



BEFORE THE ADJUDICATING OFFICER
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE BOARD OF INDIA

[ADJUDICATION ORDER NO. Order/AK/RK/2026-27/32426]

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

Saachi Overseas
(PAN: ABQFS9871C)

In the matter of Trading in Illiquid Stock Options on BSE

BACKGROUND OF THE CASE

1. Securities and Exchange Board of India (hereinafter referred to as “**SEBI**”) observed large scale reversal of trades in stock options segment of Bombay Stock Exchange (hereinafter referred to as “**BSE**”). SEBI observed that such large scale reversal of trades in stock options lead to creation of artificial volume at BSE. In view of the same, SEBI conducted an investigation into the trading activities of certain entities in illiquid stock options at BSE for the period April 1, 2014 to September 30, 2015 (hereinafter referred to as “**IP**”).
2. Pursuant to investigation, it was observed that total of 2,91,744 trades comprising 81.40% of all the trades executed in stock options segment of BSE during the IP were allegedly non genuine trades. The aforesaid alleged non-genuine trades resulted into creation of artificial volume in stock options segment of BSE during the IP. It was observed that Saachi Overseas (PAN – ABQFS9871C) (hereinafter referred to as the “**Noticee**”) was one of the various entities, which indulged in execution of reversal trades in stock options segment of BSE during the IP. Such trades were alleged to be non-genuine in nature and created false or misleading appearance of trading in terms of artificial volumes in stock options and therefore were alleged to be manipulative, deceptive in nature. In view of the same, SEBI initiated adjudication proceedings against the Noticee for alleged violation of the provisions of Regulations 3(a), (b), (c), (d), 4(1) and 4(2)(a) of SEBI (Prohibition of Fraudulent and Unfair Trade Practices Relating to Securities Market) Regulations, 2003 (hereinafter referred to as “**PFUTP Regulations**”).



APPOINTMENT OF ADJUDICATING OFFICER

3. SEBI appointed Smt. Asha Shetty as Adjudicating Officer (AO) in the matter, u/s 19 r/w Section 15-I(1) of the SEBI Act, 1992 (hereinafter referred to as “**SEBI Act**”) and Rule 3 of SEBI (Procedure for Holding Inquiry and Imposing Penalties) Rules, 1995 (hereinafter referred to as “**SEBI Adjudication Rules**”) to conduct adjudication proceedings in the manner specified under Rule 4 of SEBI Adjudication Rules r/w Section 15-I(1) and (2) of SEBI Act, and if liable, impose such penalty as deemed fit in terms of Rule 5 of SEBI Adjudication Rules r/w Section 15HA of SEBI Act. Pursuant to transfer of case, undersigned was appointed as Adjudicating Officer in the matter, vide Order dated April 03, 2025.

SHOW CAUSE NOTICE, REPLY AND HEARING

4. A Show Cause Notice dated August 10, 2022 (hereinafter referred to as “**SCN**”) was issued to the Noticee by the AO u/r 4(1) of the SEBI Adjudication Rules to show-cause as to why an inquiry should not be initiated against it and why penalty, if any, should not be imposed u/s 15HA of the SEBI Act for the violations alleged to have been committed by the Noticee.
5. It was inter alia alleged in the SCN that the Noticee had executed 4 non-genuine trades in 1 Stock Options contract which resulted in artificial volume of total 4,36,000 units.
6. The SCN with reference number EAD-8/AS/AK/42275/1/2022 dated August 10, 2022 was issued to the Noticee by AO and was served on the Noticee via SPAD. The proof of service is on record.
7. Vide Part-B of the said SCN, the Noticee was given intimation about the SEBI Settlement Scheme, 2022. The intimation regarding settlement scheme given to the Noticee is as follows:

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

“17. We are, thus, of the opinion that SEBI should reconsider and seriously give a thought in coming out with a fresh scheme under Clause 26 of the Settlement Regulations, 2018. Such scheme can be a onetime scheme for this class of person. The



terms of settlement should be attractive so that it could attract the noticees / entities to come forward and settle the matter which will ameliorate the harassment of penalty proceedings to the noticees and at the same time would help to clear the backlog of these pending matters before various AOs.” (Emphasis Supplied)

9. *In compliance with the above directions of the Hon’ble Securities Appellate Tribunal, SEBI has introduced a one-time settlement scheme called the SEBI Settlement Scheme, 2022, in terms of Regulation 26 of the Securities and Exchange Board of India (Settlement Proceedings) Regulations, 2018 in the matter of Illiquid Stock Options. The said scheme proposes payment of Settlement Amount as per the details given below:*

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

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

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

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

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



8. Pursuant to the above, vide public notice dated November 21, 2022, it was advertised/ informed that *“Considering the interest of entities in availing the Scheme, the competent authority has extended the period of the Scheme till January 21, 2023”*.
9. However, it was observed that Noticee did not avail the SEBI Settlement Scheme, in view of which, the adjudication proceeding against the Noticee was resumed in terms of Para 12 of the SCN.
10. In response to the SCN, Jogesh Bhasin, Partner in the Noticee submitted its reply, vide letter dated September 20, 2022, stating that, *“The Noticee has not done any trade on 27-03-2015 and the trades are also not reflecting in its account books and does not belong to it.”*
11. Subsequently, a Post SCN Intimation (PSI) dated March 22, 2024 was issued to the Noticee. The said PSI was attempted to be served upon email ID of the Noticee, vide email dated March 22, 2024. However, no delivery receipt of the said email service is on record. The said PSI inter alia carried information about the SEBI ISO Settlement Scheme, 2024.
12. Pursuant to the above, vide public notice dated May 8, 2024, it was advertised/ informed that *“Considering the interest of entities in availing the Scheme, the competent authority has extended the period of the Scheme till June 10, 2024.”*
13. I note that despite being granted the opportunity for Settlement twice, it did not avail the same and accordingly, the adjudication proceeding against the Noticee was resumed and in the interest of natural justice, opportunities of hearing in the matter were granted to the Noticee on March 20, 2023, January 01, 2026 and May 12, 2026, vide hearing notices dated March 02, 2023, December 26, 2025 and April 27, 2026 respectively. The said notices were duly delivered to the Noticee through email, and the proof of delivery is on record. Vide the said hearing notices, Noticee was also provided with opportunity to submit its further reply to the SCN. In response to the hearing notice, an Advocate, viz. Mahesh Narayan Pabharekar, claiming himself to be the Authorized Representative (AR) of the Noticee, vide letter dated March 25, 2026, which was physically received by SEBI on April 08, 2026, submitted as under:
 - 13.1 *That its client had never undertaken any trading in the stock options segment of BSE during the alleged period from April 1, 2014 to September 30, 2015.*



- 13.2 Its client had not appointed, authorized, or engaged any broker, counterparty, or intermediary referred to in the notice.
- 13.3 That Notice fails to provide Name and SEBI registration details of the broker, Client Code Mapping (UCC), Contract Notes, and ledger statements.
- 13.4 Its Client did not have any verified trading records, or demat evidence supporting the alleged reversal trades, and notice does not correlate the alleged trades with any actual maintained or operated by its client.
- 13.5 Its client had no connection or involvement with the alleged trades.
- 13.6 Its client had not received any monetary benefit or profit from the alleged transactions. And that no banking trail, fund movement, or financial linkage has been demonstrated in the notice.
- 13.7 That notice is vague, and non-specific, lacking transaction-level details
- 13.8 That no supporting documentary evidence has been furnished to substantiate the allegations.
- 13.9 That it has been non-operational/closed, and no such trading activity has been carried out during or after the alleged period.
- 13.10 Its client had no knowledge of any such transactions, had not dealt with any such broker or intermediary and had not authorised any person to carry out such trades.
- 13.11 That there are no records in its accounts relating to such transactions.
- 13.12 That its client had sent a communication dated September 30, 2022 to the broker at the address available, and the said communication returned undelivered, as the broker was not available/not operating at the said address, which clearly indicated that the broker details were incorrect, outdated, or not traceable, thus raising serious doubt about the authenticity of the alleged transactions and linkage with its client.
14. Vide hearing notice dated April 27, 2026, Noticee and the said AR were advised to submit the Authorization letter in favour of the said AR. However, till date, neither Noticee nor the said AR has provided the Authorization letter. In the absence of which, it is construed that the said AR was not authorized to submit reply on behalf of the Noticee. I note that despite being granted the opportunity of hearing thrice, Noticee did not avail the same.

CONSIDERATION OF ISSUES AND FINDINGS

15. The charges levelled against the Noticee, reply and the documents / material available on record have been carefully perused. The issues that arise for consideration in the present case are:



- 15.1 Whether the Noticee has violated provisions of Regulations 3(a), (b), (c), (d), 4(1) and 4(2)(a) of PFUTP Regulations?
- 15.2 Does the violation, if any, attract monetary penalty u/s 15HA of the SEBI Act, 1992?
- 15.3 If so, what would be the quantum of monetary penalty that can be imposed on the Noticee after taking into consideration the factors mentioned in section 15J of the SEBI Act, 1992?
16. Before proceeding further, the relevant provisions of the PFUTP Regulations are mentioned as below:

PFUTP Regulations, 2003

3. Prohibition of certain dealings in securities

No person shall directly or indirectly—

- (a) buy, sell or otherwise deal in securities in a fraudulent manner;*
- (b) use or employ, in connection with issue, purchase or sale of any security listed or proposed to be listed in a recognized stock exchange, any manipulative or deceptive device or contrivance in contravention of the provisions of the Act or the rules or the regulations made there under;*
- (c) employ any device, scheme or artifice to defraud in connection with dealing in or issue of securities which are listed or proposed to be listed on a recognized stock exchange;*
- (d) engage in any act, practice, course of business which operates or would operate as fraud or deceit upon any person in connection with any dealing in or issue of securities which are listed or proposed to be listed on a recognized stock exchange in contravention of the provisions of the Act or the rules and the regulations made there under.*

4. Prohibition of manipulative, fraudulent and unfair trade practices

- (1) Without prejudice to the provisions of regulation 3, no person shall indulge in a fraudulent or an unfair trade practice in securities.*
- (2) Dealing in securities shall be deemed to be a fraudulent or an unfair trade practice if it involves fraud and may include all or any of the following, namely:—*
- (a) indulging in an act which creates false or misleading appearance of trading in the securities market;*



Issue (a) : Whether the Noticee has violated provisions of Regulations 3(a), (b), (c), (d) and Regulation 4(1) & 4(2)(a) of PFUTP Regulations?

17. Before proceeding to the merits of the case, it is noted that pursuant to a preliminary examination conducted in the Illiquid Stock Options matter, Interim order was passed by SEBI on August 20, 2015 which was confirmed vide Orders dated July 30, 2016 and August 22, 2016. Meanwhile, SEBI initiated a detailed investigation relating to stock options segment of BSE which was completed in the year 2018. The investigation revealed that 14,720 entities were involved in executing non-genuine trades in BSE's stock option segment during the investigation period. The proceedings initiated vide the aforementioned Interim Order were disposed of vide Final Order dated April 05, 2018 also considering that appropriate action was initiated against the said 14,720 entities in a phased manner.
18. It is further noted that there are no timelines prescribed in the SEBI Act, for the purpose of identifying trades as non-genuine. In this regard, it is pertinent to note that, in the matter of **SEBI Vs Bhavesh Pabari** (2019) SCC Online SC 294, the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India has, inter alia, held that:
“There are judgments which hold that when the period of limitation is not prescribed, such power must be exercised within a reasonable time. What would be reasonable time, would depend upon the facts and circumstances of the case, nature of the default/statute, prejudice caused, whether the third-party rights had been created etc.”
19. It is relevant at this juncture to deal with the transactions executed by the Noticee in the alleged non-genuine trades.
20. It is noted that allegation against the Noticee is that, while dealing in the stock option contracts at BSE during the IP, it had executed reversal trades which were allegedly non-genuine trades and the same had resulted in generation of artificial volume in stock option contracts at BSE. Reversal trades are considered to be those trades in which an entity reverses its buy or sell positions in a contract with subsequent sell or buy positions with the same counterparty during the same day. The said reversal trades are alleged to be non-genuine trades as they are not executed in the normal course of trading, lack basic trading rationale, lead to false



or misleading appearance of trading in terms of generation of artificial volumes and hence, are deceptive and manipulative.

21. Further, it is noted from the trade log of the Noticee that it had allegedly executed 4 non-genuine trades in 1 contract and the above mentioned trades of the Noticee had resulted in the creation of artificial volume of 4,36,000 units in the said contract. Summary of non-genuine trades of the Noticee is as follows:

Contract Name	Avg. Buy Rate (Rs)	Total Buy Volume (No. of units)	Avg. Sell Rate (Rs)	Total Sell Volume (No. of units)	% of Non Genuine trades of Noticee in the contract to Noticee's Total trades in the Contract	% of Non-Genuine trades of Noticee in the contract to Total trades in the Contract	% of Artificial Volume generated by Noticee in the contract to Noticee's Total Volume in the Contract	% of Artificial Volume generated by Noticee in the contract to Total Volume in the Contract
ARVI15APR240.0 0CEW1	22.21	218000	13.10	218000	100	26.67	100	43.08

22. I note that the Noticee had allegedly executed non-genuine trades in said contract, wherein the percentage of alleged non-genuine trades of the Noticee in stock options contract to total trades in the contract was 26.67%. Further, alleged artificial volume generated by Noticee in the contract amounted to 100% volume of total volume generated by it in the contract. It is also noted that alleged artificial volume generated by the Noticee contributed 43.08% of the total volume from the market in the said contract.

23. The details of squaring up done by the Noticee in the contract 'ARVI15APR240.00CEW1' is as given below:

Trade Date	Client Name	CP Client Name	Trade Time	Trade Rate (Rs.)	Traded Quantity	Buy/Sell by the Noticee
27/03/2015	N M IMPEX PRIVATE LIMITED	SAACHI OVERSEAS	10:32:36.670898	3.1	218000	Sell
27/03/2015	SAACHI OVERSEAS	N M IMPEX PRIVATE LIMITED	10:32:41.271183	16.7	1000	Buy
27/03/2015	SAACHI OVERSEAS	N M IMPEX PRIVATE LIMITED	10:32:45.463439	19.1	1000	Buy
27/03/2015	SAACHI OVERSEAS	N M IMPEX PRIVATE LIMITED	10:33:06.664719	22.25	216000	Buy

- 23.1 As can be seen from the table above, the trades executed by the Noticee in the contract were squared up within short time, with the same counterparty.



Noticee on March 27, 2015 at 10:32:36 hrs (Order time of Noticee: 10:32:36.670898 and Counterparty Order time: 10:32:35.962864) entered into a sell trade with counterparty viz. N M Impex Private Limited for 2,18,000 units at the rate of Rs 13.10 per unit in the contract 'BOBL15FEB165.00CE'. Thereafter, on the same day, Noticee entered into 3 buy trades for total 2,18,000 units with same counterparty viz. N M Impex Private Limited at an average rate of Rs 22.21 per unit.

23.2 These trades were entered into with the same counterparty in the same contract. It is noted that while dealing in the said contract during the IP, the Noticee executed reversal trades with same counterparty viz. N M Impex Private Limited on the same day, with significant price difference. Thus, the Noticee, through its dealing in the contract viz. 'ARV115APR240.00CEW1' during the I.P., executed non genuine trades which were 26.67% of the total trades from the market in the said contract during the I.P., and thereby, Noticee generated artificial volume of 436000 units which was 43.08% of the volume traded in the said contract from the market during the I.P.

24. With respect to submission of the AR that Noticee had written a letter to the broker, communicating that it had not carried out the alleged trades, I note from the letters dated September 30, 2022, provided by the AR as Annexure to its reply dated March 25, 2026 that the letters were addressed to one Ms. Mousumi Deb Roy and Mr. Rahul Jhunjhunwala, wherein partner of the Noticee, vide the letters had denied executing the alleged transactions. In this regard, I note that Noticee has not provided any proof of having delivered these letters. Further, it has not provided any proof of email delivery, if any, of the said communication. I also note that it is not clear, whether Noticee had written any such letter after having received the SCN or the said letters have been created post service of hearing notices, as the said letters were not provided by the Noticee in its first reply dated September 30, 2022, and it is at this stage the letters have cropped up, which raises questions about the authenticity of the communication by the Noticee with its broker/sub-broker regarding the alleged transactions. Further, I note from the said letters that they are also devoid of any stamp of the Noticee, indicating that they have been created to substantiate the contradiction of the Noticee of not



having executed the alleged trades. I also note that delivery of SCN in the matter was also attempted by the Market Infrastructure Institutions, through the stock broker of the Noticee and that Noticee has acknowledged the receipt of SCN through its stock broker JHP Securities Private Limited. Therefore, even after having received the said SCN through it, Noticee has not provided any communication with the said broker on this issue. Thus, submission of the Noticee appears to be an afterthought and is not tenable.

25. As regards submission of the Noticee that it had not done any such alleged trades in stock options, I note that Noticee didn't provide any evidence of having raised this issue with Exchange/SEBI or any compliant filed with police w.r.t such non-genuine trades having been done without its knowledge. In the absence of any proof, its submissions are an afterthought in a bid to disassociate from the alleged trades.
26. I note that the non-genuineness of these transactions executed by the Noticee is evident from the fact that there was no commercial basis as to why, within a short span of time, the Noticee reversed the position with its counterparty. The fact that the transactions in a particular contract were reversed with the same counterparty indicates a prior meeting of minds with a view to execute the reversal trades at a pre-determined price. Since these trades were done in illiquid option contracts, there was no trading in the said contract and hence, there was no price discovery in the strictest terms. The wide variation in prices of the said contract, within a short span of time, is a clear indication that there was pre-determination in the prices by the counterparties while executing the trades. The fact that the buy and sell orders were placed by the Noticee and counterparty within a short span of time, strongly indicates meeting of minds. Thus, it is observed that Noticee had indulged in reversal trades with its counterparty in the stock options segment of BSE and the same were non-genuine trades. Therefore, submission of the Noticee is bereft of merits.
27. It is not mere coincidence that the Noticee could match its trades with the same counterparty with whom it had undertaken first leg of the respective trades. The fact that the transactions in a particular contract were reversed with the same counterparty for the same quantity of units, indicates a prior meeting of minds with



a view to execute the reversal trades at a pre-determined price. This is the outcome of meeting of minds elsewhere and it was a deliberate attempt to deal in such a manner. In this regard, it is noted that in matters dealing with violation of PFUTP Regulations, the reason as with respect to execution of non-genuine trades might not be immediately forthcoming. However, the correct test instead, is one of preponderance of probabilities and therefore at this juncture, it is pertinent to rely on the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in **SEBI v Kishore R Ajmera (AIR 2016 SC 1079)** decided on February 23, 2016, wherein it was held that-

“...According to us, knowledge of who the 2nd party / client or the broker is, is not relevant at all. While the screen based trading system keeps the identity of the parties anonymous it will be too naïve to rest the final conclusions on the said basis which overlooks a meeting of minds elsewhere. Direct proof of such meeting of minds elsewhere would rarely be forthcoming...in the absence of direct proof of meeting of minds elsewhere in synchronized transactions, the test should be one of preponderance of probabilities as far as adjudication of civil liability arising out of the violation of the Act or provision of the Regulations is concerned. The conclusion has to be gathered from various circumstances like that volume of the trade effected; the period of persistence in trading in the particular scrip; the particulars of the buy and sell orders, namely, the volume thereof; the proximity of time between the two and such other relevant factors. The illustrations are not exhaustive...”

28. The Hon'ble Supreme Court further held in the same matter that – *“It is a fundamental principle of law that proof of an allegation levelled against a person may be in the form of direct substantive evidence or, as in many cases, such proof may have to be inferred by a logical process of reasoning from the totality of the attending facts and circumstances surrounding the allegations/charges made and levelled. While direct evidence is a more certain basis to come to a conclusion, yet, in the absence thereof, the Courts cannot be helpless. It is the judicial duty to take note of the immediate and proximate facts and circumstances surrounding the events on which the charges/allegations are founded and to reach what would appear to the Court to be a reasonable conclusion therefrom. The test would always be that what inferential process that a reasonable/prudent man would adopt to arrive at a conclusion.”*



29. The observations made in the aforesaid judgments of Hon'ble Supreme Court apply with full force to the facts and circumstances of the present case. Therefore, applying the ratio of the above judgments, it is conspicuous that the execution of trades by the Noticee in the illiquid options segment with such precision in terms of order placement, time, price, quantity etc. and also the fact that the transactions were reversed with the same counterparty clearly indicates a prior meeting of minds with a view to execute the reversal trades at a pre-determined price. The only reason for the wide variation in prices of the same contract, within short span of time was a clear indication that there was pre-determination in the prices by both the counterparty when executing the trades. Thus, the nature of trading, as brought out above, clearly indicates an element of prior meeting of minds and therefore, a collusion of the Noticee with its counterparty to carry out the trades at pre-determined prices

30. Further, following is noted from the judgement of the Hon'ble SAT in the matter of **Ketan Parekh vs SEBI (supra)**:

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

31. It would be instrumental to also place reliance on the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of **SEBI v Rakhi Trading Private Limited (Civil Appeal Nos. 1969, 3174-3177 and 3180 of 2011 decided on February 8, 2018)**, in which the Hon'ble SC held that - *“Considering the reversal transactions, quantity, price and time and sale, parties being persistent in number of such trade transactions with huge price variations, it will be too naive to hold that the transactions are through screen-based trading and hence anonymous. Such conclusion would be over-looking the prior meeting of minds involving synchronization of buy and sell order and not negotiated deals as per the board's circular. The impugned transactions are manipulative/deceptive device*



to create a desired loss and/or profit. Such synchronized trading is violative of transparent norms of trading in securities.....”

32. Further, the Hon’ble SAT in its judgement dated September 14, 2020 in the matter of **Global Earth Properties and Developers Pvt Ltd** relied upon the Hon’ble Supreme Court judgement in the matter of **SEBI v Rakhi Trading Private Limited (Civil Appeal Nos. 1969, 3174-3177 and 3180 of 2011 decided on February 8, 2018)**, and held that, *“It is not a mere coincidence that the Appellants could match the trades with the counter party with whom he had undertaken the first leg of respective trade. In our opinion, the trades were non-genuine trades and even though direct evidence is not available in the instant case but in the peculiar facts and circumstances of the present case there is an irresistible inference that can be drawn that there was meeting of minds between the Appellants and the counter parties, and collusion with a view to trade at a predetermined price.”*

33. Therefore, the trading behaviour of the Noticee confirms that such trades were not normal indicating that the trades executed by the Noticee were not genuine trades and being non-genuine, created an appearance of artificial trading volumes in respective contracts. In view of the above, the violation of Regulations 3(a), (b), (c), (d), 4(1) and 4(2)(a) of PFUTP Regulations, against the Noticee stands established.

Issue (b): Does the violation, if any, attract monetary penalty u/s 15HA of the SEBI Act, 1992?

34. Considering the findings that the Noticee has executed non-genuine trades resulting in the creation of artificial volume, thereby violating the provisions of Regulation 3(a), (b), (c) & (d) & Regulation 4(1) and 4(2)(a) of the PFUTP Regulations, it is a fit case for imposition of monetary penalty on Noticee u/s Section 15HA of SEBI Act which reads as under:

Penalty for fraudulent and unfair trade practices.

15HA. If any person indulges in fraudulent and unfair trade practices relating to securities, he shall be liable to a penalty which shall not be less than five lakh rupees but which may extend to twenty - five crore rupees or three times the amount of profits made out of such practices, whichever is higher.



Issue (c): If so, what would be the quantum of monetary penalty that can be imposed on the Noticee after taking into consideration the factors mentioned in Section 15J of the SEBI Act, 1992?

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

15J. *While adjudging quantum of penalty under [15-I or section 11 or section 11B, the Board or the adjudicating officer] shall have due regard to the following factors, namely:—*

- (a) the amount of disproportionate gain or unfair advantage, wherever quantifiable, made as a result of the default;*
- (b) the amount of loss caused to an investor or group of investors as a result of the default;*
- (c) the repetitive nature of the default.*

36. I note that the material available on record does not quantify any disproportionate gains or unfair advantage, if any, made by the Noticee and the losses, if any, suffered by the investors due to such violations on part of the said Noticee. However, the Noticee has entered into 4 non-genuine trades which demonstrates the violation of PFUTP Regulations.

ORDER

37. Having considered all the facts and circumstances of the case, the material available on record, the factors mentioned in section 15J of the SEBI Act, 1992 and in exercise of power conferred u/s 15-I of the SEBI Act, 1992 r/w Rule 5 of the SEBI Adjudication Rules, 1995, following penalty u/s 15HA of the SEBI Act, 1992 is imposed on the Noticee:

Name of the Noticee	Violated provisions	Penalty
Saachi Overseas PAN: ABQFS9871C	Regulations 3(a), (b), (c), (d), 4(1) and 4(2)(a) of PFUTP Regulations	Rs 5,00,000/- (Rupees Five Lakhs only)

In my view, the said penalty is commensurate with the violation by the Noticee.



38. The Noticee shall remit / pay the said amount of penalty within 45 days of receipt of this order either through online payment facility available on the website of SEBI, i.e. www.sebi.gov.in on the following path, by clicking on the payment link:

ENFORCEMENT > Orders > Orders of AO > PAYNOW

39. In the event of failure to pay the said amount of penalty within 45 days of the receipt of this Order, SEBI may initiate consequential actions including but not limited to recovery proceedings u/s 28A of the SEBI Act, 1992 for realization of the said amount of penalty along with interest thereon, *inter alia*, by attachment and sale of movable and immovable properties.

40. In terms of the provisions of Rule 6 of the SEBI Adjudication Rules, a copy of this order is being sent to the Noticee and also to SEBI.

Date: May 29, 2026

Place: Mumbai

**AMIT KAPOOR
ADJUDICATING OFFICER**