

Before Ali Azeem Ikram, Executive Director/HOD (Adjudication-I)

In the matter of Show Cause Notice issued to CAMCO Pvt. Limited

Dates of Hearing

January 04, 2021

Order-Redacted Version

Order dated January 07, 2021 was passed by Executive Director/Head of Department (Adjudication-I) in the matter of CAMCO Pvt. Limited. Relevant details are given as hereunder:

Nature		Details		
1.	Date of Action	Show cause notice dated November 18, 2020		
2.	Name of Company	CAMCO Pvt. Limited		
3.	Name of Individual*	The proceedings were initiated against the Company i.e. CAMCO Pvt. Limited		
4.	Nature of Offence	In view of alleged violations of Regulation 6(4), Regulation 6(8), Regulation 4(a), Regulation 18(a) and Clause (iii) of SRO 245(I)/2019 of AML Regulations		
5.	Action Taken	Key findings were reported in the following manner:		
		I have examined the submissions made in writing and during the		
		hearing as well as issues highlighted in the SCN and requirements		
		of the AML Regulations. The main contention of the Respondent is		
		that since it has not launched its business commercially therefore		
		the policy, procedure and processes are not in place. The plea taken		
		does not hold merit. Respondent is a bonafide TREC holder and is		
		not barred by any legal or regulatory framework does on clients		
		other than the directors and their immediate families. Hence, it is		
		imperative that all it ensure compliance with mandatory		
		regulatory provisions. The alleged violations in the SCN and		
		discussed in the foregoing paragraphs in light of the submissions		
		made:		
		i. With regard to the observation regarding NADRA Verisys		
		of its clients, the Respondent submitted that they have not		
		launched the business commercially yet therefore, there		

SECP

Securities and Exchange Commission of Pakistan Adjudication Division Adjudication Department-I

	were deficiencies in its systems/ procedures with respect to
	compliance of AML Regulations. The Respondent being a
	regulated person and having license issued by the
	Commission to act as a securities broker is required to
	validate the identity documents of its clients which was not
	provided. The Respondent was therefore, found in
	contravention of Regulation 6(4) read with Annexure I(note
	i) of the AML Regulations.
;;	ii. With regard to the risk categorization of its clients, the
11.	6
	Respondent during the hearing and its submissions
	provided that since it has not launched its business
	commercially therefore, risk categorization was not
	performed as per requirements of the AML Regulations.
	The Respondent being a regulated person and having
	license issued by the Commission to act as a securities
	broker is required to carry out risk assessment of its clients
	as required under Regulation 6(8) of the AML Regulations.
iii.	With regard to deficiencies in its AML Policy, the
	Respondent submitted that its AML/CFT policy was
	approved by the Board in November, 2018 which was also
	submitted to the inspection team. The inspection team has
	highlighted various deficiencies in this policy where
	screening related procedures were not defined relating to
	clients and their associates such as their joint account
	holders, nominee, trustee, authorized person and directors.
	Further, the Respondent's policy was also not updated as
	per NRA, 2019 such as porous borders and Transactional
	TF risks. Therefore, the policy was found deficient in
	contravention of Regulation 4(a) of the AML Regulations.
iv	With regard to compliance of SROs, the Respondent
1	submitted that they were not informed regarding
	compliance of SROs until the SCN dated November 21,
	2019. Even after the conclusion of adjudication proceedings
	vide order dated December 26, 2019, the SRO Responses
	1
	were still delayed. In view of the submissions, the Respondent was found negligent in providing timely
	Respondent was found negligent in providing timely
	response to the SROs. Further, the Respondent was also
	found in contravention of Regulation 15(3) of the AML
	Regulations in absence of record for screening process. The
	Respondent has subsequently rectified their processes and



Securities and Exchange Commission of Pakistan Adjudication Division Adjudication Department-I

	assured that they arc now maintaining record of all
	screening processes.
v.	With regard to mechanism and procedures to perform
	screening of its customers and their associates, the
	Respondent submitted that since it has not launched its
	business commercially therefore, risk categorization was
	not performed as per requirements of the AML
	Regulations. The Respondent being a regulated person and
	having license issued by the Commission to act as a
	securities broker is required to perform screening of all its
	clients and their associates. The contention of the
	Respondent is not tenable hence, it was found non-
	compliant with Regulation 4(a) and 13(7) of the AML
	Regulations. Further, in absence of such record keeping, the
	Respondent has also contravened provisions of Regulation
	15(3) of the AML Regulations.
vi.	With regard to the appointment and job description of its
	compliance officer, the Respondent submitted that since it
	has not launched its business commercially, therefore, no
	designated compliance officer has been appointed yet. In
	this regard, it was observed that the Respondent's CEO is
	also acting as a compliance officer. The contention of the
	Respondent in this regard is not tenable since it is a
	regulated person having license by the Commission and is
	required to comply with requirements of the AML
	Regulations. The Respondent during the hearing provided
	that once it has launched commercial business, it will then
	appoint its compliance officer and update the job
	description as per the requirements of the AML
	Regulations.
In vie	ew of the foregoing and admission made by the
Repres	entative, contraventions of the provisions of AML
Regula	tions have been established against the Respondent and its
Compl	iance Officer. Therefore, in terms of powers conferred under
sectior	40A of the Act, a penalty of Rs. 150,000/- (Rupees One
	ed and Fifty Thousand Only) is hereby imposed on the
	ndent. The Respondent is directed to deposit the aforesaid
-	y in the account of the Commission being maintained in the
	ated branches of MCB Bank Limited within 30 days of date
U	der and furnish the original deposit challan to this Office.
Compl section Hundr Respon penalt design	iance Officer. Therefore, in terms of powers conferred under 40A of the Act, a penalty of Rs. 150,000/- (Rupees One ed and Fifty Thousand Only) is hereby imposed on the ndent. The Respondent is directed to deposit the aforesaid y in the account of the Commission being maintained in the ated branches of MCB Bank Limited within 30 days of date



		Penalty order dated January 06, 2021 was passed by Executive
		Director (Adjudication-I)
6.	Penalty Imposed	A Penalty of Rs.150,000/- (Rupees One Hundred and Fifty
		Thousand Only) was imposed on respondents to ensure
		compliance of law in future.
7.	Current Status of	Appeal has been filed by the respondents
	Order	

Redacted version issued for placement on website of the Commission.