



Lex Favios
Advocates & Solicitors

08th September 2025

Securities and Exchange Board of India vide circular dated September 01, 2025, has issued framework for Intraday Position Limits Monitoring for Equity Index Derivatives

- The Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI) has introduced a new framework to monitor and cap intraday positions for equity index derivatives. The goal is to prevent excessive risk-taking, reduce market manipulation, and maintain stability, especially on options expiry days.
- A new, higher intraday net position limit of ₹5,000 crore per entity has been set for index options. This is a significant increase from the previous end-of-day limit of ₹1,500 crore. The gross intraday limit remains at ₹10,000 crore.
- Stock exchanges will now monitor these positions through a minimum of four random snapshots during a trading session. One of these checks will specifically occur between 2:45 pm and 3:30 pm, a period known for high volatility on expiry days.
- Breaching these limits will lead to scrutiny from stock exchanges and may result in penalties or additional surveillance deposits, especially on expiry days.
- The circular primarily impacts large traders, proprietary trading desks, and institutional entities that handle significant volumes in the derivatives market. This includes high-frequency trading firms, Foreign Portfolio Investors (FPIs) and market makers and other liquidity providers.
- The rules are less likely to directly affect the vast majority of retail investors, as their trading volumes are typically well below these high limits.
- In simple terms, SEBI is putting a stricter speed limit on the biggest players in the stock market's options trading. Imagine a highway where everyone has a speed limit, but some professional drivers were able to temporarily exceed it during rush hour. SEBI's new rule puts a specific, higher temporary speed limit in place for all drivers during the day, but with new, random police checks.



Lex Favios
Advocates & Solicitors

- The circular is attached herein.

[Click Here](#)

Securities and Exchange Board of India vide circular dated September 05, 2025, has streamlined the process for surrender of (Know Your Client) Registration Agency (KRA) registration

- SEBI has issued a framework for the orderly winding down of Know Your Client (KYC) Registration Agencies (KRAs). This circular establishes a structured process for a KRA to cease its operations, ensuring that the critical data and services it provides remain secure and uninterrupted.
- A KRA must ensure that its services to investors and intermediaries are not disrupted during its exit.
- The framework mandates a seamless and secure transfer of all KYC records and related responsibilities to a successor KRA.
- A clear mechanism must be in place to address any pending or future investor complaints, even after the KRA has surrendered its license.
- The exiting KRA must disclose any defaults or pending regulatory actions to SEBI as part of the surrender application.
- The circular primarily impacts the KRAs themselves, as it dictates the specific process they must follow to surrender their registration. It also affects financial intermediaries such as stockbrokers, mutual fund distributors, and other entities that rely on KRAs to access and verify client KYC data.
- While not directly impacted in their daily trading, investors are the ultimate beneficiaries of this framework, as it protects their sensitive personal and financial data from being lost or compromised in the event of a KRA's closure.
- The circular is attached herein.

[Click Here](#)



Lex Favios
Advocates & Solicitors

EPFO Dues from Post-Liquidation 7A Assessment Not Admissible: NCLAT New Delhi

The National Company Law Appellate Tribunal (NCLAT), Principal Bench, New Delhi, comprising *Justice Ashok Bhushan (Chairperson)* and *Barun Mitra (Member – Technical)*, has held that provident fund dues arising from assessments made **after the liquidation commencement date** under Section 7A of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952, cannot be admitted as claims in liquidation.

Case Background

- CIRP of the corporate debtor began on **30.11.2017**, and liquidation was ordered on **16.09.2019**.
- The EPFO conducted a 7A inquiry on **11.10.2021** and determined PF dues of **₹1.68 crore**. Including damages and interest (u/s 14B & 7Q), a total claim of **₹4.57 crore** was filed before the liquidator.
- The liquidator rejected the claim, citing belated filing and violation of moratorium.

The EPFO approached the NCLT, which dismissed the application. The present appeal was then filed before the NCLAT.

Contentions

- **Appellant (EPFO):**
 - Dues determined were for the pre-CIRP period; hence, payable by the liquidator under Section 36(4) of the IBC.
- **Respondent (Liquidator):**
 - Assessment was made after liquidation commenced, hence not “in existence” at the relevant date.
 - Claims were filed nearly two years late.
 - EPFO did not appeal under Section 42 of the IBC.
 - Relied on *Employees' Provident Fund Organisation, Nashik v. Girish Siriram Juneja & Anr.*

NCLAT's Findings

- **Regulation 16(2), IBBI (Liquidation Process) Regulations, 2016** permits admission only of those claims that existed as on the liquidation commencement date.
- The 7A assessment was made in October 2021, well after liquidation commenced in September 2019. Hence, such claims were **non-existent at the relevant date and inadmissible**.
- Affirmed reliance on the precedent in *EPFO, Nashik v. Girish Siriram Juneja*.
- Clarified that non-admission under IBC does not prevent the EPFO from pursuing other remedies available in law.



Lex Favios
Advocates & Solicitors

Decision

The NCLAT upheld the NCLT's order and dismissed the appeal.

Case Title: *Regional P.F. Commissioner, EPFO v. Alok Kailash Saksena, Liquidator of Gujarat Foils*

Case No.: Company Appeal (AT) (Insolvency) No. 807 of 2025

Bar on Even Number of Arbitrators Under Arbitration Act Not Applicable to Statutory S. 31(7)(a) Arbitration Act | Clause Restricting Interest on Delayed Payments Does Not Bar Pendente Lite Interest: Supreme Court

The Supreme Court has held that an arbitral tribunal retains the discretion to award *pendente lite* interest under Section 31(7)(a) of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, unless the contract expressly or by necessary implication prohibits it. A mere contractual bar on interest for delayed payments will not by itself prevent the grant of interest during the pendency of arbitration proceedings.

The bench of **Justices P.S. Narasimha and Manoj Misra** dismissed ONGC's appeal against the Gauhati High Court's judgment, upholding the tribunal's award of *pendente lite* interest.

At the core of the dispute was **Clause 18.1** of the contract, which provided: "*No interest shall be payable by ONGC on any delayed payment/disputed claim.*" The Court held that the clause only excluded contractual interest on delayed invoices, but did not restrict the tribunal's statutory power to award *pendente lite* interest.

Authoring the judgment, Justice Misra clarified that an arbitral tribunal can be divested of such power only where the contract is worded in a manner that expressly or impliedly bars *pendente lite* interest. Since Clause 18.1 did not contain such a bar, the tribunal's decision to award *pendente lite* interest was valid.

Accordingly, the appeal was dismissed.

Case Title: *Oil and Natural Gas Corporation Ltd. v. G & T Beckfield Drilling Services Pvt. Ltd.*



Lex Favios
Advocates & Solicitors

In case you have suggestions or do not wish to receive our newsletter,
please email us at info@lexfavios.com

Contact details

Sumes Dewan

Managing Partner

Lex Favios

Email: sumes.dewan@lexfavios.com

Tel: 91-11-41435188/45264524