Regulation 5(e) of the Stock Broker Regulations

read with Regulation 27(iv) of the Stock Broker Regulations read with Schedule II of the Intermediaries Regulations.

ENQUIRY BY DESIGNATED AUTHORITY

8. A Designated Authority (hereinafter referred to as “**DA**”) was appointed by SEBI vide order dated September 21, 2018 to conduct an enquiry against the Noticee and submit a report and make recommendation in terms of Regulation 27 of the Intermediaries Regulations (as applicable at the relevant time) in respect of the violations alleged to have been committed by the Noticee mentioned at para 7 above.
9. After conducting the enquiry as envisaged under Regulation 25 of the Intermediaries Regulations, the DA submitted an Enquiry Report dated March 19, 2020, (hereinafter referred to as the “**Enquiry Report**”) which, *inter alia*, observed and recommended as under:

“In view of the facts and circumstances of the case and material placed before the Designated Authority, I am of the view that the Noticee is not a fit and proper person in terms of Regulation 5(e) of the Stock Broker Regulations read with Schedule II of the Intermediaries Regulations. Therefore, in terms of Regulation 27 of the Intermediaries Regulations, I recommended that registration of the Noticee, i.e. Ganesh Commodities Private Limited as a commodities derivatives broker be cancelled in the interest of the securities market.”

POST ENQUIRY PROCEEDINGS

Show Cause Notice, Reply and Personal Hearing

10. After considering the Enquiry Report, a post-enquiry Show Cause Notice dated July 10, 2020 (hereinafter referred to as the “**SCN**”) was issued to the Noticee under Regulation 28(1) of the Intermediaries Regulations (as applicable at the relevant time) enclosing therewith (a) copy of the Enquiry Report, (b) copy of the letter dated December 30, 2014 of the Department of Economic Affairs (DEA) Ministry of Finance and (c) a copy of the order dated August 22, 2014 passed by

the Hon'ble Bombay High Court in Criminal Bail Application No. 1263 of 2014 in the case of *Jignesh Prakash Shah Vs. The State of Maharashtra*. The SCN was issued to the Noticee calling upon it, as to why action as recommended by the DA including any other action as deemed fit should not be taken against the Noticee, by the Competent Authority.

11. The Noticee, vide letter dated August 31, 2020, filed its reply and submitted that the details of the alleged trades of the Noticee has been relied in the Enquiry Report but the Noticee has not received any data pertaining to the trade details of the Noticee and the same may be provided to the Noticee in order to enable the Noticee to file a reply. Further, vide letter dated October 26, 2020, the Noticee filed detailed written submissions in the matter, which are summarized as under:
- i. SEBI does not have power and jurisdiction to regulate the spot market in India. Pursuant to the merger of SEBI with the FMC, SEBI has amended the Stock Broker Regulations and the Securities Contracts (Regulation) (Stock Exchange and Clearing Corporations) Regulations, 2012 but the said amendments empower SEBI to regulate only the commodities market and SEBI does not have the power to regulate the spot market even after amendment of the said regulations;
 - ii. The "*Report of Expert Committee on Integration of Commodity Spot and Derivatives Markets*" has observed that spot contracts for commodities are not within the ambit of SCRA and SEBI may be made the regulating authority for the same only after necessary changes to the SCRA;
 - iii. FMC order does not allege any involvement of the Noticee in the '*paired contracts*' and thus, the same cannot be relied upon in the matter;
 - iv. Since the present proceedings have been initiated under SEBI Act/ Intermediaries Regulations, the same are liable to be rendered infructuous as the same are in contradiction with Section 29A(d)(e) of the FCRA which stipulates that all offences committed or existing proceedings shall be continued to be governed by the provisions of FCRA and thus, the present proceedings under the Intermediaries Regulations are unfounded in the eyes of the law;

- v. The transactions done by the Noticee before September 2015 are beyond the scrutiny of SEBI as the SEBI Regulations and SEBI Act were not applicable till September 28, 2015 and the enquiry period pertains to 2009-2013;
- vi. Government of India, Ministry of Finance, Department of Economic affairs vide its letter dated November 20, 2015 had advised SEBI that SEBI is not expected to deal with matters which were not dealt with by the erstwhile FMC and since spot market/ ready delivery contracts were not regulated by FMC, SEBI is not expected to take upon itself any regulatory function with regard to such markets;
- vii. The noticee has not been provided with the trade log and order log of the scrip/ contracts during the investigation period and in the absence of the same, it is not possible for the noticee to provide any justification for its trades whatsoever. The non-supply of documents amounts to non-adherence of the principles of natural justice. In this regard, reliance is placed on ***SEBI Vs. Price Waterhouse, Shri B. Ramalinga Raju Vs. SEBI, Ms. Smitaben N. Shah Vs. SEBI*** etc.;
- viii. Though SEBI has the power to examine the '*fit and proper person*' status of its intermediaries, it cannot do so after having granted a certificate of registration, especially based on evidence of any act/ omission done prior to grant of registration as the same would be in violation of principle of estoppel;
- ix. Determining the '*fit and proper person*' status of the Noticee based only on the fact that the Noticee was a trading member without establishing actual violation of the applicable law by the Noticee would be in gross violation of the principle that before rendering penal consequences on an entity, the actual violations of the entity have to be profoundly established;
- x. The adverse recommendation in the enquiry Report is based on the allegations of alleged violations of Stock Broker Regulations and Intermediaries Regulations but there is no allegation of violation of SEBI Act or other allied regulations, in absence of which, the allegations of Noticee violating the provisions of Stock Broker Regulations and/ or

Intermediaries Regulations cannot stand. In this regard, reliance is placed upon the matter of *ICICI Brokerage Services Limited* dated September 10, 2004;

- xi. The Noticee was not a party to the FMC order and thus, the same cannot be relied upon. The observations in the FMC order are *in rem* and not *in personam*, and the order does not deal with the conduct of the Noticee and therefore, the same cannot be taken into consideration to draw adverse inference against the Noticee;
- xii. NSEL Circular dated March 10, 2015 does not state that the special payout made to the Noticee was for paired contracts;
- xiii. The interim EOW report contains no specific allegations against the Noticee. Further, contrary to the general observations made in the EOW report, the Noticee never induced the clients to invest in any product and never financed its investors. Further, the interim report mentions the money-exposure amounting to ₹3,29,50,850/- but the same is not defined to be associated with the trading in the paired contract and therefore, reference of the same cannot be taken so as to infer anything against the Noticee;
- xiv. SEBI has not provided any cogent reasoning and/ or concrete evidence to depict that the Noticee had participated/ facilitated in or promoted the '*paired contracts*' and thus, only on the basis of the association of the Noticee with NSEL and without taking into account the fact that there have been no grievances against the Noticee, the integrity, fairness and character of the Noticee is being brought into question;
- xv. Reliance cannot be placed on the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the **63 Moons Technologies Ltd. vs. UOI**¹ matter as the Noticee was not a party to the same;
- xvi. The Noticee was not a party to the decision of the Hon'ble Bombay High Court in the matter of **Jignesh Prakash Shah Vs. State of Maharashtra**² and therefore the same cannot be relied upon to draw any adverse inference against the noticee;

¹ Civil Appeal no. 4476 of 2019

² Criminal Bail Application No. 1263 of 2014

- xvii. Reliance cannot be placed upon the letter of Department of Economic Affairs dated December 30, 2014 as the said letter has made observations only against NSEL and not the Noticee. The Noticee being a trading and clearing member was merely following the instructions of NSEL and/ or its respective clients and acting as their agent and thus, the Noticee cannot be said to have contravened the exemption given to the NSEL. Since the Noticee was acting as an agent of NSEL, it cannot be held liable for the actions of its principle unless knowledge of the illegal activities and actual participation or facilitation by the Noticee is elucidated;
- xviii. The Noticee was granted certificate on February 23, 2016, after thorough due diligence, and after the NSEL scam had unearthed. If SEBI had any doubt as regards the '*fit and proper*' person status of the Noticee, it could have granted a conditional registration or sought more clarification but the present process to take away the certificate from the Noticee after granting causes greater harm to the market and hampers the interest of the investors;
- xix. The noticee cannot be held liable solely on the basis of trading in pair contracts, in absence of evidence showing collusion/ malice on the part of the noticee. SEBI is attempting to hold the Noticee liable for undertaking trading at NSEL platform which were legitimately expected to be within the law by all stakeholders, including the regulatory authorities and the Noticee. Noticee being a trading member of NSEL could not be expected to doubt the competence of NSEL;
- xx. FMC was the designated agency since February, 2012 but neither the Government nor the FMC raised any concerns or initiated any enquiry as regards the functioning of NSEL;
- xxi. The '*paired contracts*' were introduced by the Board of NSEL and the Noticee was under the impression that the same were legal and genuine. The Noticee as a commodity broker was not required to check the legality of the product launched by NSEL;
- xxii. Reliance is placed on the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of ***SEBI Vs. Rakhi Trading*** to submit that the noticee cannot be

- held liable for merely facilitating a transaction and there has to be material on record to suggest negligence or connivance on the part of the noticee;
- xxiii. Reliance is placed on the decision of the Hon'ble SAT in the case of ***Kasat Securities Private Limited Vs. SEBI*** to submit that merely because the Noticee acted as a broker cannot lead to the conclusion that the Noticee knew about the nature of the transactions;
- xxiv. Reliance is placed upon the decision of the Hon'ble SAT in the matter of ***MJ Patel Vs SEBI***³ to submit that suspension or cancellation of certificate is not a matter which could be treated lightly and in the absence of sufficient justification supported with reasonable evidence, such action cannot be sustained.
12. During the pendency of the proceedings, due to administrative reasons, the competent authority of SEBI, reallocated cases and transferred the present matter to the undersigned on August 11, 2022 for further proceedings.
13. While the extant proceedings in the present matter were ongoing, SEBI passed five separate orders during February, 2019, rejecting the applications filed by five other entities for registration as commodity brokers who were involved in the NSEL matter. Aggrieved by the said SEBI orders, the entities filed separate appeals before the Hon'ble Securities Appellate Tribunal (hereinafter referred to as "**Hon'ble SAT**"). The Hon'ble SAT, vide common order dated June 9, 2022 (hereinafter referred to as "**SAT order**"), remanded the aforesaid orders to SEBI to decide these matters afresh within six months from the date of the said SAT order. While remanding the aforesaid SEBI orders, the Hon'ble SAT, *inter alia*, held as under:

"42...The matters are remitted to the WTM to decide the matter afresh in the light of the observations made aforesaid in accordance with law after giving an opportunity of hearing to the brokers. All issues raised by the brokers for which a finality has not been reached remains open for them to be raised before the

³ (2002) 38 SCL 889

WTM. It will be open to the WTM to rely upon other material such as the complaint letters of NSEL, EOW report, EOW charge sheet, etc. provided such copies are provided to the brokers and opportunity is given to rebut the allegations. Such additional documents relied upon by the respondent should form part of the show cause notice for which purpose, it will be open to the WTM to issue a supplementary show cause notice.....”

14. In the light of the aforesaid SAT Order and certain other orders passed by the Hon'ble SAT in similar set of cases, it was felt necessary to furnish certain additional documents/material to the Noticee before concluding the present proceedings. Accordingly, a supplementary show cause notice (hereinafter referred to as “**SSCN**”) dated October 12, 2022 enclosing therewith a copy of the SEBI Complaint dated September 24, 2018 filed with EoW, Mumbai, a copy of the First Information Report (hereinafter referred to as “**FIR**”) dated September 28, 2018 and a copy of the amended Schedule II of the Intermediaries Regulations was issued to the Noticee and the Noticee was granted 15 days' time to file its reply, if any from the date of receipt of the said SSCN. Further, hearing in the matter was also scheduled on November 2, 2022.
15. On the date of hearing, Mr. Raj Kumar Jalan, Director of the Noticee appeared and sought time to file the reply to the SSCN and further requested to reschedule the hearing. The request of the Noticee was acceded to and the Noticee was advised to file written submissions, if any, on or before November 20, 2022. Further, the hearing in the matter was also rescheduled to December 13, 2022. It is noted from the record that the Noticee filed its written submissions vide letter dated November 21, 2022.
16. The reply of the Noticee, dated November 21, 2022, is summarised as under:
 - i. The Noticee had requested SEBI to provide all the relevant documents in the matter which were not provided to the Noticee and the same shows indolence on the part of SEBI while dealing with a serious issue of cancellation/ suspension of certificate of registration;

- ii. Intermediaries Regulations were amended in November 2021 but the SSCN was issued to the Noticee, pursuant to the SAT order, in October 2022, which shows an inexplicable delay on the part of SEBI. Further, the cause of action in the matter arose in 2009-2013 and the SSCN has been issued in the year 2022, i.e., after a lapse of 13 years and the same is a testament to the nature in which the enquiry has been conducted. The SSCN has been issued after inordinate delay and the same is grossly unjust, illegal and arbitrary;
- iii. The SSCN should not be taken on record as it proposes to add more charges, material and information after the first round of enquiry has already been done by the DA and the same is in violation of principles of natural justice;
- iv. The amended Intermediaries Regulations cannot be made applicable retrospectively. The Noticee was provided registration in February 2016 and thus, the amended Intermediaries Regulations cannot be made applicable for the alleged transactions, if any, which took place in 2009-2013;
- v. The sole basis of the Enquiry Report that the Noticee was a trading member and hence, was in a close association with NSEL has been set aside by the Hon'ble SAT in its order dated June 9, 2022 and thus, the Enquiry Report cannot be considered against the Noticee in the present proceedings. The criminal complaint filed under section 154 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (hereinafter referred to as "**CrPC**") was not under consideration while making the adverse recommendation in the Enquiry Report and therefore, the same cannot be a valid basis to assess the correctness or reason to justify the said recommendation of the DA;
- vi. There is no finding in the Enquiry Report as to the Noticee having violated any provisions of either SEBI Act or the allied regulations. The violation of Stock Brokers Regulations and Intermediaries Regulations have to be seen in light of alleged violation of the SEBI Act or the allied regulations and in the present proceedings no such violations have been alleged;
- vii. The certificate of registration already granted to the Noticee is being proposed to be cancelled for acts which were alleged to have taken place before the Noticee was granted the Certificate of Registration and thus the

provisions of Stock Brokers Regulations and Intermediaries Regulations cannot be applied retrospectively;

- viii. The certificate of registration was granted to the Noticee on February 23, 2016, after coming to a conclusion that the Noticee was a '*fit and proper person*'. The said submission is further corroborated from the fact that SEBI had refused to grant the certificate of registration to certain brokers, as noted from the SAT order. In case of the Noticee, the certificate was granted to it without any adverse observations;
- ix. The Noticee had not suppressed any material information at the time of grant of certificate, which has come to the notice of the regulator at this stage, so as to question the integrity and honesty of the Noticee for being '*fit and proper person*';
- x. The '*paired contracts*' were introduced by NSEL and the Noticee had no role or participation in the introduction of these contracts. The Noticee was simply acting as a Trading Member and following directions issued by the Exchange;
- xi. NSEL as an exchange and the clearing corporations were the first level regulators and thus, the Noticee cannot be held liable for any alleged misconduct. It has not been alleged in the SCN/SSCN that the Noticee had knowledge of the alleged illegal activities of the NSEL and in absence of knowledge/ actual participation, the Noticee cannot be held liable;
- xii. The documents relied upon in the present matter do not conclusively bring out the exact role played by the Noticee and the said documents only make general observations and cannot be relied upon to equate the Noticee with other brokers who had funded their clients;

17. On the scheduled date of hearing, i.e., December 13, 2022, the Noticee was represented by Advocate Suyash Bhandari (Authorized Representative), who reiterated the submissions made by the Noticee earlier. Further two weeks' time was granted to the Noticee to make additional submissions, if any. Accordingly, vide letter dated December 27, 2022, the Noticee reiterated its earlier submissions and made additional submissions in the matter which are summarized as under:

- (i) The term '*paired contracts*' was not defined earlier and was later coined by the authorities. The shorter period contracts, i.e., T+2, T+3 and T+5 were independent of the longer period contracts, i.e., T+25, T+30 and T+36 and the buy and sell orders were placed at different times and price;
- (ii) In terms of regulation 27 of the Intermediaries Regulations, once the DA has submitted the Enquiry Report, the Competent Authority is required to forward the same to the Noticee and regulation 27 does not envisage reliance on any other documents, which would be outside the scope of the Enquiry Report and in contravention of the Intermediaries Regulations;
- (iii) There is nothing on record to show that the Noticee had knowledge about the purported illegality or the illegal purpose of introducing the allegedly illegal '*paired contracts*';
- (iv) The amended Intermediaries Regulations were not under consideration before the DA and thus the amended regulations and the additional documents cannot be made applicable for introducing new disqualification which were not part of the statute book on the date of the Enquiry Report;
- (v) Hon'ble SAT quashed the WTM order dated February 22, 2019 in the matter of India Infoline Commodities Limited and remanded the matter vide its order dated June 9, 2022. Pursuant to the same, a fresh enquiry was conducted and the application of India Infoline Commodities Limited was considered afresh as if made after the aforesaid SAT order. Since the said facts are not applicable in the present matter, as the Noticee was granted certificate in February, 2016 and the SCN was also issued prior to the amendment of the Intermediaries Regulations, the amended regulations with addition material cannot be relied upon in the present proceedings;
- (vi) The Noticee cannot be disqualified from continuing its business merely because of the fact that a complaint has been filed against the Noticee. Presumption of innocence until proven guilty attaches to every person/ entity and it continues till the said person is found guilty after a full-fledged trial. Reliance is placed upon ***Nirmal Bang Securities Private Limited Vs. The Chairman, SEBI***⁴ to submit that cancellation of certificate is akin to capital

⁴ Appeal No 54 of 2002, Decided on October 31, 2003

punishment for an intermediary and thus, the same has to be awarded with great care and caution;

CONSIDERATION OF ISSUES AND FINDINGS

18. I have carefully perused the post enquiry SCN, SSCN along with all the documents attached therewith, the replies submitted by the Noticee, the oral submissions made by the Noticee during the course of the personal hearing along with the material/ information available on record. After considering the allegations made/ charges levelled against the Noticee in the instant case, I note that the issue that arises for consideration in the present proceedings is whether the Noticee satisfies the '*fit and proper person*' criteria as laid down under Schedule II of the Intermediaries Regulations.
19. Before considering the issue on its merits, I note that the SCN dated July 10, 2020 called upon the Noticee to show cause as to why action as recommended by the DA, including passing of appropriate direction should not be taken against the Noticee in terms of regulation 28 of the Intermediaries Regulations. I note that by the amendments made to Intermediaries Regulations on January 21, 2021, regulation 27 which dealt with recommendations for actions which could be made by DA in case of default, has been substituted and regulation 28, which dealt with procedure for action on receipt of the recommendation from DA, has been omitted and these matters now stand governed by the Regulations 26 and 27, respectively. In the present case, I note that prior to the aforesaid amendment, procedure for conduct of enquiry proceedings before DA and Competent Authority (CA) was provided under regulations 25 to 28 of the Intermediaries Regulations wherein regulation 25 dealt with issue of SCN by the DA, regulation 26 dealt with reply of SCN by the Noticee, regulation 27 dealt with recommendation for actions which could be made by the DA and regulation 28 dealt with conduct of proceedings before the CA, like issue of SCN, hearing and passing of final order. After the aforesaid amendment, regulation 25, as substituted, deals with holding of enquiry proceedings before DA, regulation 26 deals with recommendation for actions which can be made by the DA and regulation 27 deals with conduct of enquiry proceedings before the CA and

passing of order by the CA. Thus, the proceedings before CA which were earlier governed by the provisions of regulation 28 are now governed by the provisions of regulation 27 with certain modifications. Therefore, the new regulation 27 is regarded having force continuously (by virtue of pre-existing regulation 28) and the modification or changes are treated as amendment coming into force with effect from the date of enforcement of new regulation 27 i.e. January 21, 2021. Accordingly, I note that the present proceedings can be concluded under the amended provisions of the Intermediaries Regulations and for the violations committed by the Noticee, directions under regulation 27 of the Intermediaries Regulations can be issued.

20. The Noticee has argued that in terms of Section 29A(2)(d) of the FCRA, SEBI could only initiate proceedings for violation of provisions of FCRA and not proceed under the Intermediaries Regulations. In this regard, section 29A(2)(e) of the FCRA empowered SEBI to initiate fresh proceedings for offences, within a period of three years from the date repeal of the FCRA Act. I note that SEBI had filed a complaint dated September 24, 2018 with the concerned police authorities for initiating appropriate action for the violations of the provisions of FCRA, *inter alia*, alleged to have been committed by the Noticee. I also note from the records that on the basis of the said complaint of SEBI, a FIR dated September 28, 2018 was registered with MIDC Police Station. In the background of these facts, it is pertinent to see the scope and scheme of Section 29A(2)(e) of the FCRA which is reproduced as under for ease of reference:

“29A. Repeal and savings. — (1) The Forward Contracts (Regulation) Act, 1952 (74 of 1952) is hereby repealed.

(2) On and from the date of repeal of Forward Contracts Act—

(e) a fresh proceeding related to an offence under the Forward Contracts Act, may be initiated by the Security Board under that Act within a period of three years from the date on which that Act is repealed and be proceeded with as if that Act had not been repealed;”

21. A bare perusal of the aforesaid provision would reveal that it is an enabling provision which enables SEBI to initiate fresh proceedings within a period of three

years from the date on which the FCRA is repealed. As stated above, SEBI has filed complaint, *inter alia*, against the Noticee within the stipulated period as specified in the FCRA. Accordingly, I note that SEBI has taken appropriate steps for the alleged violation of the provisions of the FCRA and, the contention that transactions done by the Noticee prior to September, 2015 are beyond the regulatory ambit of SEBI is misplaced as Section 29A(2)(e) of the FCRA mandates SEBI to initiate appropriate proceedings within the given timeframe for the offences committed under the FCRA.

22. Further, as stated above, the present proceedings pertain to examination of the '*fit and proper*' person status of the Noticee under the Intermediaries Regulations and it is a settled position of law that as a statutory body, SEBI is well within its regulatory purview to examine the '*fit and proper*' person status of the intermediaries registered with SEBI. Accordingly, the submission of the Noticee as regard maintenance of the present proceedings under the Intermediaries Regulations is also without merit.
23. Before coming to the merits of the case, it is relevant to deal with the contention of the Noticee that the present proceedings are vitiated as the SSCN was issued after considerable delay. In this regard, I deem it fit to place reliance on the decision of the Hon'ble SAT in the matter of **Mr. Rakesh Kathotia & Ors. vs SEBI⁵**, wherein the Hon'ble SAT had held as under:

"23. It is no doubt true that no period of limitation is prescribed in the Act or the Regulations for issuance of a show cause notice or for completion of the adjudication proceedings. The Supreme Court in Government of India vs, Citedal Fine Pharmaceuticals, Madras and Others, [AIR (1989) SC 1771] held that in the absence of any period of limitation, the authority is required to exercise its powers within a reasonable period. What would be the reasonable period would depend on the facts of each case and that no hard and fast rule can be laid down in this regard as the determination of this question would depend on the facts of each case. This proposition of law has

⁵ Appeal no. 7 of 2016, decided on May 27, 2019

been consistently reiterated by the Supreme Court in Bhavnagar University v. Palitana Sugar Mill (2004) Vol.12 SCC 670, State of Punjab vs. Bhatinda District Coop. Milk P. Union Ltd (2007) Vol.11 SCC 363 and Joint Collector Ranga Reddy Dist. & Anr. vs. D. Narsing Rao & Ors. (2015) Vol. 3 SCC 695.”
(emphasis supplied)

24. I further place reliance on the decision of the Hon'ble the Supreme Court in the matter of **SEBI Vs. Sunil Krishna Khaitan and Ors** (Decided on July 11, 2022) discussed its earlier decision in the matter of **SEBI Vs. Bhavesh Pabari**⁶ and held the following:

“81. This Court in the judgment authored by one of us (Sanjiv Khanna, J.) in Bhavesh Pabari (supra) had examined the question of delay and laches in initiating proceedings under Chapter VI-A of the Act and the principle of law that when no limitation period is prescribed proceedings should be initiated within a reasonable time and what would be reasonable time would depend upon facts and circumstances of each case. In this regard, it was held as under:

35. The Appellants have also contended that in the absence of any prescribed limitation period, SEBI should have issued show-cause notice within a reasonable time and there being a delay of about 8 years in issuance of show-cause notice in 2014, the proceedings should have been dropped. This contention was not raised before the adjudicating officer in the written submissions or the reply furnished. It is not clear whether this contention was argued before the Appellate Tribunal. 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. The show-cause notice in the present case had specifically referred to the respective dates of default and the date of compliance, which was made

⁶ (2019) 5 SCC 90

between 30-8-2011 to 29-11-2011 (delay was between 927 days to 1897 days). Only upon compliance being made that the defaults had come to notice. In the aforesaid background, and so noticing the quantum of fine/penalty imposed, we do not find good ground and reason to interfere.

82. The directions given in the aforesaid quotation should not be understood as empowering the authorities/Board to initiate action at any time. In the absence of any period of time and limitation prescribed by the enactment, every authority is to exercise power within a reasonable period. What would be the reasonable period would depend upon facts of each case, such as whether the violation was hidden and camouflaged and thereby the Board or the authorities did not have any knowledge. Though, no hard and fast Rules can be laid down in this regard as determination of the question will depend on the facts of each case, the nature of the statute, the rights and liabilities thereunder and other consequences, including prejudice caused and whether third party rights have been created are relevant factors. Whenever a question with regard to inordinate delay in issuance of a show-cause notice is made, it is open to the noticee to contend that the show-cause notice is bad on the ground of delay and it is the duty of the authority/officer to consider the question objectively, fairly and in a rational manner. There is public interest involved in not taking up and spending time on stale matters and, therefore, exercise of power, even when no time is specified, should be done within reasonable time. This prevents miscarriage of justice, misuse and abuse of the power as well as ensures that the violation of the provisions are checked and penalised without delay, thereby effectuating the purpose behind the enactment.”

25. In view of the aforesaid decisions, it is clear that no specific limitation period has been prescribed in the SEBI Act. However, I also note that even though there is no limitation period in the SEBI Act, the proceedings have to be initiated in a timely manner by the regulator and there cannot be any undue/ unexplainable delay. Since an appeal was already pending before the Hon'ble SAT, in a similar matter, which was disposed of vide order dated June 9, 2022, the SSCN was issued after taking into considerations the directions issued by the Hon'ble SAT. Therefore, I am of the view that the delay is justifiable and has not caused any prejudice to the Noticee.

26. Prior to moving forward with considering the said issue as stated at para 18 above, it is pertinent to refer to the common order dated June 09, 2022⁷ passed by the Hon'ble SAT which is also referred in the preceding paragraph 13. The Hon'ble SAT, while setting aside and remanding the earlier WTM Orders passed during February 2019, had made the following observations (relevant to the present case as well):

- (a) Observations of the Bombay High Court in the matter of *63 Moons vs. Union of India*⁸ cannot be relied upon as the said judgement has been set aside in appeal⁹ by the Hon'ble Supreme Court vide judgment dated April 30, 2019.
- (b) Observation from the Order dismissing the Writ Petition filed by NSEL against the invocation of the Maharashtra Protection of Interest of Depositors (in Financial Establishments) Act, 1999 ("MPID Act") (*NSEL vs. State of Maharashtra*¹⁰) cannot be relied upon, as in a subsequent Writ Petition¹¹ moved by 63 Moons, a Division Bench of the Hon'ble Bombay High Court has held that NSEL is not a financial establishment and therefore, the provisions of the MPID Act are not applicable. The prima facie observations cannot be the basis to judge the reputation, character or integrity of NSEL.
- (c) Observations in the bail rejection order dated August 22, 2014, passed by the Hon'ble Bombay High Court in the matter of ***Jignesh Prakash Shah vs. The State of Maharashtra***, cannot also be relied upon as the observations made in a bail order were limited to the fact as to whether the bail should be granted or not.
- (d) Reliance placed on decisions of the Hon'ble Tribunal in the matter of ***Jermyn Capital vs. SEBI***¹² and ***Mukesh Babu Securities vs. SEBI***¹³ is misplaced, as decisions in the said matters are distinguishable on facts. Jermyn Capital was held to be in relation to an Interim Order passed by SEBI, and the Tribunal was of the view that the criteria for passing an Ad Interim Order are based on a

⁷ Appeal No. 214 of 2019 Geofin Comtrade Ltd Vs. SEBI, Appeal No. 217 of 2019 Philip Commodities India Pvt. Ltd Vs. SEBI, Appeal No. 218 of 2019 IIFL Commodities Ltd Vs. SEBI, Appeal No. 288 of 2019 Anand Rathi Commodities Ltd Vs. SEBI and Appeal No. 288 of 2019 Anand Rathi Commodities Ltd Vs. SEBI

⁸ Writ Petition No. 2743 of 2014

⁹ Civil Appeal No. 4467 of 2019

¹⁰ Writ Petition No. 1403 of 2015

¹¹ Writ Petition No. 1181 of 2018

¹² Appeal No. 26 of 2006 decided on September 06, 2006

¹³ Appeal No. 53 of 2007 decided on December 10, 2007

different criterion, namely prima facie case, the balance of convenience and irreparable injury which are distinct and different while considering an application for grant of Certificate of Registration. The decision in the matter of *Mukesh Babu Securities* was of a criminal complaint filed against the Chairman of the Company. The Tribunal noted that there is no evidence to show that any proceedings have yet been initiated against the appellants in the matter under consideration.

- (e) Reputation of the applicant cannot be lightly considered based on observations which are not directly related to the applicant.
- (f) SEBI Order does not state for how long the rejection of application will continue. The Hon'ble Tribunal was of the view that the rejection cannot continue indefinitely, and in such cases, a time period should be provided during which the applicant will become ineligible to seek fresh registration.
- (g) Grant Thornton Forensic report does not find any close connection between the applicant and the NSEL. This is overlooked by SEBI.
- (h) With respect to the additional material available, the Hon'ble SAT observed that,

"It will be open to the WTM to rely upon other material such as the complaint letters of NSEL, EOW report, EOW charge sheet, etc. provided such copies are provided to the brokers and opportunity is given to rebut the allegations. Such additional documents relied upon by the respondent should form part of the show cause notice for which purpose, it will be open to the WTM to issue a supplementary show cause notice. It will also be open to SEBI if it considers necessary, to conduct an independent enquiry proceeding against the connected entities and persons associated with the brokers against whom evidence is available."

27. As noted above, taking cognizance of the order passed by the Hon'ble SAT on June 09, 2022 (*supra*), a SSCN dated October 12, 2022 was issued to the Noticee calling upon the Noticee to show cause as to why the following information/material along with the Enquiry Report dated March 19, 2020 should not be considered against it for determining whether the Noticee satisfies 'fit and

proper person' criteria as laid down under Schedule II of the Intermediaries Regulations:

- a) SEBI complaint dated September 24, 2018 filed with Economic Offence Wing ('EOW');
- b) First Information Report ('FIR') dated September 28, 2018; and
- c) Schedule II of the Intermediaries Regulations (Amended with effect from November 17, 2021).

28. Before considering the matter on merits and test the compliance of the Noticee with the '*fit and proper person*' criteria, on the basis of the material that has been brought on record, it would be appropriate to look at the background and understand the nature of the '*paired contracts*' that were offered on the NSEL – which ultimately is the cause / genesis of the current proceedings. While undertaking this exercise, I will not be independently recording any findings on the nature of the contracts that were entered on the NSEL platform or commenting on the actions of any entity which is not a party to the present proceedings. I will, however, be relying on the observations made by other authorities including the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matters of **63 Moons Technologies Ltd. vs. UOI**¹⁴ (hereinafter referred to as the "**merger petition**") and **The State of Maharashtra Vs. 63 Moons Technologies Ltd**¹⁵ (hereinafter referred to as the "**MPID Matter**"), wherever appropriate.

Transactions in the nature of 'paired contracts' on NSEL:

29. The spot exchanges were envisaged as a platform for providing transparent and secure trading in commodities with a view to boost the agriculture sector in the country. NSEL was incorporated in 2005 as an electronic exchange for spot trading of commodities. On June 5, 2007, the Ministry of Consumer Affairs ("MCA"), Government of India, issued a Notification SO 906(E) under Section 27 of the FCRA granting conditional exemption from the provisions of that Act with respect to (i) forward contracts, (ii) for sale and purchase of commodities, of one-day duration traded on NSEL. The conditions, *inter alia*, placed an absolute bar

¹⁴ Civil Appeal no. 4476 of 2019

¹⁵ Civil Appeal No. 2748-49 of 2022

on short sales and stipulated that all outstanding positions at the end of the day must result in delivery. It was also stipulated that all information or returns relating to the trade as and when asked for shall be provided to the Central Government or its designated agency. Thereafter, NSEL commenced operations in October 2008.

30. As noted from the FMC order, NSEL introduced, on its platform, the concept of '*paired contracts*', in September 2009, which involved buying and selling the same commodity through two different contracts at two different prices wherein investors could buy a short duration settlement contract and sell a long duration settlement contract or vice versa, with the same counterparty at the same time. In other words, the '*paired contract*' involved two simultaneous transactions being undertaken at the same time with the same counterparty—one being a purchase transaction (settling at T+2 or T+3) and the other being a sale transaction (settling at T+25 or T+36), at different prices on the platform of NSEL. The transactions were structured in such a manner that buyer of the short duration contract always ended up making profits.
31. As mentioned at para 4 above, FMC, after analysing the trade data as received from NSEL, vide order No. 4/5/2013-MKT/B dated December 17, 2013 observed that: "55 contracts offered for trade on NSEL were with settlement period exceeding 11 days and all such contracts traded on NSEL were in violation of provisions of FCRA" and "the condition of 'no short sale by members of the exchange shall be allowed' was not being met by NSEL".
32. Further, in the above mentioned Order, FMC, *inter alia*, held that the contracts traded on NSEL have violated certain conditions stipulated in the 2007 Exemption Notification, which granted permission to NSEL to offer spot trading in commodities which, *inter alia*, included "*no short sale by members of the exchange shall be allowed; that all outstanding positions of the trade at the end of the day shall result in delivery*" and that "*all information or returns relating to the trade as and when asked for shall be provided to the Central Government or its designated agency*".

33. It is clear from the order of FMC that NSEL was given permission to setup as a spot exchange for trading in commodities. It was essentially meant to only offer forward contracts having one-day duration as per 2007 Exemption Notification. I note from the FMC Order¹⁶ that the 55 contracts offered for trade on NSEL were with settlement periods exceeding 11 days and all such contracts traded on NSEL were in violation of the provisions of FCRA. I further note from the FMC Order that under the FCRA, a *“forward contract”* is defined as a *“contract for delivery of goods and which is not a ready delivery contract”*. A *‘ready delivery contract’* is defined as *“a contract which provides for the delivery of goods and the payment of a price therefor, either immediately or within such period not exceeding eleven days”*. Given the said definition as contained in FCRA, I note that FMC was of the view that all the contracts traded on NSEL which provided settlement schedule exceeding 11 days were treated as Non-Transferable Specific Delivery contracts.
34. Therefore, it is noted that even though it was stipulated in the 2007 Exemption Notification that, only contracts of one-day duration were permitted to be offered on NSEL, FMC, in its Order, relying on the definition of *“forward contract”* under FCRA held that, NSEL was allowed to trade only in one-day forward contracts and was obliged to ensure delivery and settlement within 11 days. I note the observation in the FMC order that NSEL had permitted 55 contracts of various commodities having duration longer than 11 days and these contracts were, *ex facie*, in contravention to the exemption granted to NSEL. It is pertinent to note that all the 55 contracts that were advertised by NSEL, and which are captured in the Hon’ble Supreme Court’s Judgement in the matter of MPID matter, were for durations exceeding 11 days.
35. I note that the Hon’ble Supreme Court in the matters of NSEL has also extensively commented on the nature of the ‘paired contracts’ traded on NSEL. The said observations made by the Hon’ble Supreme Court are as under:

¹⁶ Order No. 4/5/2013-MKT-1/B dated December 17, 2013

- a. the Two-Judge Bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the course of determining the validity of the amalgamation order in the matter of merger petition, vide judgment dated April 30, 2019, had observed as under:

*“55. We have seen that neither FTIL nor NSEL has denied the fact that ‘paired contracts’ in commodities were going on, and by April to July, 2013, 99% (and excluding E-series contracts), at least 46% of the turnover of NSEL was made up of such ‘paired contracts’. **There is no doubt that such ‘paired contracts’ were, in fact, financing transactions which are distinct from the sale and purchase transactions in commodities and were, thus, in breach of both the exemptions granted to NSEL and the FCRA.**” (emphasis supplied)*

- b. the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the MPID matter vide judgement dated April 22, 2022, has drawn reference to the presentations made by NSEL in respect of the ‘paired contracts’. Upon analysing the presentations made, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has observed that:

*“The above representation indicates that ‘paired contracts’ were designed as a unique trading opportunity by NSEL under which a trader would, for instance, purchase a T+2 contract (with a pay-in obligation on T+2) and would simultaneously sell a T+25 contract (with a pay-out of funds on T+25). The price differential between the two settlement dates was represented to offer an annualized return of about 16%. NSEL categorically represented that all trades were backed by collaterals in the form of stocks and its management activities included selection, accreditation, quality testing, fumigation and insurance. **Therefore, NSEL represented that on receiving money and commodities, the members would receive assured returns and a service.** Though NSEL has been receiving deposits, it has failed to provide services as promised against the deposits and has failed return the deposits on demand. Therefore, the State of Maharashtra was justified in issuing the*

attachment notifications under Section 4 of the MPID Act." (emphasis supplied)

36. I, therefore, note that the Hon'ble Supreme Court has already commented on the nature of the '*paired contracts*' offered on the NSEL platform. In the case of *63 Moons Technologies Ltd. vs. UOI*, the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that these contracts were in the nature of financing transactions. In the MPID matter (*The State of Maharashtra vs. 63 Moons Technologies Ltd.*), the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that such transactions come within the definition of '*deposits*' under the MPID Act.
37. It is further noted that the Hon'ble Supreme Court, in the MPID matter, had extensively referred to the claims made on the website of the NSEL and the contents of the publicity material and other investor resources. As seen from the order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, NSEL was advertising an annualized return of about 16% p.a. for the '*paired contracts*' traded on its platform. The return offered was the same across commodities. The return remained the same irrespective of the duration of the contract. For example, a T+2 & T+25 paired contract in steel had the same offered return as a T+ 2 & T + 35 paired contract in castor oil. The '*paired contracts*', it is noted, were being marketed as an alternative to fixed deposits.
38. In view of the above, I note that the FMC Order and both the judgments of the Hon'ble Supreme Court discuss in detail that, NSEL was permitting short sales, i.e., permitting sellers to offer contract for sale of commodities on its platform without ensuring that requisite amount of commodity is available in the warehouse. As noted above, the Hon'ble Apex Court in the merger petition has held that these contracts were in the nature of financing transactions. Further, the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the MPID matter has held that the overwhelming majority of the sale leg of the '*paired contracts*' which were executed were naked short sales i.e. the commodities to back such sales were not available at the designated warehouses of NSEL.

39. As regards the Noticee's submission that the merger petition and the FMC order have no relevance in the present matter, as the Noticee was not a party to the same, I note that the said decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court and the FMC order has been relied upon in the present proceedings to explain the nature of the paired contracts which were being traded on the NSEL platform and not to draw any adverse inference against the Noticee. Thus, even though the Noticee was not a party to the said decisions, they are still relevant for explaining the nature of '*paired contracts*'. Similarly, the submissions of the Noticee as regards the irrelevancy of the DEA, Government of India letter dated December 30, 2014 are also not tenable as the said document has also been relied upon in the present proceedings to only explain the nature of the paired contracts. Accordingly, the submissions of the Noticee are not tenable.

Objections raised by the Noticee:

40. The Noticee has submitted that SEBI does not have the jurisdiction to deal with the Spot Market in terms of letter dated November 20, 2015 of the Ministry of Finance. Since spot markets/ ready delivery contracts were not being regulated by the FMC, SEBI is not expected to take upon itself any regulatory function with regard to such markets. Accordingly, the merger of FMC with SEBI cannot empower SEBI to regulate the Spot Market. In this regard, without going into the merits of the contention that whether SEBI has the authority to regulate Spot Market or not, I note, that the issue under consideration in the present proceedings is limited to the determination of fit and proper status of the Noticee under the Intermediaries Regulations. It is a settled position of law that SEBI has statutory authority to determine the fit and proper status of the intermediaries registered with it. Since the Noticee is an intermediary registered with SEBI, I am of the view that SEBI is within its jurisdiction to determine the fit and proper status of the Noticee.
41. The Noticee has also argued that it has not been provided with all the documents which have been relied upon while issuing the notice and the same amounts to violation of the principle of natural justice. The Noticee has also submitted that the relevant trade details have not been provided to the Noticee. In this regard, I note

that vide letter dated August 22, 2019, the Noticee was provided with the relevant material such as the copy of EoW report, NSEL Circulars dated August 27, 2013 and March 10, 2015, FMC order etc., by the DA. Further, vide email dated February 13, 2020, the Noticee was also provided with relevant trade data in the matter. The Noticee has not specified as to what documents have not been provided to the Noticee which has caused prejudice to the it. Thus, I note that vide letter dated August 22, 2019, email dated February 13, 2020, SCN dated July 10, 2020 and SSCN dated October 12, 2022, the Noticee has been provided with the relevant documents and therefore, I am of the view that the principles of natural justice have been duly complied with in the matter and the Noticee's contention with regard to non-supply of relevant documents in the matter is not tenable.

42. The Noticee has further submitted that although the interim EOW report mentions the money-exposure amounting to ₹3,29,50,850/- against the name of the Noticee but the said is not defined to be associated with the trading in the paired contract and therefore, reference of the same cannot be taken so as to infer anything against the Noticee. I am of the view that the aforesaid contention of the Noticee is misplaced. The interim EOW report was prepared pursuant to initial investigation in the NSEL scam by the EOW. While submitting the said report to FMC, it was stated that the investigation was conducted to “...*identify the role played by broking houses in EOW C.R. No. 89/2013 (NSEL case)*...”. It is a matter of record that the aforementioned FIR No. 89/2013 was filed pursuant to the NSEL scam. Since the EOW report pertains to investigation in the NSEL scam, the amount mentioned in the said report, i.e., money exposure has to be seen in that light. Therefore, it would only be logical that the money exposure mentioned in the EOW report was as regards the trades executed in the ‘*paired contracts*’. Accordingly, the Noticee's contention that the interim EOW report has no connection to the ‘*paired contracts*’ and the money exposure stated therein is not related to ‘*paired contracts*’ is not tenable.

43. The Noticee has also relied upon the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **SEBI Vs. Rakhi Trading Private Limited**¹⁷ and Hon'ble SAT in the

¹⁷ [2018] 207 CompCas 443 (SC)

matter of ***Kasat Securities Private Limited Vs. SEBI***¹⁸ to submit that merely because the Noticee acted as a broker, it cannot be concluded that the Noticee knew about the nature of transactions or it was guilty of negligence or connivance. The said contention of the Noticee has to be seen in light of the fact that the ‘paired contracts’ have been held to be in violation of the 2007 Exemption Notification by the Hon’ble Supreme Court (as noted above at para 35). Thus, as understood in light of the above observations of the Hon’ble Supreme Court, the nature of the transactions being carried out on the NSEL platform was simply “financing”, whereby fixed returns (e.g. 16%) were being given by one party to the other. Considering the above, I do not find any merit in the argument of the Noticee that it was not aware of the nature of transactions being carried out on the NSEL platform.

Fit and proper person criteria

44. Now, I would be proceeding to deal with the main issue in hand in the present case which is whether the Noticee satisfies the ‘fit and proper person’ criteria laid down under Schedule II of the Intermediaries Regulations. Before moving forward, it would be appropriate to take a look at the relevant provision of the SEBI Act, Stock Broker Regulations and the Intermediaries Regulations (as they exist on date) which are reproduced as under for reference:

SEBI Act

Registration of stock brokers, sub-brokers, share transfer agents, etc.

12.(3) The Board may, by order, suspend or cancel a certificate of registration in such manner as may be determined by regulations:

Provided that no order under this sub-section shall be made unless the person concerned has been given a reasonable opportunity of being heard.

Broker Regulations

Consideration of application for grant of registration.

¹⁸ Appeal No. 27 of 2006, Decided on June 29, 2006

5. The Board shall take into account for considering the grant of a certificate, all matters relating to trading, settling or dealing in securities and in particular the following, namely, whether the applicant,
(e) is a fit and proper person based on the criteria specified in Schedule II of the Securities and Exchange Board of India (Intermediaries) Regulations, 2008.

Conditions of registration.

9. Any registration granted by the Board under regulation 6 shall be subject to the following conditions, namely, -

(b) he shall abide by the rules, regulations and bye-laws of the stock exchange which are applicable to him.....

(f) he shall at all times abide by the Code of Conduct as specified in Schedule II

Liability for action under the Enquiry Proceeding Regulations.

27. A stock broker or a sub-broker shall be liable for any action as specified in Chapter V of the Securities and Exchange Board of India (Intermediaries) Regulations, 2008 including suspension or cancellation of his certificate of registration as a stock broker or a sub-broker, as the case may be, if he—

(i)

(iv) has been found to be not a fit and proper person by the Board under these or any other regulations; ...”

SCHEDULE II

**Securities and Exchange Board of India (Stock Brokers) Regulations,
1992**

CODE OF CONDUCT FOR STOCK BROKERS

[Regulation 9]

A. General.

(1) Integrity: A stock-broker, shall maintain high standards of integrity, promptitude and fairness in the conduct of all his business.

(2) Exercise of due skill and care: A stock-broker shall act with due skill, care and diligence in the conduct of all his business.

(3)

(5) Compliance with statutory requirements: A stock-broker shall abide by all the provisions of the Act and the rules, regulations issued by the Government, the Board and the Stock Exchange from time to time as may be applicable to him.”

Intermediaries Regulations:

SCHEDULE II

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE BOARD OF INDIA (INTERMEDIARIES)

REGULATIONS, 2008

[See regulation 7]

(1) The applicant or intermediary shall meet the criteria, as provided in the respective regulations applicable to such an applicant or intermediary including:

(a) the competence and capability in terms of infrastructure and manpower requirements; and

(b) the financial soundness, which includes meeting the net worth requirements.

(2) The ‘fit and proper person’ criteria shall apply to the following persons:

(a) the applicant or the intermediary;

(b) the principal officer, the directors or managing partners, the compliance officer and the key management persons by whatever name called; and

(c) the promoters or persons holding controlling interest or persons exercising control over the applicant or intermediary, directly or indirectly:

Provided that in case of an unlisted applicant or intermediary, any person holding twenty percent or more voting rights, irrespective of whether they hold controlling interest or exercise control, shall be required to fulfill the ‘fit and proper person’ criteria.

Explanation–For the purpose of this sub-clause, the expressions “controlling interest” and “control” in case of an applicant or intermediary, shall be construed with reference to the respective regulations applicable to the applicant or intermediary.

- (3) For the purpose of determining as to whether any person is a ‘fit and proper person’, the Board may take into account any criteria as it deems fit, including but not limited to the following:
- (a) integrity, honesty, ethical behaviour, reputation, fairness and character of the person;
 - (b) the person not incurring any of the following disqualifications:
 - (i) criminal complaint or information under section 154 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (2 of 1974) has been filed against such person by the Board and which is pending;
 - (ii) charge sheet has been filed against such person by any enforcement agency in matters concerning economic offences and is pending;
 - (iii) an order of restraint, prohibition or debarment has been passed against such person by the Board or any other regulatory authority or enforcement agency in any matter concerning securities laws or financial markets and such order is in force;
 - (iv) recovery proceedings have been initiated by the Board against such person and are pending
 - (v) an order of conviction has been passed against such person by a court for any offence involving moral turpitude;
 - (vi) any winding up proceedings have been initiated or an order for winding up has been passed against such person;
 - (vii) such person has been declared insolvent and not discharged;
 - (viii) such person has been found to be of unsound mind by a court of competent jurisdiction and the finding is in force;
 - (ix) such person has been categorized as a wilful defaulter;
 - (x) such person has been declared a fugitive economic offender; or
 - (xi) any other disqualification as may be specified by the Board from time to time.

- (4) *Where any person has been declared as not 'fit and proper person' by an order of the Board, such a person shall not be eligible to apply for any registration during the period provided in the said order or for a period of five years from the date of effect of the order, if no such period is specified in the order.*
- (5) *At the time of filing of an application for registration as an intermediary, if any notice to show cause has been issued for proceedings under these regulations or under section 11(4) or section 11B of the Act against the applicant or any other person referred in clause (2), then such an application shall not be considered for grant of registration for a period of one year from the date of issuance of such notice or until the conclusion of the proceedings, whichever is earlier.*
- (6) *Any disqualification of an associate or group entity of the applicant or intermediary of the nature as referred in sub -clause (b) of clause (3), shall not have any bearing on the 'fit and proper person' criteria of the applicant or intermediary unless the applicant or intermediary or any other person referred in clause (2), is also found to incur the same disqualification in the said matter: Provided that if any person as referred in sub-clause (b) of clause (2) fails to satisfy the 'fit and proper person' criteria, the intermediary shall replace such person within thirty days from the date of such disqualification failing which the 'fit and proper person' criteria may be invoked against the intermediary:*
Provided further that if any person as referred in sub -clause (c) of clause (2) fails to satisfy the 'fit and proper person' criteria, the intermediary shall ensure that such person does not exercise any voting rights and that such person divests their holding within six months from the date of such disqualification failing which the 'fit and proper person' criteria may be invoked against such intermediary.

(7) The 'fit and proper person' criteria shall be applicable at the time of application of registration and during the continuity of registration and the intermediary shall ensure that the persons as referred in sub -clause s (b) and (c) of clause (2) comply with the 'fit and proper person' criteria.

45. I note that regulation 5(e) of the Broker Regulations provides that for the purpose of grant of Certificate of Registration, the applicant has to be a '*fit and proper person*' in terms of Schedule II of the Intermediaries Regulations. I further note that the '*fit and proper person*' criteria specified in Schedule II of the Intermediaries Regulations, 2008 was amended vide SEBI (Intermediaries) (Third Amendment) Regulations, 2021 with effect from November 17, 2021.
46. From the records, I note that SEBI has filed a complaint with EOW Mumbai on September 24, 2018, against brokers who facilitated access to '*paired contracts*' traded on NSEL, including the Noticee. On the basis of this complaint, FIR dated September 28, 2018, was registered with the MIDC Police Station, Mumbai, against the Noticee. I note from the records that the Noticee is holding a certificate of registration No. INZ000025034. In order to continue to hold such Certificate of Registration from SEBI, the Noticee is also required to satisfy the conditions of eligibility, which, *inter alia*, included, continuance of its status as a '*fit and proper person*'. The above condition to be fit and proper person is not a onetime condition applicable only at the time of seeking registration. Rather, the provisions governing the criteria show that this is a condition which each and every registered intermediary is required to fulfil on a continuous basis as long as the entity remains associated with the Securities Market as a registered intermediary.
47. In this context, I note that the Noticee, vide its reply dated October 26, 2020 had, *inter alia*, submitted that '*...The transactions had been executed by the Noticee for the clients for the contract on NSEL as they were duly authorized contracts by the exchange...*'. The Noticee in the said reply has further stated that "*...the Noticee cannot be held liable solely on the basis of its trading in NSEL...*". Further, on perusal of the Enquiry Report, it is noted that as per the interim EOW Report, the Noticee had money exposure to the tune of ₹3,29,50,850/-. It is also observed

from the Enquiry Report that NSEL had made a special pay-out to the Noticee. On perusal of the NSEL Circular dated March 10, 2015, it is observed that NSEL had made a special payout to the tune of ₹6,94,431/-. As regards the NSEL circular, the Noticee has contended that there is nothing on record to suggest that the said circular was with respect to the '*paired contracts*'. I am of the view that the said contention of the Noticee is misplaced as the said circular had details of brokers to whom pay-outs were made, and vide the said circular, information was also sought from other brokers who had outstanding against the trader's contract (also known as '*paired contracts*'). The relevant excerpt is quoted as under:

"...In view thereof, Members (having outstanding against the trader's contract) are requested to comply with the said Circular within 7 days i.e till 17th March, 2015 and in..."

Accordingly, the Noticee's contention in this regard is not tenable.

48. I also note from the Enquiry Report that the Noticee was involved in the trading in '*paired contracts*'. For instance, it is observed from the Enquiry Report that the Noticee purchased 300 units of CASTKADI3 for its clients on June 7, 2011 (settlement date on June 9, 2011) and then sold 300 units on the same date (settlement date July 13, 2011). In view of the same, it is clear that the Noticee was, in fact, involved in facilitating the trading in the alleged '*paired contracts*' on NSEL Platform. Accordingly, the Noticee's contention that SEBI has not provided any cogent reasoning/ concrete evidence to show that the Noticee had participated/ facilitated trading in the '*paired contracts*' is also not tenable.

49. The Noticee has also submitted that the shorter period contracts, i.e., T+2, T+3 and T+5 settlement and longer period contracts, i.e., T+25, T+30 and T+36 settlement were independent of each other and there was no relation between them, and accordingly. As already discussed, the Noticee has dealt in the paired contracts, I am of the view that the submission of the Noticee that the short term and long term contracts were independent of each other, cannot be taken at face value, especially, in absence of corroborating evidence. Further, without prejudice to the same, I note that the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of merger petition

has observed that majority of the trades executed on the NSEL platform were paired contracts. In the present matter, it is not the Noticee's case that the transactions facilitated by it for its clients were E-series contracts. Accordingly, transactions on NSEL, which the Noticee has admitted to have facilitated for its clients, could not have been anything but "*paired contracts*". In view of the above, the argument of the Noticee that the short term contracts and long term contracts were individual contracts independent of each other, and therefore cannot be considered as paired contracts, is rejected.

50. Further, without prejudice to the above, as noted above at para 31, "55 contracts offered for trade on NSEL were with settlement period exceeding 11 days and all such contracts traded on NSEL were in violation of provisions of FCRA". Thus, the contracts with durations such as T+25, T+30, etc., were, per se, in violation of the Exemption Notification.

51. I note that the act of the Noticee in offering access to '*paired contracts*' by facilitating trading in such contracts, seriously calls into question the integrity, honesty and lack of ethical behaviour on the part of the Noticee. As recorded in the FMC order and the judgements of the Hon'ble Supreme Court (*supra*), these contracts, were *ex facie* offered in violation of the 2007 Exemption Notification and were not spot contracts in commodities which were permitted to be traded on NSEL. The '*paired contracts*' were nothing but financing transactions masquerading as spot contracts in commodities. The execution of the trades in '*paired contracts*' were not permitted under the 2007 Exemption Notification and were purely financial contracts promising assured returns under the garb of spot trading in commodities, as observed by FMC in its Order. Therefore, the Noticee by its conduct and as a member of NSEL has facilitated trading in '*paired contracts*' which were in the nature of financing transaction, as held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court. The Noticee, by providing access for taking exposure to '*paired contracts*' has exposed its clients to the risk involved in trading in a product that did not have regulatory approval and thereby raising doubts on the competence of the Noticee to act as a registered Securities Market intermediary. Thus, I am of the view that the trading activities of the Noticee in '*paired contracts*' on the NSEL

platform have serious ingredients amounting to jeopardizing the reputation, belief in competence, fairness, honesty, integrity and character of the Noticee in the Securities Market.

52. I further note that Clause 3(b) of Schedule II of the amended Intermediaries Regulations lays down a list of disqualifications which includes the following:

i) criminal complaint or information under section 154 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (2 of 1974) has been filed against such person by the Board and which is pending;

53. As discussed above, the Noticee has facilitated its clients to trade in '*paired contracts*'. As the paired contracts were violative of the conditions stipulated in the 2007 Exemption Notification, a complaint was filed by SEBI with Economic Offences Wing, Mumbai (EoW) on September 24, 2018, against the brokers who participated/ facilitated access to '*paired contracts*' traded on NSEL, including the Noticee within the time limit, as specified under section 29A(2)(e) of the FCRA. On the basis of the said complaint of SEBI, FIR dated September 28, 2018 was registered with MIDC Police Station, Mumbai and the same are subsisting. I note that the name of the Noticee is reflected in the complaint and the FIR. I also note that the copies of the said complaint and the FIR were provided to the Noticee along with the SSCN dated October 12, 2022.

54. The Noticee has also submitted that it was granted the certificate of registration by SEBI on February 23, 2016, after coming to the conclusion that it was '*fit and proper*' person and it had not suppressed any material information at the relevant time. In this regard, it is pertinent to note that the criteria of '*fit and proper person*', is an ongoing requirement throughout the period during which the Noticee remains operational in the Securities Market as a registered intermediary. In case, pursuant to the grant of registration by SEBI, any evidence comes to the notice of SEBI that casts a doubt on the integrity, reputation and character of the registered intermediary, SEBI is well within its powers to examine the '*fit and proper person*' status of such entity based on various parameters. It is noted that parameters

provided under Clause 3(b) of the amended criteria of Schedule II of the Intermediaries Regulations lays down a list of disqualifications which includes a pending criminal complaint or information under Section 154 of CrPC filed against such an entity by the Board. It is, therefore, noted that the Noticee attracts the disqualification provided in Clause 3(b)(i) of the Schedule II of the Intermediaries Regulations. Thus, the submission of the Noticee that it has already been granted a certificate of registration by SEBI is not relevant as the Noticee is required to satisfy the '*fit and proper*' person status on a continuous basis.

55. The Noticee has also submitted that the fit and proper criteria was amended with effect from November 17, 2021, i.e., after initiation of the proceedings against the Noticee and thus cannot be applied retrospectively. In this regard, as noted above, the '*fit and proper*' person criteria, being a continuing requirement under the Intermediaries Regulations ought to be complied with at all times as long as an entity desires to remain associated with the securities market as a registered intermediary. The present proceedings intend to examine the '*fit and proper person*' status of the Noticee as per the Intermediaries Regulations. Therefore, I am of the view that the Noticee must satisfy the fit and proper person criteria as it exists on date and accordingly, the submissions of the Noticee that the Intermediaries Regulations cannot be made applicable retrospectively and the '*fit and proper*' person status cannot be tested for acts done prior to grant of registration are misplaced.

56. Therefore, looking holistically, I find that the conduct of the Noticee is detrimental to the Securities Market, being not in conformity with the applicable code of conduct. I, therefore, note that there were enough red flags for a reasonable person to come to conclude that what was being offered as '*paired contracts*' on NSEL were not spot contracts in commodities. Given the above, I am constrained to conclude that the Noticee facilitated its clients to access a product, which was not permitted to trade raised serious questions on the ability of the Noticee to conduct proper and effective due diligence regarding the product itself. By failing to disassociate itself from, and continuing to facilitate participation in the said paired contracts, the Noticee failed to act with due diligence.

57. Furthermore, as mentioned in paragraph 54 above, the Noticee has also earned disqualification under Clause 3(b)(i) of the amended Schedule II of the Intermediaries Regulations on account of the complaint filed by SEBI and the FIR registered against the Noticee. In this regard it is pertinent to note that the said FIR is subsisting and has not been challenged, quashed or stayed by any competent court qua the Noticee. In this context, as observed above, I note that being a '*fit and proper person*' is a continuing 'eligibility criteria' which must be satisfied by the Noticee including the amended criteria, at all times.

58. The Noticee has also submitted that NSEL as an exchange and the clearing corporations were the first level regulators and the '*paired contracts*' were launched by the Board of NSEL and hence, there was no reason for the Noticee to question the legality of such product launched by NSEL. In this regard, I am of the view that, the principle of '*ignorantia juris non excusat*' or '*ignorantia legis neminem excusat*' or '*ignorance of law is no excuse*' becomes applicable in the situation, since trading in '*paired contracts*' was in violation of the 2007 Exemption Notification and ignorance of the conditions of the said 2007 Exemption Notification cannot be claimed. As held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, the '*paired contracts*' were nothing but financing transactions which were portrayed as spot contracts in commodities. Therefore, giving go-by to the terms of the 2007 Exemption Notification and attempting to camouflage the nature of the transactions brings into question of appropriateness and suitability of the continuance of the registration of the Noticee as a broker. Equally, any argument deflecting the responsibility to NSEL is misplaced and hereby rejected, as the primary onus of diligence enjoined on an intermediary, which diligence any reasonable or prudent person would also perform, has not been undertaken by the Noticee. Clearly, the actions of the Noticee has been detrimental to the interest of the Securities Market and accordingly the Noticee can no longer be called a '*fit and proper person*' for holding the Certificate of Registration as a broker in the Securities Market, which is one of the conditions for continuance of registration as specified in regulation 5(e) of the Broker Regulations read with the provisions of Schedule II of the Intermediaries Regulations.

59. I would also like to address the objection of the Notice that by issuing the SSCN (pursuant to the SAT order), SEBI has sought to add more charges against the Noticee after the DA has already completed the enquiry. The Noticee has also submitted that the amended Intermediaries Regulations and additional documents cannot be made applicable for introducing new disqualifications. However, I find that the said objection, to be totally misplaced as the essence of the said SAT order is that it advises SEBI to provide the documents which it intends to use/rely in the present proceedings so that the entity would have an opportunity to prepare its defence pertaining to these documents and which is also in adherence to the principles of natural justice. Further, I also deem it important to place reliance on the SAT order dated June 9, 2022 wherein the SAT has, *inter alia*, observed as under:

“42...The matters are remitted to the WTM to decide the matter afresh in the light of the observations made aforesaid in accordance with law after giving an opportunity of hearing to the brokers. All issues raised by the brokers for which a finality has not been reached remains open for them to be raised before the WTM. It will be open to the WTM to rely upon other material such as the complaint letters of NSEL, EOW report, EOW charge sheet, etc. provided such copies are provided to the brokers and opportunity is given to rebut the allegations. Such additional documents relied upon by the respondent should form part of the show cause notice for which purpose, it will be open to the WTM to issue a supplementary show cause notice.....”

60. On the basis of the above observations of the Hon'ble SAT, I am of the view that the legality of the SSCN issued to the Noticee, alongwith other relevant material, cannot be questioned. Further, as purpose behind issuance of such SSCN was to provide due opportunity to evaluate the materials and to be heard to the Noticee and thereby adhere to the principles of natural justice. In any case, as recorded above, the Hon'ble SAT had already granted permission to SEBI to provide material which SEBI intended to rely in the proceedings and the same has been duly complied with by SEBI in this regard. Accordingly, Noticee's contention as

regard adding of more charges is not tenable as the SSCN has only brought on record further material and not added any charges as such.

61. The Noticee has also submitted that determining the '*fit and proper*' status of the Noticee only on the basis that the Noticee was a trading member without establishing actual violation of law would be against the principles of natural justice. In this regard, as noted above, the Noticee has admittedly traded in the '*paired contracts*' which were in violation of the 2007 Exemption Notification (as observed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court) and the Noticee has also incurred disqualification under Clause 3(b) of the Schedule II of the Intermediaries Regulations. Therefore, the '*fit and proper*' person status of the Noticee is for reasons as mentioned above and thus, the submissions of the Noticee are not tenable.

62. The Noticee has also contended that there is no finding in the Enquiry Report about violation of the SEBI Act or allied regulations and in absence of the same, allegations of violation of Intermediaries Regulations/ Stock Brokers Regulations cannot sustain on its own. Further, violation of Stock Broker Regulations and Intermediaries Regulations have to be seen in light of violation of SEBI Act or the allied regulations which is not the case. In this regard, I have perused the material available on record and I note that the SCN issued by the DA alleged that the Noticee has violated regulations 9(b), 9(f) read with Clause A(1), A(2) and A(5) of the Stock Broker Regulations. The DA, after taking into account the material available on record, has recommended that the certificate of the Noticee may be cancelled. I am of the opinion that merely the fact that the DA has not, in as many words, stated that the Noticee has violated the aforesaid provisions would not vitiate the present proceedings. Further, it is a settled position that SEBI, as a market regulator, is within its four walls to adjudge the '*fit and proper*' person status of intermediaries registered with it. The intent of the Intermediaries Regulations, as regards judging the fit and proper status of a registered intermediary, is that any entity who is not fit and proper, should not remain active/ enter in the securities market ecosystem. It is very much possible that a registered intermediary is declared as not fit and proper for violation/ activities not pertaining

to securities market/securities laws. To further strengthen the said understanding, I deem it fit to place reliance on clause 3(b)(v) of Schedule II of the Intermediaries Regulations which states as under:

“(v) an order of conviction has been passed against such person by a court for any offence involving moral turpitude;”

On a bare perusal of the above requirement, it is clear that disqualification of not being ‘*fit and proper*’ can come into play for violations not specifically pertaining to the SEBI Act or allied regulations and thus, the submission of the Noticee that there is no finding in the Enquiry Report as regard the violation of SEBI Act or allied regulations is not tenable. Accordingly, the Noticee cannot place reliance on the SEBI order dated September 10, 2004 (*ICICI Brokerage Services Limited*) as the facts of the present matter are different.

63. In the context of Securities Market, I note that the role of a registered intermediary including a broker is not only sensitive and predominantly fiduciary in nature but also demands from it honesty, transparency, fairness and integrity which are essentially the hallmarks of such market intermediaries. Given the fact that one of the avowed objects of the SEBI Act is the protection of interest of investors apart from promotion and development of the Securities Market, the legislature through enactment, empowers SEBI to grant registration to several class of entities including brokers, which are not only required to act as an intermediary simplicitor i.e., a bridge or a connector between the markets and investors, but also have a very important role to play in creating an ecosystem of trust and fairness so as to provide a fair and secure market to the investors and any deviation from the above noted objective could have a cascading adverse impact on the development of the Securities Market and interests of investors. Thus, undisputedly a broker is obligated to act in a transparent manner and comply with all applicable regulatory requirements which are in the best interests of its clients and which will uphold the integrity of the Securities Market.

64. I am also aware that SEBI has passed certain orders¹⁹ in the related NSEL matters where the Noticees therein have been debarred from making a fresh application seeking registration for a specified period from the date of the said order or till acquittal of the said Noticee by Courts pursuant to the charge sheet and FIR filed by/with EOW, whichever is earlier. I find that present matter at hand is different from that of those cases, as in the extant matter the Noticee is already holding a Certificate of Registration whereas in those cases, the entities had filed applications seeking certificate of registration. As already noted above at paragraph 54, '*fit and proper person*' criteria is a continuing requirement under the Intermediaries Regulations which the Noticee ought to comply with at all times so long it desires to remain associated with the Securities Market as a registered intermediary. Further, I note that the Hon'ble SAT in its order dated June 09, 2022 (pertaining to entities whose application for registration was rejected) has observed that the period for which the noticees cannot apply for registration needs to be specified by SEBI. Having noted the aforesaid observation of the Hon'ble SAT, I am of the view that since the recommendation in the present matter is of cancellation and not of rejection of the application, the necessity of specifying a period of time may not arise in this order (as in the case of entities desiring to be registered as market intermediaries) as this forum cannot presume whether such entity wishes to reapply to be a market intermediary or not. If it chooses to do so, it will have to be assessed at such point of time if it is fit and proper as per the extant and applicable regulations.

65. The scope of the present proceedings is to see whether the indulgence and engagement could be held to be beneficial to the development of Securities Market or the same contain elements that are potentially dangerous and detrimental to the interest, integrity, safety and security of the Securities Market. In this respect, the undisputed fact, as recorded in the FMC order and Orders of

¹⁹ Orders dated November 29, 2022 in respect of Motilal Oswal Commodities Brokers Pvt. Ltd. (at https://www.sebi.gov.in/enforcement/orders/nov-2022/order-in-respect-of-motilal-oswal-commodities-broker-pvt-ltd-_65602.html), Anand Rathi Commodities Ltd. (at https://www.sebi.gov.in/enforcement/orders/nov-2022/order-in-the-matter-of-anand-rathi-commodities-ltd-_65604.html), Geofin Comtrade Limited (previously known as Geojit Comtrade Limited) (at https://www.sebi.gov.in/enforcement/orders/nov-2022/order-in-the-matter-of-geofin-comtrade-limited-previously-known-as-geojit-comtrade-limited_65597.html), India Infoline Commodities Ltd. (at https://www.sebi.gov.in/enforcement/orders/nov-2022/order-in-the-matter-of-india-infoline-commodities-ltd-_65595.html) and Phillip Commodities India Pvt. Ltd. (at https://www.sebi.gov.in/enforcement/orders/nov-2022/order-in-the-matter-of-phillip-commodities-india-pvt-ltd-_65593.html) in the matter of NSEL.

the Hon'ble Supreme Court (as mentioned supra), that the scheme of '*paired contracts*' traded on the NSEL ultimately has caused loss to the market which itself casts serious aspersion on the conduct, integrity and reputation of, *inter alia*, the Noticee who facilitated such '*paired contracts*' and therefore, its continuing role in the Securities Market cannot be viewed as good and congenial for the interest of the investors or of the Securities Market.

66. Given the above discussions and deliberations, I am constrained to conclude that the act of the Noticee providing access to its clients to participate in a product, which did not have the requisite regulatory approval, raises serious questions on the ability of the Noticee to conduct proper and effective due diligence regarding the said product itself presumably, driven by its desire to earn brokerage and / or profit. Further, as per findings recorded above, the Noticee also attracts the disqualification provided in Clause 3(b)(i) under the amended Schedule II of the Intermediaries Regulations in view of the complaint filed by SEBI and the pending FIR against the Noticee which is subsisting/pending as on date. Further, it is also not the case of the Noticee that said FIR filed is either stayed or quashed by any competent court qua the Noticee or otherwise. In view of the above, I hold that the Noticee does not satisfy the '*fit and proper person*' criteria specified in Schedule II of the Intermediaries Regulations and hence, the continuance of the Noticee as a registered broker will be detrimental to the interest of the Securities Market. Therefore, activities of the Noticee, as discussed in the preceding paragraphs, as a registered broker cannot be condoned and deserve appropriate measure to prevent such wrong doings recurring to the detriment of the interest of the Securities Market. In light of the aforesaid discussion, the Noticee cannot place reliance on the decision of the Hon'ble SAT in the matter of ***MJ Patel Vs. SEBI*** and ***Nirmal Bang Securities Private Limited Vs. The Chairman, SEBI***²⁰ as there is sufficient material to justify taking of appropriate action against the Noticee in terms of the Intermediaries Regulations.

²⁰ Appeal No 54 of 2002, Decided on October 31, 2003

67. In view of the above, I concur with the recommendation made by the DA, i.e., registration of the Noticee, Ganesh Commodities Private Limited, registered as a commodities broker, may be cancelled.

ORDER

68. I, therefore, in exercise of powers conferred under Section 12(3) and Section 19 of the SEBI Act, 1992 read with Regulation 27 of the Intermediaries Regulations, 2008 cancel the Certificate of Registration (bearing no. INZ000025034) of the Noticee viz. Ganesh Commodities Private Limited.

69. The Noticee shall, after receipt of this order, immediately inform its existing clients, if any, about the aforesaid direction in paragraph 68 above.

70. Notwithstanding the direction at paragraph 68 above, the Noticee shall allow its existing clients, if any to withdraw or transfer their securities or funds held in its custody, within 15 days from the date of this order. In case of failure of any clients to withdraw or transfer their securities or funds within the said 15 days, the Noticee shall transfer the funds and securities of such clients to another broker registered with SEBI within a period of next 15 days thereon, under advice to the said clients.

71. This Order shall come into force with immediate effect.

72. The above Order is without prejudice to the criminal complaint filed by SEBI in the NSEL matter and/or any proceedings pending before any authority in respect of similar matter concerning the Noticee or other relevant persons.

73. A copy of this order shall be served upon the Noticee and the recognized Market Infrastructure Institutions for necessary compliance.

DATE: NOVEMBER 30, 2023

PLACE: MUMBAI

Sd/-

S.V. MURALI DHAR RAO

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE BOARD OF INDIA