

## Concerns of Related Party Deals in Stock Market

### Why in news?

\n\n

The Securities Exchange Board of India's (SEBI) asked ICICI Prudential Mutual Fund to refund Rs.240 crore to investors in its schemes.

\n\n

### What is the reason behind this decision?

\n\n

\n

- SEBI's decision on ICCI Mutual Fund comes after the hidden governance issues for mutual fund (MF) investors.

\n

- The issue pertains to ICICI Pru MF's decision to invest Rs. 640 crore in the recent IPO of ICICI Securities.

\n

- In this regard the market regulator has reached a Private advisory and issued a notice to the asset manager ICICI MF to refund Rs.240 crore plus interest to investors in its schemes.

\n

- The regulator's contention is that the fund house has effectively engaged in an act of bailing out its sister firm when its IPO was in danger of failing.

\n

\n\n

### What are the issues with response from ICICI?

\n\n

\n

- The fund house's defence is that it did not violate the prudential limits set out in SEBI's mutual fund regulations and that it made a bona fide investment, based on ICICI Securities' prospects.

\n

- But such defence is weak, for SEBI has found that ICICI Mutual Fund did not place its IPO bids at one go.

- \n
- After investing Rs.400 crore on Day One of the book-built offer, it invested another Rs.240 crore on the last day.
- \n
- If the fund managers were really convinced that the group firm was a great investment opportunity, there would be no need to break up the bids, or wait until the eleventh hour.
- \n

\n\n

### **What are the grey areas to SEBI's actions?**

\n\n

- \n
- SEBI having decided to ask the fund house to make refunds, it has taken refuge in a private 'advisory' to ICICI MF instead of passing a public order to this effect.
- \n
- This forces investors to rely on conjecture and hearsay on this issue, and sets no precedent for the future.
- \n
- While there are obvious conflicts of interest to a MF investing in group entities, SEBI's MF regulations do not specifically forbid funds from taking group exposures.
- \n
- While there are scheme-specific caps on stock, sector and group exposures to avoid concentration risks, MFs dealing with associates or group firms are required to make only half-yearly disclosures of such deals, post facto.
- \n
- But investors seldom peruse the half-yearly accounts of their MFs and such disclosures come too late to make a difference.
- \n

\n\n

### **What measures are needed to address related party deal?**

\n\n

- \n
- Private sector MFs now dominate the industry and the sponsors of leading MFs have their finger in many pies NBFCs, investment banking, brokerage and corporate lending.
- \n

- Laxity on related-party deals can seriously compromise both governance and investor confidence in the vehicle.  
\n
- To address this, SEBI can consider setting tight aggregate exposure limits for mutual funds looking to invest in group entities, with index names alone excluded from these curbs.  
\n
- MFs must also be required to make immediate public disclosures of any investment in a group firm with a clear rationale.  
\n
- SEBI must force the Trustees overseeing AMCs to take their fiduciary duties to investors more seriously, instead of mechanically rubber-stamping all of the asset managers' decisions.  
\n

\n\n

\n\n

**Source: Business Line**

\n

