Parichay: Maharaja Surajmal Institute Journal of Applied Research

The Cost of Oversight: Examining Regulatory Challenges in SEBI's Framework in the Sahara Case

Dr. Shailza Dutt*, Ms. Mehak Mohandru*

ABSTRACT

The Sahara India Pariwar case that dragged on for years in court between the Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI) and Sahara exposed critical gaps in the SEBI's regulatory oversight, and the framework it had to manage large, complex financial entities. The study, using a qualitative case study approach, looks at the regulatory challenges confronted by SEBI in the Sahara case, how much it costs SEBI to oversee companies, how jurisdictional conflicts impact on investor protection, and how the Sahara case has and will impact on the way SEBI carries out its day-to-day duties. This case bears witness to the need for tighter regulatory tools to compel compliance with securities laws, and to enhance investor protection measures as well as inter agency cooperation.

Keywords: SEBI, Regulatory Framework, Investor Protection, Sahara

1. INTRODUCTION

The Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI) is a central regulator of India's capital markets and monitors the Indian financial markets through a maze of regulatory regime. The main objective of SEBI Act of 1992 was to create SEBI and to safeguards investors interests by maintaining transparency in market operations and promotion of fair practices in the securities market. However, SEBI has been confronted with many difficulties in discharging its duty, especially in cases involving high profile circumvention or exploitation of regulatory structures.

The Sahara India Pariwar case is a notable example of how these difficulties were highlighted. It is concerned with the issue of Optionally Fully Convertible Debentures (OFCDs) for millions of investors who do not follow the required regulatory frameworks. This case, which led to a long-drawn legal battle between SEBI and Sahara, exposed critical gaps in SEBI's regulatory oversight, questioning the effectiveness of its framework in managing large, complex financial entities.

The Sahara case illustrates the natural trade off inherent in the regulation enforcement versus the risks of a regulatory lapse or oversight failure. On the same hand, SEBI's actions in this case affirmed its role as a market watcher and a shield for the interests of the investors who seek protection from fraudulent courses. On one hand, it took a long time to litigate, the jurisdictions were disputed, as well as significant cost of regulatory oversight in terms of resources and credibility from investors standing by.

This paper aims to examine the regulatory challenges SEBI faced during the Sahara case, with a focus on the cost of oversight, jurisdictional conflicts, and the implications for investor protection. It also explores gaps and deficiencies in India a regulatory framework as a way to provide insights learnt from this landmark case, and draw lessons from the case to propose possible reforms to improve regulatory efficacy in India's financial markets.

SEBI's Role in Regulating India's Securities Market

SEBI has enabled investor interest protection, fair market practice and the growth of a vibrant and transparent securities market. SEBI's mandate is wide ranging and includes regulation of multiple aspects of the market, such as protection of investors, regulation of market intermediaries and orderly growth of the market. Protective, regulatory and developmental are its core functions.

1. Protective Role

The main function of SEBI is to protect the interests of investors.

By forcing laws that keep people from taking advantage of other people by promoting trading which makes them illegal activities include insider trading, fraudulent market activities and manipulation of stock price. SEBI ensures that all participants in securities market obey legal norms and that retail investors do not face ethical offence. And it requires that companies disclose timely and adequate on things they can and must disclose.

2. Regulatory Role

The stock exchanges, the brokers (sub-brokers), the mutual funds, portfolio managers, etc in the securities market are regulated under SEBI. SEBI regulates the market and ensures compliance with rules and regulations of market operation by using its regulatory power. Guidelines for companies raising capital through public issues or Rights issues. Providing enforcement of listing and disclosure requirements for public companies. It also regulates mergers and take overs by

* *Assistant Professor & Student, Department of Business Adminisration, Maharaja Surajmal Institute*

regulating acquisition such as SEBI (Substantial Acquisition of Shares and Take overs) Regulations, 1997, etc. Through its regulatory powers, SEBI ensures compliance with rules and regulations governing market operations. SEBI's regulatory actions include:

- Issuance of guidelines for companies looking to raise capital through public issues or rights issues.
- Enforcing compliance with listing and disclosure requirements for public companies.
- Regulating mergers and takeovers, including overseeing acquisitions through the SEBI (Substantial Acquisition of Shares and Takeovers) Regulations, 1997.
- Surveillance and investigations into suspected market manipulation, fraud, or insider trading.

3. Developmental Role

SEBI has nothing else but developing of securities market. It attempts to preserve a stable fair and efficient market environment for all market participants. Best practices relating to corporate governance, and some cutting-edge innovations, are promoted by SEBI for modernization of the market using new technologies.

Regulatory Framework

SEBI's authority is derived from a robust legal and regulatory framework that includes the SEBI Act of 1992, the Securities Contracts (Regulation) Act of 1956, and the Companies Act of 2013. These statutes provide SEBI with the power to:

- Conduct inspections of market participants.
- Investigate and audit companies or intermediaries involved in securities market activities.
- Enforce penalties for violations of securities laws and fraud.

Key regulations under SEBI's domain include:

- It prohibits trading of security by persons who are privy to non-public information which is needed in belief, to affect price of any security from the perspective of others. (2015, SEBI [Prohibition of Insider Trading] Regulations).
- SEBI (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2015, which standardizes reporting requirements and ensures timely dissemination of information to shareholders.
- SEBI (Issue of Capital and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2018, governing public issue norms and ensuring fair practices in fundraising activities.

Investor Protection Mechanisms

One of SEBI's primary goals is to foster an environment where investors feel confident about the safety and security of their investments. Key investor protection initiatives include:

- Prohibition of unfair trade practices, such as circular trading and market manipulation.
- Mandatory disclosures by companies, ensuring that investors have access to accurate, timely, and adequate information about the financial health of the company.
- Compensation schemes, such as the Investor Protection Fund (IPF), which is designed to protect investors from potential defaults by brokers or market intermediaries.

SEBI also maintains a Grievance Redressal Mechanism to address complaints from investors. It has launched platforms like the SEBI Complaints Redress System (SCORES) to expedite the resolution of investor grievances related to the securities market.

Regulating Intermediaries and Financial Markets

Activities of entities like stock brokers, merchant bankers, portfolio managers, credit rating agencies and mutual fund are regulated by SEBI. This helps to maintain this high level of professionalism, financial integrity and accountability by these market players. According to SEBI, brokers and intermediaries are forced to be financially sound and capable of handling investor funds for which capital adequacy requirements are also placed by SEBI.

In addition, SEBI has a crucial part in controlling stock exchanges and watching market activities. The function of oversees the operation of large stock exchanges, Bombay Stock Exchange (BSE) and the National Stock Exchange (NSE) and the trading norms and maintain trading systems integrity.

Challenges in SEBI's Regulatory Role

While SEBI has made significant strides in regulating India's capital markets, it continues to face challenges. Some of the key challenges include:

- Ensuring compliance in a rapidly evolving financial landscape where new financial products and technologies constantly emerge.
- Dealing with non-compliance by large market entities, especially those that attempt to circumvent regulatory norms by exploiting legal loopholes.
- Global integration: As Indian companies become increasingly connected with global markets, SEBI must adapt its regulations to align with international standards while addressing domestic market conditions.
- Technological advancements: The rapid pace of financial innovation, such as algorithmic trading, blockchain, and fintech, has made it necessary for SEBI to update its regulatory mechanisms to keep pace with emerging risks and opportunities.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

1. **Srivastava (2021)** discusses the role of SEBI which plays a critical role in ensuring transparency, market integrity,

and investor protection in India's financial market. SEBI has managed to ensure the prevention of fraudulent practices such as insider trading but struggles with its implementation of penalties in such high-profile cases like the Sahara. The study says that the authorities need stronger regulatory tools to reach a level of securities law compliance.

2. **Sharma (2016)** examines what financial scandals of the Sahara and Satyam cases revealed about holes in India's regulatory framework. Scams, as the study points out, have forced SEBI to revisit its frameworks, which thereby have become framed in more stricter enforcement mechanisms. Despite that, repeated frauds indicate gaps that continue in enforcement and corporate governance.

3. **Kanteti (2015)** discusses corporate social responsibility failure Sahara case left Sahara's fraudulent actions and resulted in devastation of millions of investors. Despite enforcement delay, the study highlights SEBI's role in identifying these violations and working towards investor redress.

4. **Yadav & Verma (2024)** The focus of the study though is on SEBI's role in the protection of investor interests as well as in ensuring compliance with norms pertaining to public issues. In light of the Sahara case, the study contends for SEBI reforms to protect the jurisdiction of the agency over unlisted companies.

5. **Choudhury (2022)** This evaluates the impact of long pending regulatory disputes such as Sahara on public confidence in SEBI as a regulator. The Sahara case shows that delays in enforcement, as a study finds, diminish the credibility of SEBI and negatively affect its ability to protect investors effectively. The research concludes that while SEBI needs to improve its enforcement capabilities, investor trust can be restored.

6. **Kumar & Sharma (2020)** It examines SEBI's efforts to protect the interests of retail investors through, among other things, the Investor Protection Fund (IPF) and required disclosure. While the study finds that SEBI has come a long way in investor education and awareness, there are still gaps when it comes to protecting the small investor from corporate fraud and market manipulation.

7. **Gupta & Mishra (2019)** A study of the regulatory framework controlling corporate governance in India, specifically focusing on how SEBI has been playing its role in enhancing transparency and the accountability of the corporate body. The study, however, argues that SEBI's Prohibition of Insider Trading Regulations and its Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements (LODR) are not as effective as they need to be.

8. **Patel & Joshi (2021)** It focuses on how SEBI has navigated complex financial products such as (OFCDs). The study brings to light precisely where the regulatory oversight lapsed, allowing Sahara to first move outside of SEBI's cognizance and underscores the need for clearer guidelines for regulatory oversight of hybrid instruments.

9. **Narasimhan (2022)** It talks about the jurisdictional disputes between SEBI and other regulator such as Ministry of Corporate Affairs (MCA) in the Sahara case. The study also points to how tensions between jurisdictions can slow regulatory actions and damage market participants' confidence.

10. **Raju & Deepthi (2004)** examines the role of SEBI as a regulator with respect to corporate takeovers and mergers under SAST Regulations. In particular, the study points to the need to examine selectors steps to protect investors in hostile takeovers.

11. **Verma & Iyer (2020)** highlights SEBI's troubles in enforcing penalties, especially against bigger corporate defaulters like Sahara. The study contends that SEBI can levy fines but would struggle to recover these due to the long-drawn-out litigation and non-cooperation by the defaulters.

12. **Mehta & Kapoor (2021)** An analysis of SEBI and of international financial regulators, as well as an examination of the manner in which they create investor protection and compliance is conducted. The study also concludes that SEBI has the scope to utilise some of the best practices internationally in a bid to streamline its operational framework, which could include technological integration as well as inter agency coordination.

3. OBJECTIVES

1. To examine the regulatory challenges faced by SEBI during the Sahara case.

2. To analyse the gaps in SEBI's regulatory framework exposed by the Sahara case.

3. To assess SEBI's role in protecting investor interests and promoting transparency within India's securities market.

4. To evaluate the broader implications of the Sahara case for the future of financial regulation and investor protection in India.

4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

1. Research Design: Qualitative Case Study Approach

The study employs a qualitative case study approach to examine the regulatory challenges faced by SEBI in the Sahara case. This approach is particularly suitable for exploring complex financial and regulatory issues in detail. The case study method allows for an in-depth analysis of a real-life example, providing rich insights into

the regulatory gaps and enforcement issues within India's financial market.

2. ***Data Collection: Secondary Data***

This research relies on secondary data, including legal judgments, SEBI orders, court proceedings, and scholarly articles on regulatory frameworks. These sources are reviewed to evaluate SEBI's regulatory actions and the broader challenges in enforcing market rules. Secondary data is particularly useful for understanding historical contexts and drawing insights from documented evidence.

3. ***Sampling Technique: Convenience Sampling***

This study uses convenience sampling for selecting secondary data sources, including publicly available documents, legal records, and academic publications. Convenience sampling is employed due to the accessibility of these materials, ensuring a more efficient data collection process. Although this method allows for quicker access to information, it may introduce bias, as the data sources are not selected systematically.

5. LIMITATIONS

1. **Limited Access to Complete Legal Proceedings**: The Sahara case has ongoing legal complexities, and not all court documents, regulatory reports, and internal SEBI communications are available for public review. This limits the study's ability to offer a comprehensive analysis of SEBI's decision-making processes during enforcement.

2. **Focus on a Single Case**: The study focuses solely on the Sahara case, which may limit the generalizability of findings to other instances of regulatory oversight in India's financial markets. Broader studies involving multiple cases would provide a more holistic view of SEBI's effectiveness.

3. **Data Gaps and Anomalies in Investor Information**: One of the key challenges in the Sahara case was SEBI's difficulty in accessing accurate investor data from the Sahara, which affected the refund process. The study relies on secondary data that may also reflect these inaccuracies, potentially limiting the scope of conclusions regarding investor protection mechanisms.

4. **Timeframe of Legal Resolution**: The protracted nature of the Sahara case, which spanned over a decade, may distort the analysis of SEBI's enforcement capabilities in real-time. This delay impacts the study's ability to measure the immediate effectiveness of SEBI's actions during critical moments of the case.

5. **Lack of Comparative Analysis with International Regulators**: The study primarily focuses on SEBI's role in India's regulatory framework without comparing its methods to international financial regulators. A comparative study could highlight alternative strategies or best practices from global markets that SEBI could adopt to improve its enforcement mechanisms.

6. CASE STUDY: SAHARA INDIA PARIWAR

Background of the Case

The Sahara India Pariwar case, which is one of the most significant legal battles in Indian capital markets history paving the way for the regulatory difficulties which the Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI) has to face figuring out complex financial transactions. Sahara's issuance of Optionally Fully Convertible Debentures (OFCDs) to millions of investors between 2008 and 2011 was at the centre of the case. These instruments raised over ₹24,000 crores that Sahara did not comply with SEBI's regulatory framework for public issue norms.

An alleged fraud related to Sahara's fundraising practices was reported to SEBI in 2010, after which the case was launched. An investigation, later fuelled by an escalation into a costly prolonged legal struggle, culminated in the high court judgment of 2012 that is a landmark. What this case exposed though was crucial gaps in SEBI's regulatory framework around unlisted companies and private placements, which Sahara sought to exploit.

The Regulatory Challenges

The Sahara case illustrates several core challenges SEBI faces in its role as a regulator, particularly when dealing with large entities that attempt to navigate through regulatory loopholes. The key regulatory issues that emerged in the Sahara case are outlined below.

1. Jurisdictional Conflicts

One of the primary challenges in the Sahara case was the jurisdictional dispute between SEBI and the Sahara Group. Sahara contended that SEBI had no jurisdiction over their OFCDs as the securities were issued privately and the company was unlisted. The group argued that their fundraising activities were governed by the Ministry of Corporate Affairs (MCA), rather than SEBI, under the Companies Act.

But SEBI was of the view that the sheer scale of the fundraising —impacting more than three crore investors — made Sahara's OFCDs, essentially, a public issue and for that reason too, SEBI had to take control. In its 2012 ruling, in which it upheld SEBI's jurisdiction, the Supreme Court held that SEBI could regulate securities—whether a company was listed or unlisted—as long as protecting the interests of the public was at issue.

2. Non-Compliance with Securities Laws

People like Sahara put on the spotlight serious issues on compliance with securities laws. Public issue norms specified

under the SEBI Act and the Companies Act have to be followed even in private placement of securities, under SEBI Act, SEBI demands. Sahara solved this by wronging OFCDs in the form of private placements, which were sold to only a small number of investors. In fact, the fact that it had more than three crores' investors indicated it was a public issue which required SEBI's regulatory intervention.

The legal battle was over this non-compliance: SEBI contended that this was because two parts of the law that apply to Sahara – Section 67 of the Companies Act, which concerns any offer to more than 50 people as a public offer, and hence under SEBI's remit – were violated.

3. Investor Protection Concerns

The Sahara case raised serious concerns about investor protection. SEBI found that Sahara violated the rules and had irregularities in the data of its investors, some with identical names, incomplete address, unverifiable identities. Complicating SEBI'S efforts to protect investors and refund their money was the fact that Sahara did not faithfully provide such data.

In its 2012 order to Sahara, Supreme Court directed the company to refund the entire ₹24,000 crore to the investors and alerted SEBI as the recovery and repay agent. It was this decision that ultimately protected investors, however, tracing and compensating the investors from the Sahara group was a long and difficult process, with Sahara repeatedly dragged its heels before complying with court orders.

4. Challenges in Enforcement

While SEBI succeeded in securing a favourable ruling, the enforcement of this judgment presented significant challenges. Again, in the face of repeated directives of the Supreme Court, Sahara did not deposit the funds needed to refund the investors. The case continued for years and Sahara's chairman, Subrata Roy, was jailed in 2014 for contempt of court for refusing to pay the order. Until recent updates, SEBI hadn't been able to enforce compliance from large conglomerates including Sahara in the manner of the court's directives to return the investors' money.

Supreme Court Rulings

It was a landmark moment in India's regulatory history, when the country's apex Court in the 2012 decision in SEBI vs. Sahara gave landmark status to the law. The court upheld the jurisdiction of the SEBI on the case and asked Sahara to refund the ₹24,000 crores amount illegally raised, at an interest rate of 15%. The ruling also required Sahara to pay stiff penalties in its assets and bank accounts, to recover money for its investors.

Key outcomes of the Supreme Court's decision include:

- Reinforcement of SEBI's Authority: The ruling allowed SEBI to bring in its jurisdiction even in case of unlisted companies if the public interest was involved which widened SEBI's powers of regulation.
- Investor Protection: The case also provided a blueprint for SEBI's future enforcement proceedings aimed at protecting investors from fraudulent fundraising schemes and another standard in the domain.
- Judicial Support for Regulatory Oversight: Of the involvement of the Supreme Court in SEBI decisions, the effect was that the joint impression communicated the support of the judiciary to regulatory oversight and corporate accountability.

7. ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

The case of the Sahara has become a critical lens through which to review the effectiveness of SEBI's regulatory framework. Key aspects of SEBI's oversight, enforcement challenges and implications for India's financial regulatory environment are analysed in light of the following analysis.

1. Jurisdictional Conflicts

One of the core issues in this case was the jurisdictional conflict between SEBI and the Sahara Group. Sahara argued that SEBI had no authority over its operations as the OFCDs issued were private placements. This contention led to legal disputes, with Sahara asserting that the Securities Act did not apply to unlisted companies.

Interpretation**:** This case highlights a significant gap in SEBI's jurisdiction over hybrid financial instruments like OFCDs. The final ruling, which affirmed SEBI's jurisdiction, is a reminder that regulatory bodies need clearer guidelines regarding their oversight powers over unlisted and private placements. This ruling has implications for future cases, setting a precedent that companies cannot circumvent SEBI by exploiting ambiguities in financial instruments.

2. Compliance and SEBI's Enforcement Challenges

The court's ruling was in SEBI's favour, but it is hard to enforce the repayment orders. Sahara was unable to deposit funds in SEBI and thus the process of identifying and refunding investors was also delayed because of faulty or insufficient data from Sahara. This non-compliance is evidence that SEBI tends to find it difficult to enforce penalties on large corporations.

Interpretation**:** While legally sound, enforcement mechanisms of SEBI are often less effective in practice in answering the problem of large-scale non-compliance. The Sahara case shows how important it is to have a good verifying the data and stiffer controls on corporate disclosures in the future to avoid such delays. Moreover, it emphasises that inter agency collaboration among SEBI, judiciary and the RBI as other similar regulatory bodies for better oversight is essential.

3. Investor Protection Failures

A central theme in this case is the protection of investors, particularly the millions of small investors who were misled by Sahara's OFCD scheme. SEBI's role as a protector of investor interests was upheld by the court, but the ongoing difficulties in repaying investors have shown that regulatory victory in court does not always translate to effective investor protection.

Interpretation: SEBI’s efforts to protect investors in the Sahara case were notable but not fully successful. The case emphasizes the need for enhanced investor protection mechanisms, such as robust tracking systems to ensure accurate and timely refunds. SEBI’s difficulties in enforcing compliance in this case expose vulnerabilities in the Indian financial regulatory system that could be exploited in future cases unless reforms are implemented.

4. Impact on SEBI's Credibility

The delays and challenges SEBI faced in ensuring Sahara’s compliance and safeguarding investor interests have affected its credibility. While the Supreme Court recognized SEBI's jurisdiction and upheld its role, the slow pace of enforcement has caused reputational harm. The case brought into question SEBI’s ability to handle large corporate defaulters effectively, reducing its deterrent power.

***Interpretation*:** The credibility of SEBI as a regulatory body has been tested by its difficulties in recovering investor funds in the Sahara case. While the legal framework allowed SEBI to act, the delays in enforcing the court’s decision suggest that SEBI needs stronger tools and faster mechanisms to protect its credibility and deter future corporate violations.

5. Broader Implications for Regulatory Frameworks

The Sahara case only embodies wider flaws in India's financial regulatory architecture. Reform is clearly needed to create streamlined oversight of private placements and unlisted companies. The jurisdictional dispute between SEBI and Sahara plus the very protracted litigation thus reflects the current inadequacies in India’s regulatory environment to neatly fit hybrid financial instruments.

Interpretation: There is an important lesson to be learned from this case concerning the need for a more integrated regulatory regime to address overlaps within different regulator’s competencies. The case has fuelled discussions on consolidating regulatory bodies to prevent jurisdictional disputes like those seen here. It also calls for moving toward more comprehensive financial reporting standards to avoid this kind of thing in the future.

8. CONCLUSION

The Sahara case in the Indian finance market revealed fundamental shortfalls in the regulatory structure of the Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI), while the last set of laws and bylaws left much to be desired. It identified weaknesses regarding the authorities and enforcement capacity. Considering the power that SEBI enjoyed to assert jurisdiction over unlisted companies such as Sahara, the intricacies and obstacles through which it had to navigate while securing compliance to the regulatory norms as well was safeguarding the interests of investors held up the very shortcoming of the Indian financial regulatory scene. The lesson of this case is imperative—that comprehensive reforms are necessary to strengthen and better enforce the regulation of all aspects of the regulatory framework. It includes, but is not limited to, enhancing data verification facilities to guarantee honesty and reliability, improved protection of the interests of investors, and strengthened mechanisms for interaction and collaboration between government entities that are managing the financial sector. Additionally, in the dynamic and fast changing capital market, SEBI must remain dynamic and dynamic regarding the forthcoming financial innovations. Therefore, new and sophisticated financial instruments and practices call for augmentation of enforcement instruments and mechanisms. Adopting these reforms and becoming more malleable will help better fulfil SEBI’s own mandate to protect and safeguard investors and maintain market integrity.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

[1] Srivastava, P. K. (2021). SEBI's regulatory role in strengthening capital markets in India. Webology, 18(6), 9466-9487.

[2] Sharma, P. (2016). Impact of securities and financial scams on the regulatory framework. International Journal of Business Management, 1(1), 77-91.

[3] Raju, M. T., & Deepthi, L. S. (2004). Market for corporate control and takeover regulations: Trends and analysis. SEBI Working Paper No. 10.

[4] Reddy, G. (n.d.). Case analysis on SEBI vs Sahara: DSA assignment. Supremo Amicus, 23, 2456-9704.

[5] Srivastava, J. (2016). Case: SEBI vs Sahara – What went wrong? SAMVAD: SIBM Pune Research Journal, 10, 42-47.

[6] Kanteti, V. L. (2015). Corporate social irresponsibility towards investors: A case analysis of Sahara Group. Paripex - Indian Journal of Research, 4(5), 198-199.

[7] Kumar, R., & Sharma, A. (2020). SEBI's role in strengthening investor protection in India. Journal of Financial Markets and Policy, 12(3), 145-163.

[8] Gupta, P., & Mishra, S. (2019). Corporate governance and regulatory oversight in India: SEBI's role and challenges. Indian Journal of Corporate Law, 8(2), 91-110.

[9] Patel, M., & Joshi, K. (2021). Regulating hybrid financial instruments: SEBI’s challenges and the Sahara case. Journal of Financial Regulation and Compliance, 14(4), 312-329.

[10] Narasimhan, C. R. L. (2022). Jurisdictional conflicts and regulatory challenges: The case of SEBI vs Sahara. The Hindu, Opinion Column. Retrieved from https://www.thehindu.com/opinion.

[11] Choudhury, S. (2022). Evaluating investor protection mechanisms in India's financial markets. Indian Journal of Corporate Governance, 13(2), 151-163.

[12] Verma, T., & Iyer, R. (2020). Challenges in recovering penalties from corporate defaulters: SEBI's enforcement difficulties. Journal of Financial Crime, 27(1), 67-81.

[13] Mehta, P., & Kapoor, S. (2021). Comparative analysis of SEBI and international financial regulators: Lessons for India. International Review of Financial Studies, 9(1), 45-63.