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Satyam case: Sebi fines head of investor relations for insider trading

Market Regulator Sebi on Tuesday levied a fine of Rs 32 lakh on the former head of investor relations of Satyam Computer Services (I) Ltd, for violating insider trading norms.

According to a probe carried out by the regulators, the former head of investor relations of Satyam, while in possession of unpublished, inside information (IPO) of the company, received a beneficial deal from a broker and transacted in the shares of the company.

He also induced other persons to trade in the shares of the company based on the information which was not yet made public.

“The information which was the subject matter of investigation was about the announcement of the merger of Tech Mahindra and Satyam Computer Services (India) Limited on December 15, 2008, after which the shareholders of Tech Mahindra had 5 days to sell or buy and the shareholders of Satyam had 3 days to sell or buy the shares,” Sebi said.

As a result, a total fine of Rs 32 lakh was imposed on him.

SIT rejects Axis Bank plea to recover 1 cr in Modex Int'l case

The Securities Appellate Tribunal (SAT) today ruled against Axis Bank in a plea seeking a refund of Rs 1 crore, which the lender had paid to a promoter of IXIM Technologies, a erstwhile company in the Modex International Group.

In its capacity as a pro-secutor, the bank had filed an application before the SAT, seeking refund of the amount paid to the promoter of IXIM, as the company was never able to perform the contract for the supply of software systems.

The tribunal, however, said the bank’s case “lacks merit” and dismissed the petition.

The court held that the bank should have worked out a strategy before advancing any payment.

The bank, however, had not ascertained whether IXIM was a defaulting company, before it advanced the said amount.

The bank had clarity from the promoter that IXIM was not a defaulting company.

The bank’s application was rejected on the grounds that it was filed after receiving 12 months intimation from the company that it was in default.

The bank had also not been able to recover any money from the promoter of IXIM Technologies.

In a recent ruling, the SAT had asked the bank to show cause why the promoter of IXIM should not be booked for cheating the bank.

The bank had also been asked to provide an undertaking that it will not entertain any claims on IXIM.

In this connection, the bank had also said that it had been unable to recover the amount from the promoter.

The bank had also contended that it was entitled to interest on the amount it had paid to the promoter.
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