



SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION OF PAKISTAN  
SECURITIES MARKET DIVISION

Before the Executive Director (Securities Market Division)  
In the matter of Show Cause Notice issued to

KASB Securities Limited

Under Rule 8 of the Brokers & Agents Registration Rules, 2001 for Violation of Regulation  
3(b) of the Regulations Governing Futures Contracts of the Karachi Stock Exchange  
(Guarantee) Limited

---

Number and date of Notices	SMD-SOUTH/SCN/53/07 dated March 19, 2007
Date of hearing	April 3, 2007
Present	Mr. Iqbal Bawaney - Legal Counsel Mr. Farrukh Sabzwari - CEO Mr. Moeen Sheikh - CFO
Date of Order	April 05, 2007

---

**ORDER**

---

1. I have before me 64 cases involving broadly the same issues in relation to the 64 Show Cause Notices, issued by the Commission to 64 Brokerage Houses, for which I conducted hearings on various dates in relation to same. Since there is a commonality of issues involved, I have addressed the core issues raised by or on behalf of the 64 Brokerage Houses together, given the need to expedite the disposal of these matters. Accordingly, I have decided to issue a common order, which addresses all the core issues raised in the submissions made at these hearings and in the written responses filed by or on behalf of the 64 Brokerage House, even though, in certain instances, some of these core issues may not have been raised by each and every Brokerage House.
2. Accordingly, this order shall dispose of the proceedings initiated through Show Cause Notice SMD-SOUTH/SCN/53/07 dated March 19, 2007 issued to KASB Securities Limited

(the "Respondent") for violation of Regulation 3(b) of the Regulations Governing Futures Contracts (the "Regulations") of The Karachi Stock Exchange (Guarantee) Limited (the "Exchange") by the Securities and Exchange Commission of Pakistan (the "Commission").

3. Basic facts of the case are that the Respondent is a member of the Exchange and is registered with the Commission under the Brokers and Agents Registration Rules, 2001 (the "Brokers Rules"). Consequent to the submission of the Forensic Report regarding the Exchange events of March 2005 by Diligence USA, LLC, the Commission sought information from the Respondent to determine whether or not in February and March 2005, the Respondent had complied with Regulation 3(b) of the Regulations which requires that no member shall have a sale position in a particular scrip of more than Rs. 50 million, unless the actual shares sold over and above the aforesaid limit, are deposited with the Exchange or the broker gives documentary evidence that the shares are lying in Central Depository Company of Pakistan Limited ("CDC") or with some bank or Development Finance Institution ("DFI"), to the satisfaction of the Exchange management. For the purpose of establishing such sale position, net buy position in T+3, shall be net off from net sale position in Futures Counter.
4. An examination of the information provided by the Respondent revealed that 36 times, during the period from February 23, 2005 to March 25, 2005 the Respondent, had net sale positions in Futures Contracts, which were in excess of the prescribed limit of Rs. 50 million. In contravention of the requirement of Regulation 3(b) of the Regulations, the Respondent failed to either deposit with the Exchange the actual shares sold over the prescribed limit or submit to the Exchange the documentary evidence that such shares were lying in the CDC or a bank or DFI on the given dates.
5. Based on the findings, a Show Cause Notice No. SMD-SOUTH/SCN/53/07 dated March 19, 2007 was issued under Rule 8 of the Brokers Rules stating that the Respondent has prima facie contravened Rule 12 of the Brokers Rules read with Clause A5 of the code of conduct contained in the Third Schedule to the Brokers Rules. The Respondent was called upon to Show Cause in writing within seven days and appear before the Executive Director (SMD-South) on Thursday, March 29, 2007 at 10:00 a.m. for hearing, to be attended either

in person and/or through an authorized representative. Subsequently, on the request of the Respondent the date of the hearing was extended and rescheduled for Tuesday, April 3, 2007 at 4:00 p.m.

6. The hearing was held on Tuesday, April 3, 2007 at 4:00 p.m. which was attended by Mr. Iqbal Bawaney - Legal Counsel, Mr. Farrukh Sabzwari - CEO and Mr. Moeen Sheikh - CFO as the Representatives of the Respondent ("the Representatives"), who submitted a written reply and argued the case.
7. A summary of the contentions raised by the Respondent in the written submissions are as follows:
  - The Respondent reiterated that no violation of Regulation 3(b) of the Regulation has taken place. Regulation 3(b) unequivocally provides that if a member has sale position in a particular scrip of more than Rs. 50 million, then either he has to deposit the shares for the over sale position with the Exchange or submit documentary evidence to the satisfaction of the Exchange's management.
  - The Exchange had itself introduced and adopted a standard mechanism for all the brokers, whereby the Exchange itself based on its computerized records, determined the net exposure of the brokers under the said Regulations and subsequently advised the concerned broker to deposit the required number of shares in respect of such scrip or to submit documentary evidence within a stipulated period of time. Hence, by fixing a specific period of time and advising the brokers to do so within such specified period, the KSE absolved the brokers from any implication of violation of Rule 3(b).
  - No dissatisfaction was ever shown at stage by the Exchange. On the contrary, the Exchange itself been advising (not even calling upon) the Respondent to submit the evidence and the Respondent always abide by the Exchange's request and did the needful. Copies of such letters received from the Exchange have also been attached with the written reply.
  - The Regulations were made by the Exchange as internal Regulations under Section 34 of Securities and Exchange Ordinance 1969 (the "Ordinance"), for regulating the

Future Trades. The Regulations contain no penal provisions whatsoever, whereas the above referred customary practice was followed by the Exchange as well as the Brokers for last several years. Since these Regulations were made by the Exchange, the Exchange was supposed to implement and enforce the Regulations and to determine the effective systems and procedures for compliance. Therefore, whenever the Respondent received such letters, they complied with the same. Hence there was no violation whatsoever of the Regulations.

- Without prejudice to the above, the Exchange has adopted the above referred mechanism and the Respondent followed in good faith, therefore, if at all there has been any violation, then the Exchange alone would be responsible for the same. At no stage, the Exchange had ever indicated the Respondent that they will be penalized by following the Exchange's own instructions from time to time. Hence the Exchange is necessary party to the proceedings and the Respondent reserve a right to claim from the Exchange any penalties that may be wrongfully imposed on the Respondent by the Commission.
- The Respondent has asserted that they do not concur with the Commission's conclusion in para 6 of the aforesaid Show Cause Notice.
- The Respondent further contended that the paras 7 and 8 of the Show Cause Notice are based on misconception of facts since the Commission itself is not sure whether they had deposited the shares or had provided the evidence in respect of trades exceeding to Rs. 50 million per scrip, Hence the Show Cause Notice is not sustainable.
- As to paras 9 and 10 of the Show Cause Notice, since no violation of Regulation 3(b) has been taken place, the question of contravention of Clause A5 of the Third Schedule to the Brokers Rules does not arise. Hence, action under Rule 8 of the Brokers Rules is not warranted in law. The Respondent has candidly stated that they have abided by the code of conduct and in particular Clause A5 thereof, for reasons mentioned above.

- The Respondent further argued that if there was any contravention of any internal Rules and Regulations of the Exchange, there ought to have been a formal complaint lodged by the Exchange with the Commission. Since no complaint has been lodged by the Exchange with the Commission with regard to the alleged contravention, the Show Cause Notice is neither warranted, nor sustainable.
- The Respondent further asserted that they have always provided the evidence whenever the same has been demanded by the Exchange.

8. The following arguments were made by the Representatives during the course of hearing:

- The Representatives pointed out that there is no penal provision under the Regulations.
- The Representatives further argued that since non-reporting of the required information to the Exchange is a minor issue, therefore, penal action in this matter will not be justifiable. While challenging the basis of Show Cause Notice, the Representatives asserted that the Forensic report has not identified any reporting violation by the Brokers.
- The Representatives further argued that Regulation 3(b) of the Regulations is a “Secondary Legislation” and is primarily made for the purpose of internal control of the Exchange. The Exchange in its own capacity has discretionary powers of using and implementing its Regulations. Since it was a customary practice of the Exchange to ask for necessary information required under Regulation 3(b) of the Regulations, the brokers were never supposed to initiate the compliance requirements, as being interpreted by the Commission. In order to discuss the term “Regulation” the Representatives quoted the case of Haji Ghulam Zamin vs A.B. Khondkar, PLD 1965 Dacca 156, page no 187.
- Further, the Representatives discussed the letter provided by the Exchange as evidence of acceptance that the Exchange used to collect the required information from the brokers by issuing them letters and also providing them flexibility of time so that the required evidence could easily be collected from their respective clients.

- The Representative further argued that as per the spirit of the law, the system adopted by the Regulator is perceived as a rule and in this particular scenario, the Exchange being the front line regulator had a well established practice.
- The Representative placed emphasis on the word "advice" used in the Exchange's letter and it was argued that as stated earlier the Regulations were meant for the internal control of the Exchange, therefore, the Exchange used the word "advice" and not "call upon" showing the confidence it placed in its brokers. It was further added that if there would have been any violation of law by the brokers for not submitting the evidences even in the usual practice, the Exchange should have used the word "failed" which has not been used by them in their correspondence.
- It was asserted that Regulation 3(b) of the Regulations does not specify any time limit for the brokers to deposit the required evidence with the Exchange. In addition it is not practically possible for a broker to deposit such evidence in advance to the Exchange. It was concluded that since the Exchange was satisfied with its members, therefore, there is no violation of law has been committed by the Respondent` .
- It was further contended that it is the practice of law that if the Regulator identified any breach of law, a Show Cause Notice is issued to the alleged party for necessary explanation in writing. In case the written reply does not satisfy the Regulator then an opportunity of hearing is provided to the party. But in this case the Commission has already fixed the hearings with out considering or concluding on the written submissions of the Respondent which is again substantiating the argument that the Commission has already made up its mind for penalizing the brokers under the alleged violation. It was added that the practice of "natural justice" demands that the opportunity of the written explanation should be given to the alleged party before calling the hearing.
- The Representatives asserted that the Show Cause Notice issued to the Respondent is lacking its legal sanctity because the allegations written in these Show Cause Notice are mainly derived from the Forensic Report of Diligence, which itself is lacking in the authenticity in his view point. It was argued that the Diligence was not aware of the local practices of the market and there are many loopholes in their investigation so that

the Show Cause Notice can not be issued, based on the findings of the Forensic Report.

- The Representatives finally argued on the role of the Exchange's management. They stated that the management of the Exchange is a party in this case and they should be called upon to cross examine their intention for not asking the evidence during March 2005.

9. I have considered the contentions of the Respondent and the core issues raised therein and the same are addressed by me below:

- In relation to the Respondents' contention that there has not been a violation of Regulation 3(b) of the Regulations, it may be noted that Regulation 3(b) has two limbs. The first pertains to regulating the underlying mischief, i.e. to ensure that no member indulges in 'short selling' over and above the Rs. 50 million threshold by providing that no member shall have a sale position in a particular scrip of more than Rs. 50 million, unless (a) the actual shares sold over and above the aforesaid limit are deposited with the Exchange or (b) the broker gives documentary evidence that the shares are lying in CDC or with some bank or DFI to the satisfaction of the Exchange. The second pertains to complying with the reporting requirement / action to be taken by each broker, every time that a broker exceeds the Rs. 50 million threshold, i.e. by either depositing the shares or providing documentary evidence for same. Therefore, it will follow that the reporting requirement / action is an independent obligation under Regulation 3(b) and is meant to ensure that there is no 'short selling' by placing on the broker an obligation to deposit shares or provide documentary evidence for same. Failure by a broker to comply with the above would infer that the Broker has indulged in 'short selling'. Therefore, the fact that at the material time (i.e. when a member had taken a sale position in a particular scrip of more than Rs. 50 million), the Respondent did not deposit shares or provide documentary evidence, and only did so subsequently at the request of the Commission, resulted in non-fulfilment of Regulation 3(b).
- As to the Respondent's next contention that only the Exchange is empowered to take action under the Regulations, I do not find substance in same, more so since the Regulations have been notified by the Exchange under Section 34 of the Ordinance.

Under the Ordinance and indeed under the Securities and Exchange Commission of Pakistan Act, 1997, the Commission, inter alia, has wide powers to regulate all matters relating to capital markets, securities and ancillary issues. In any event, more specifically, under Rule 8(iii) of the Brokers Rules, the Commission can take action under Rule 8(a) or (b) of the Brokers rules if "...the Commission is of the opinion that a broker... has contravened the rules and regulations of the stock exchange". The Commission as the apex regulator of all corporate activities is not precluded from taking appropriate action where there is any violation or non-compliance of the laws, rules or regulations. Hence, even if the Exchange may not have acted against any non-compliance of Regulation 3(b) in letter and spirit or may have allowed a certain practice to develop in this context, would not absolve the Respondent from the consequences of any non-compliance of the said Regulation, or indeed preclude the Commission from taking remedial action. The Respondent has an independent obligation to comply with the legal requirement as it is settled law that there cannot be an estoppel against the law.

- In this context, I now refer to the Respondent's related contention that documentary evidence to the satisfaction of the Exchange had been provided from time to time. However, the said information was provided before and after March 2005, but it is noteworthy that during March 2005, no information was provided by the Respondent in terms of Regulation 3(b). Lastly, on a related point, it has been argued that there was no specific procedure set out in Regulation 3(b) nor any timeframe was given within which the evidence was to be forwarded to the Exchange. In my view, there was no requirement for any specific procedure to be provided, as the language of Regulation 3(b) is clear, as stated above, inasmuch as it presupposes that no member shall have a sale position in a particular scrip of more than Rs. 50 million unless the actual shares sold over and above the aforesaid limit are deposited with the Exchange or documentary evidence relating to same are furnished.
- The Respondent has next contended that imposing any form of a penalty would not be in the "public interest". I have perused the case law cited by the Respondent and in my view, in fact it supports the position of the Commission. The entire purpose of this enquiry leading to issuance of Show Cause Notices, not only to the Respondent, but



also to other Brokerage Houses was done, keeping the “public interest” in mind. Ensuring compliance of the Regulations and indeed compliance of all the corporate laws is the primary duty and function of the Commission, which is discharged in the public interest. The action in this instance is all the more necessary, particularly bearing in mind the recent history of the stock market crisis, which seriously compromised the interest of the public at large and particularly the small investors. Hence, these proceedings were initiated to enquire as to whether there had been any violation of Regulation 3(b) in March 2005 and were conducted in public interest.

- As regards the contention that no loss has been caused, nor there was any short selling beyond the threshold of Rs. 50 million, I have already held above that there are two elements of Regulation 3(b), i.e. the first being to ensure that there is no ‘short selling’ and the second being a reporting requirement / action. Hence the fact that there has been no loss or ‘short selling’ would not absolve the Respondent from its obligation at the material time to comply with the reporting requirement, envisaged under Regulation 3(b) by either depositing the concerned shares or providing documentary evidence to that effect as prescribed in the said Regulation 3(b). In this instance, in relation to the issue of short selling, my perusal of the evidence provided by the Respondent substantiated the existence of the required shareholding in compliance of Regulation 3(b), in which context, I am satisfied to the extent that there was no short selling beyond the prescribed limit in Regulation 3(b) at the material time.

10. In view of what has been discussed above, and my considering the arguments presented before me in writing, as well as at the time of hearing and my having perused the documents and information placed on record, I am of the view that the Respondent has not fulfilled the requirement of reporting / taking action as envisaged under the said Regulation 3(b). However, certain extenuating circumstances have emerged from the Respondent's practice of supplying the requisite evidence under Regulation 3(b) only when required by the Exchange, which may have persuaded the Respondent to believe that it had discharged its obligation under Regulation 3(b), which clearly it did not for reasons stated above. I am also mindful of the fact that no evidence of ‘short selling’, has been revealed from the examination of the records provided by the Respondent.

11. In this background, I am inclined, on this occasion, to take a lenient view in the matter and will not take any punitive action under Rule 8 of the Brokers Rules. As such, I believe a 'caution' in this instance to the Respondent would suffice and I would further direct the Respondent to ensure that full compliance is made of all the Regulations in future for avoiding any punitive action under the law.

**Zafar Abdullah**  
*Executive Director*