



SECURITIES & EXCHANGE COMMISSION OF PAKISTAN  
(Securities Market Division)

\*\*\*

Before the Director (Securities Market Division)

In the matter of Show Cause Notice issued to

**Maan Securities (Pvt.) Limited**

**Under Rule 8 read with Rule 12 of the Brokers and Agents Registration Rules, 2001**

---

Number and Date of Notice	No. MSW/SMD/LSE/1(5)2006/58-A dated September 12, 2007
Date of Hearing	October 09, 2007
Present at the Hearing:	Mirza Mahmood Ahmed, Legal Counsel
Date of Order	January 28, 2008

---

**ORDER**

---

1. This order shall dispose of the proceedings initiated through Show Cause Notice bearing No. MSW/SMD/LSE/1(5)2006/58-A dated September 12, 2007 (**the SCN**) issued to Maan Securities (Pvt.) Limited (**the Respondent**), member of the Lahore Stock Exchange (Guarantee) Limited (**LSE**) by the Securities and Exchange Commission of Pakistan (**the Commission**) under Rule 8 of the Brokers and Agents Registration Rules, 2001 (**the Brokers Rules**) for violation of Rule 12 of the Brokers Rules and Clause A5 of the Code of Conduct contained in the Third Schedule of the Brokers Rules.
2. The brief facts of the case are that the Respondent is a member of LSE and is registered with the Commission under the Brokers Rules. An enquiry was initiated by the Commission in exercise of its powers under Section 21 of the Securities and Exchange Ordinance, 1969 (**the Ordinance**) and KPMG Taseer Hadi & Co. (**the Enquiry Officer**) was appointed as the Enquiry Officer under the above mentioned Section for the following:
  - (a) to enquire into the dealings, business or any transaction by the Respondent during the period from April 01, 2006 to June 15, 2006 (**the Review Period**).
  - (b) to identify any and all the acts or omissions constituting a violation of the Ordinance and the Rules made thereunder.
  - (c) to identify violations of any other applicable laws, including but not limited to the Brokers Rules, Regulations for Short Selling under Ready Market, 2002 (**Short Selling Regulations**).



SECURITIES & EXCHANGE COMMISSION OF PAKISTAN  
(Securities Market Division)

\*\*\*

General Rules and Regulations of LSE, Securities and Exchange Rules 1971 ("the 1971 Rules") and directives issued by the Commission from time to time.

3. The findings of the Enquiry Officer revealed several instances of potential non compliances with applicable laws and regulations. A copy of the Enquiry Officer's report was sent to the Respondent on May 14, 2007 which required the Respondent to provide explanations on the observations of the Enquiry Officer together with supporting documents.
4. After perusal of the Respondent's replies to the above mentioned letter, which did not adequately explain the position in respect of some instances, the SCN was issued to the Respondent 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 which are reproduced as under:

**Rule 12-** "A broker holding a certificate of registration under these rules shall abide by the Code of Conduct specified in the Third Schedule".

**Clause A5 of the Code of Conduct-** "A broker shall abide by all the provisions of the Securities and Exchange Commission of Pakistan Act, 1997 ("the Act") and the rules, regulations issued by the Commission and the stock exchange from time to time as may be applicable to him".

5. On September 12, 2007, the Respondent was called upon to show cause in writing within seven days and appear before the undersigned on September 25, 2007 for a hearing, to be attended either in person and/or through an authorized representative, however, on the Respondent's request hearing was refixed for October 09, 2007.
6. The hearing was attended by Mirza Mahmood Ahmed, legal counsel of the Respondent, who argued the case. The Legal Counsel also submitted written replies on the behalf of the Respondent.
7. A summary of the contentions and objections that were raised by the Respondent in its written submissions and during the hearing and findings and conclusions of the Commission on the same are as follows:

8. **Preliminary Objections**

8.1 The objections raised by the Respondent, pertaining to the Enquiry, are given as under:-

- The Enquiry Officer did not conduct the Enquiry in a proper manner and halfway through the enquiry the Enquiry Officer left without providing an opportunity to the Respondent to furnish documentary evidence which could have cleared the objections raised in the Enquiry Report.
- There is a procedural requirement that in order to initiate an Enquiry the Commission must have a reason, like a complaint etc. However, in this case the Commission did not have any reason to conduct an Enquiry.





SECURITIES & EXCHANGE COMMISSION OF PAKISTAN  
(Securities Market Division)

\*\*\*

- These Enquiries were a "fishing and roving exercise" and as per prior court decisions no Regulatory Authority is authorized to conduct frivolous enquiries. In support of its argument the legal counsel provided copies of a number of such court orders. These are:
  - a) Order dated March 08, 1992 in the matter of Civil appeal Nos. 38-K to 40-K Assistant Director Intelligence and Investigation, Karachi v/s B.R. Herman and Others,
  - b) Order dated October 10, 2003 in the matter of Constitution Petition No. 1353 of 1998 and Constitution Petition No. 177 of 2002 – Karachi Administrative Employee cooperative Housing Society Ltd v/s Government of Sindh; and
  - c) Order dated September 20, 2004 in the matter of Customs Appeal No. K-779/04 – Muhammad Ateeq Paracha & Others v/s The State.
- The Commission has converted the Enquiry into an Audit.

8.2 I have considered the contentions and the preliminary objections raised by the Respondent and the issues raised therein and the same are addressed below:

- The Respondent's assertion that it was not provided an opportunity to furnish documentary evidence to clear different violations reported in the Enquiry Report is not correct. It may be noted that the Enquiry Officer forwarded draft Enquiry Report to the Respondent for a review and provision of any documents to clear violations reported therein. Further, before issuance of the SCN by the Commission, the Enquiry Report was forwarded to the Respondent in order to provide it with another opportunity to clear any violation reported in it. Based on the replies and documents provided by the Respondent a number of issues reported in the Enquiry Report were dropped and only those violations were taken up in the SCN where the Respondent could not provide sufficient evidences. Therefore, sufficient opportunity was provided to the Respondent to clear any violation reported in the Enquiry Report.
- The assertion of the Respondent that the Enquiry was conducted without any reason/compliant is not true. It may be noted that the Review Period was a period of high volatility for Stock Market and in order to identify the reasons for such volatility the Commission conducted an initial Enquiry into the affairs of various members of LSE, including the Respondent. The findings of initial enquiry identified number of areas which needed further in-depth review for identification of possible violations of securities market rules, regulations. Therefore, it was deemed necessary to conduct enquiries in order to determine if there was any violation of applicable rules and regulations by the members. Further, it may be noted that Section 21 of the Ordinance allows the Commission to initiate an Enquiry on its own motion, when ever it deems necessary.
- The Respondent's contention that the Enquiry was a "fishing and roving exercise" is unfounded. As stated above the Enquiry was commenced based on the findings of the initial



SECURITIES & EXCHANGE COMMISSION OF PAKISTAN  
(Securities Market Division)

\*\*\*

enquiry conducted by the Commission that identified different areas which required further review/enquiry. The members were selected on the basis of trading volume in certain scrips during the review period. Further, the Enquiry Officer was given specific tasks that limited its scope to enquiry into and identifying any violation of the applicable rules, regulations. All the areas covered by the Enquiry Officer were critical and part of the scope of Enquiry assigned to it. It is further stated that the Commission is primarily responsible for regulating the capital markets and protection of investors under the Act and the Ordinance. Further, the Commission is not expected to take a reactionary approach and wait for complaints to be brought before it after the damage has already been caused. It is for this reason that the Commission has suo motu powers as stated above, to initiate an enquiry into the affairs and dealings in an Exchange or its members.

- The Respondent's assertion that the Commission has converted the Enquiry into an Audit is not correct. It may be noted that the scope of the Enquiry was limited and covered only specific areas and did not cover the audit of the entire financials of the members. The Enquiry principally covered compliance of the Securities Market Laws.

9. **Blank Sales ("Issue No. 1")**

9.1 In terms of Regulation 4 of the Short Selling Regulations, Blank Sales are not permissible and in terms of Regulation 5 of the Short Selling Regulations, it is provided that:

"No Member shall make a Short Sale unless:

- a) Prior contractual borrowing arrangement has been made
- b) The sale is made at an uptick, and
- c) The trade is identified as a Short Sale at the time of placement of order"

9.2 The findings of the Enquiry Officer revealed 541 instances of Blank Sales during the Review Period.

9.3 The Respondent made the following submissions on the issue:

- The Respondent in its written reply dated October 04, 2007 stated that it has never been involved in Blank Selling and the Enquiry Officer has misconstrued the sales given in Annexure – A ("the Annexure") of the SCN as Blank Sales. The Respondent stated that the Enquiry Officer failed to account for the deliveries available in its House Account or the clients' carry over positions while calculating Blank Sales.
- During the hearing, the Respondent again denied that the sales mentioned in the Annexure are Blank Sales and agreed to provide documentary evidence of pre-existing interest of the clients in this regard. The Respondent vide letter dated November 05, 2007, provided instance wise





explanation and provided CDC statements for various dates and scrips in support of its claim that it had deliveries available in the Accounts against sales mentioned in Annexure.

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

- CDC Account Balance Reports provided by the Respondent primarily related to House Account and did not show deliveries in the CDC Sub-account of the clients' mentioned in the Annexure. The analysis of the said CDC Account Balance Reports showed that the sales mentioned at serial nos. 470 – 519 were not Blank Sales as the said sales belonged to the Respondent and adequate deliveries were available in the Respondent's House Account. However, in case of rest of the instances, the Respondent did not provide any documentary evidence to prove that the deliveries appearing in the CDC Account Balance Reports belonged to the clients mentioned in the Annexure or the clients had carry over positions. Therefore, in the absence of any documentary evidence deliveries appearing in these reports can not be treated as pre-existing interest of the clients. Hence the rest of the sales given in the Annexure will be treated as Blank Sales.

9.5 Considering the above facts and the contentions of the Respondent, it is clear that 491 Blank Sales have been made in violation of Regulation 4 of the Short Selling Regulations. In terms of Rule 8 of the Brokers Rules, sub rule (ii) where the Commission is of the opinion that a broker has inter alia failed to comply with any requirements of the Act or the Ordinance or of any rules or directions made or given thereunder, in terms of sub rule (iii) has contravened the rules and regulations of the exchange and in terms of sub rule (iv) has failed to follow any requirement of the Code of Conduct laid down in the Third Schedule, the Commission may in the public interest, take action under Rule 8(a) or (b) of the Brokers Rules.

9.6 In light of the above facts that the Respondent by making Blank Sales has violated the Short Selling Regulations thereby attracting sub rule (iii) of the Rule 8 of the Brokers Rule and has also failed to comply with Clause A5 of the Code of Conduct contained in the Third Schedule to the Brokers Rules, thereby, attracting sub rule (iv) of the Rule 8 of the Brokers Rule. Accordingly, a penalty of Rs. 75,000 (Rupees Seventy Five Thousand only) is hereby imposed on the Respondent under Rule 8 (b) of the Brokers Rules.

#### 10. Account Opening Forms ("Issue No. 2")

10.1 In terms of Commission's Directive No. SMD/SE/2(89) 2003 dated July 23, 2003 which requires all the members-brokers to maintain Account Opening Form(s) ("the AOF(s)") in conformity with the Standardized Account Opening Form ("the SAOF") prescribed by the Commission and subsequent changes made to the SAOF vide letters No. SMD/SE/2(89) 2003, dated November 19, 2003 and



SECURITIES & EXCHANGE COMMISSION OF PAKISTAN  
(Securities Market Division)

January 20, 2004. Subsequently this SAOF was also made part of LSE General Rules and Regulations as Chapter VIII. The said directives of the Commission require that:

- i) List of Transaction fee, commission to be charged by the Broker and other CDC charges to be levied should be attached with the AOFs.
- ii) Attested copy of CNIC of the clients should be attached with the AOF.
- iii) Name of nominees should be mentioned on the AOFs.
- iv) Each page of AOFs should be duly signed by the Broker or his authorized representative.

10.2 Findings of the Enquiry Officer revealed that:

- i) List of Transaction fee, commission to be charged by the Respondent and other CDC charges to be levied were not attached with the AOFs.
- ii) CNIC's of the clients enclosed with AOFs were not attested.
- iii) Name of nominees were not mentioned on AOFs.
- iv) Each page of AOFs was not signed by the Respondent or its authorized representative.

10.3 The Respondent made the following submission on these issues:

- With reference to the omission of not attaching list of charges with the AOFs, the Respondent asserted that commission slabs and transaction charges are given by the Respondent to its clients through Trade Confirmations which are sent daily and through Ledger/Account Statement which is sent weekly. The Respondent further stated that it is in process of rectifying this error.
- With reference to violation of unattested copies of client's CNICs the Respondent stated that the said violation has already been pointed out by the auditors during System Audit conducted during 2006 and it has already paid a fine on the same. The Respondent further asserted that it has already corrected the said omission and also provided attested copies of clients' CNICs in support of its claim.
- With regard to the missing names of nominees on AOFs, the Respondent asserted that same are mentioned only in those cases where the clients provided such information. In most of the cases the clients themselves do not mention the name of nominee on AOFs.
- With regard to violation of missing signatures of the Respondent on AOFs, the Respondent in its written reply stated that it is in the process of getting new AOFs executed to clear such trivial lapses.

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





SECURITIES & EXCHANGE COMMISSION OF PAKISTAN  
(Securities Market Division)

- I have considered the contentions of the Respondent regarding missing list of charges with AOFs and do not agree with the Respondent that giving commission rates on the account statements/trade confirmations suffices the requirement of attaching the list of charges with the AOFs. Therefore, by not attaching the said list with the AOFs, the Respondent has failed to comply with the directives of the Commission. It may be noted that enclosing the list of charges with the AOF makes it a part of the AOF which is the basic agreement between the broker and his clients. In case of any dispute arises between them all the matters are resolved on the basis of clauses of the AOF.
- With regard to Respondent's assertion on violation of un-attested copies of client's CNICs, it is clear that the Respondent failed to comply with the directives of the Commission. However, the Respondent stated that it has already been penalized by LSE for the said violation pointed out during the System Audit.
- With regard to Respondent's statement about the missing names of nominees on AOFs, it may be noted that SAOF requires that name of nominee should be mentioned on the AOFs. Further, the SAOF also requires that each and every field of the AOFs should be duly filled in. Therefore, by not mentioning the name of nominee on the AOFs the Respondent has violated the abovementioned directive of the Commission.
- With regard to the Respondent's submission about its missing signatures on the AOF, it is clear that the Respondent has failed to comply with the directives of the Commission. It may be noted that SAOF requires that each and every page of the AOFs should be signed by the broker and its clients.

10.5 Considering the above facts and the contentions of the Respondent, it is established that the Respondent has failed to comply with Commission's directive and General Rules and Regulations of the LSE. In terms of Rule 8 of the Brokers Rules, more particularly sub rule (iii), (vi) and sub rule (v) therefore, where the Commission is of the opinion that a broker has inter alia failed to comply with requirements of any directions of the Commission and/or has contravened the rules and regulations of the Exchange and/or has failed to follow any requirement of the Code of Conduct laid down in the Third Schedule, it may in the public interest, to take action under Rule 8(a) or (b) of the Brokers Rules.

10.6 In light of the above i.e. the fact the Respondent failed to comply with Commission's directive thereby attracting sub rule (v) of the Rule 8 of the Brokers Rule. However, based on the Respondents statement that it has already taken corrective actions 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 these instances to the Respondent would suffice and I would further direct the Respondent

 7



SECURITIES & EXCHANGE COMMISSION OF PAKISTAN  
(Securities Market Division)

\*\*\*

to ensure that full compliance is made of all rules, regulations and directives of the Commission in the future for avoiding any punitive action under the law.

11. **Order Register ("Issue No. 3")**

11.1 In terms of Rule 4(1) of the 1971 Rules it is provided that:

"All orders to buy or sell securities which a member may receive shall be entered, in the chronological order, in a register to be maintained by him in a form which shows the name and address of the person who placed the order, the name and number of the securities to be bought or sold, the nature of transaction and the limitation, if any, as to the price of the securities or the period for which the order is to be valid."

11.2 The findings of the Enquiry Officer revealed that the register as mentioned above was not maintained by the Respondent during the Review Period.

11.3 The Respondent made the following submission on the aforementioned issue:

- The Respondent in its written reply asserted that electronic ledger as maintained today by the Lahore Stock System ("the LSS") fulfills the requirement of abovementioned Rule.
- During the hearing the Respondent stated that now-a-days due to high volume and velocity of trading it is practically impossible to maintain manual order register.

11.4 I have considered the contentions of the Respondent and I am of the view that electronic ledgers or the Daily Activity Log as mentioned by the Respondent is not a substitute for the Order Register as required under the Rule 4(1) of the 1971 Rules. The aforementioned Logs only record those orders that are placed by the Respondent into LOTS and not all the orders which were received from the clients and not entered into LOTS. Further, the said Log only records the time of placement of orders into the system and not the time of receipt of orders.

11.5 The Commission is also cognizant of the practical difficulties associated with the maintenance of such an Order Register manually. However, it is noted with disappointment that the brokerage house and LSE were not able to keep pace with evolution in technology and significant increase in trading activities whereby a system should have been developed to enable simultaneous recording of orders received from clients and their incorporation in a database to generate the Order Register as required under the Rule 4(1) of the 1971 Rules.

11.6 Considering the above mentioned fact 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 that a caution in this instance to the Respondent would suffice and I would further direct the Respondent to ensure that full compliance be made of all the laws, regulations and directives of the Commission in future for avoiding any punitive action under the law.





SECURITIES & EXCHANGE COMMISSION OF PAKISTAN  
(Securities Market Division)

12. **Separate Bank Account for Clients Funds ("Issue No. 4")**

12.1 In terms of Commission's directive No. SMD/SE 2(20)/2002 dated March 4, 2005 which states that;

"The exchanges are to ensure that brokers follow the practice of segregating clients' assets from the broker's assets in order to ensure that clients' assets are not misused.

For this purpose brokers should have one separate bank account which includes all the cash deposits of their clients along-with records/breakdown of client positions."

12.2 The findings of the Enquiry Officer revealed that the Respondent was not maintaining a separate bank account for clients' funds.

12.3 The Respondent made the following submission on the aforementioned issue:

- The Respondent in its written reply dated October 04, 2007 stated that the said violation was pointed out during the System Audit conducted during 2006 and based on that it has already opened a separate bank account for clients' funds.

12.4 I have considered the contentions of the Respondent and I am of the view that the Respondent has complied with the Commission's directive No. SMD/SE 2(20)/2002 dated March 4, 2005. Therefore, no punitive action will be taken against the issue no. 4.

13. As stated above, the Respondent is penalized as follows:

- a) As regards Issue No. 1, as stated above, a penalty of Rs. 75,000/- (Rupees Seventy Five Thousand only) is imposed.
- b) No punitive action is taken in relation to Issue Nos. 2, 3 and 4 and a simple caution will suffice.

13.1 The matter is disposed of in the above manner and the Respondent is directed to deposit the fine with the Commission not later than fifteen (15) days from the receipt of this Order.

Imran Inayat Butt  
Director (SM)  
Securities Market Division