 DOI: *https://doij.org/10.10000/IJLMH.119118*

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LAW MANAGEMENT & HUMANITIES

[ISSN 2581-5369]

Volume 8 | Issue 2

2025

© 2025 International Journal of Law Management & Humanities

Follow this and additional works at: https://www.ijlmh.com/

Under the aegis of VidhiAagaz – Inking Your Brain (https://www.vidhiaagaz.com/)

This article is brought to you for "free" and "open access" by the International Journal of Law Management & Humanities at VidhiAagaz. It has been accepted for inclusion in the International Journal of Law Management & Humanities after due review.

In case of **any suggestions or complaints**, kindly contact **support@vidhiaagaz.com**.

To submit your Manuscript for Publication in the **International Journal of Law Management & Humanities**, kindly email your Manuscript to **submission@ijlmh.com.**

An Analysis of Insider Trading & Balancing Market Fairness with Legal Enforcement

MAGLIN M. RAJA[1]

ABSTRACT

One of the most sensitive legal and financial concerns, investigating international regulations, is insider trading. Some claim it damages investor confidence and levels the playing field, but others see it as a necessary evil that increases market efficiency. From a legal and economic perspective, this paper explores the intricate connection between market justice and law enforcement in cases of insider trading. It involves jurisdictional regulatory structures, landmark case legislation, and enforcement efficacy debates. It also examines surveillance technology, globalization's influence on enforcement, and corporate governance's role in limiting insider trading concerns. The research seeks to examine insider trading's effects on financial markets, investor protection, and ethics. The analysis also shows how insider trading restrictions have changed over time and affected market stability. It examines how firms, regulators, and investors see insider trading and the ethical issues with unequal access to crucial information. This article examines legal barriers and high-profile enforcement cases to determine how well regulatory measures reduce illegal trade. This study also considers the possibility that controlled insider trading might improve price discovery and market efficiency. It also explores how strict insider trading restrictions affect innovation, business decision-making, and financial market competitiveness. The research also examines whistleblowers' importance in exposing insider trading and reward-based programs' efficacy in encouraging disclosures. In the age of decentralised finance (DeFi) and cryptocurrency marketplaces, anonymity and jurisdictional complexity make insider trading law enforcement difficult. Psychological and behavioural factors such cognitive biases and moral disengagement impact insider trading decisions are examined. This study integrates legal research, economic theory, and practical case studies to contribute to insider trading debate and enlighten policymakers, legal practitioners, and financial market players on the best enforcement-market efficiency balance.

***Keywords**: Insider trading, market fairness, corporate governance, investor protection, whistleblowers, decentralized finance.*

I. INTRODUCTION

Insider trading is a complex, multifaceted issue that has garnered significant interest from the

[1] Author is a Research Scholar at Bhagwant University, Ajmer, Rajasthan, India.

financial and legal communities. It refers to the buying or selling of stocks by people who know important non-public information (MNPI) about a company. This conduct raises serious ethical and legal concerns since it unfairly benefits individuals who have privileged access to information. The primary question surrounding insider trading is whether it increases market efficiency by facilitating the faster dissemination of knowledge or jeopardises market fairness by adversely impacting ordinary investors. Insider trading regulations emerged in the early 20th century when financial markets began to recognise the value of transparency and investor protection. Many regulatory regimes have evolved over time to fight insider trading, reflecting broader societal concerns about market integrity, justice, and trust. The United States' enactment of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 was a major turning point in the regulation of insider trading and set the stage for more recent laws in other countries. Despite these efforts, insider trading remains an issue due to the challenges of identification, the fluidity of financial markets, and the globalisation of economic activity.

In addition to ethical and legal issues, insider trading has major economic consequences. The strategy might undermine public confidence in the banking system, discourage investment, and skew market prices. The ability of insider trading to disrupt market equilibrium highlights the need of robust regulatory frameworks and vigilant enforcement mechanisms. However, experts, legislators, and industry stakeholders continue to disagree on how to strike a balance between enforcing stringent regulations and fostering market efficiency. The purpose of this essay is to provide a comprehensive analysis of insider trading by examining its moral, legal, and financial facets. It looks into how regulatory bodies throughout the world have attempted to strike a balance between deterring illicit trade and fostering market efficiency. This article also looks at how well enforcement actions work, how technological advancements help detect insider trading, and how insider trading affects investor trust and the stability of the financial system more broadly.

By examining important case laws, investigating the viewpoints of different stakeholders, and assessing the socioeconomic effects of insider trading laws, this study also aims to close the gap between theory and practice. The study intends to add to current policy discussions by providing a comprehensive knowledge of insider trading and by offering ideas into how regulatory frameworks might be enhanced to create a more equitable and transparent financial system. The study will also look at how financial markets are changing, particularly the emergence of digital assets and decentralised finance, and how these developments provide new difficulties for regulators.

II. Theoretical framework

The necessity of preserving openness, equity, and confidence in financial markets is reflected in insider trading laws, which have their roots in both ethical and economic ideas. A thorough framework supporting the necessity of controlling insider trading is offered by a number of well-known ideas. Together, these ideas highlight the need of stakeholder protection, investor trust, and market integrity. They also provide insightful information about the wider effects of insider trading on social justice, corporate governance, and economic stability.

(A) Market Efficiency Theory:

According to this argument, insider trading may increase market efficiency by hastening the release of price-sensitive information. Proponents contend that by integrating confidential information into stock prices more quickly, insider trading activities speed up the price discovery process. Consequently, a more accurate value of securities may be reflected in the market. Critics point out that the advantages of market efficiency are not greater than the moral and equitable issues raised by insider trading. This idea also calls into question whether short-term gains in market efficiency might come at the price of long-term investor trust.

(B) Fairness Doctrine:

Equal access to information is the foundation of the fairness doctrine. It argues that insider trading disadvantages ignorant investors by giving those with privileged information an unfair advantage. The fundamental tenet of fairness in financial markets is compromised by this imbalance, which may erode public confidence and deter market participation. According to the idea, maintaining investor confidence and promoting long-term economic growth depend on an open and fair marketplace. Furthermore, the fairness theory supports inclusive financial institutions and the protection of disadvantaged investors, which are in line with larger social justice ideals.

(C) Agency Theory:

The fiduciary obligation that corporate insiders, including executives and directors, have to shareholders is the main emphasis of agency theory. As part of their professional responsibilities, corporate insiders are trusted with sensitive information, and their main duty is to behave in the best interests of shareholders. Insiders violate their duty of loyalty when they use confidential knowledge for their own benefit, which might reduce shareholder value and damage a company's reputation. This idea emphasises how corporate representatives have a moral and legal duty to put shareholders' interests ahead of their own. Furthermore, in order to

prevent insider trading and maintain corporate responsibility, agency theory emphasises the necessity of strong internal control systems and corporate governance frameworks.

(D) Property Rights Theory:

According to this concept, insider information is exclusive knowledge that belongs to the business rather than the insider. It is a misuse of the company's intellectual property when such knowledge is used without authorisation for private benefit. According to this viewpoint, insider trading is comparable to theft as it entails the unauthorised use of corporate knowledge. The necessity of regulatory actions to safeguard company assets and uphold the integrity of corporate governance is supported by the property rights theory. Furthermore, this idea presents significant legal issues about who owns intangible assets and business insiders' moral obligations to protect confidential data.

(E) Behavioural Economics Theory:

This theory examines how psychological and cognitive factors influence decision-making in insider trading. It suggests that individuals may engage in insider trading due to behavioural biases such as overconfidence, moral disengagement, or the perception that the likelihood of detection is minimal. Understanding these psychological motivators provides valuable insights into why individuals may rationalize unethical behaviour, highlighting the importance of regulatory mechanisms to deter insider trading through heightened detection and enforcement. Furthermore, behavioural economics theory advocates for the implementation of behavioural interventions, such as ethics training and corporate culture reforms, to promote ethical decision-making and compliance.

(F) Public Interest Theory:

Public interest theory advocates for regulatory interventions to safeguard the broader interests of society. It argues that insider trading can undermine investor confidence, deter market participation, and destabilize financial markets. By prohibiting insider trading, regulations serve to protect the collective welfare of investors and promote market stability. This theory emphasizes that regulatory frameworks are essential for fostering a fair and transparent financial environment, which is fundamental to the functioning of modern economies. Furthermore, public interest theory emphasises how regulatory bodies must strike a balance between social welfare goals and market efficiency to make sure financial markets function in a way that benefits society as a whole.

© 2025. International Journal of Law Management & Humanities

(G) Stakeholder Theory:

By taking into account how insider trading affects other stakeholders, such as staff members, clients, suppliers, and the general public, this theory expands on the moral ramifications of insider trading. In addition to having an impact on shareholders, insider trading erodes the confidence and interests of all parties involved in the business. Stakeholder theory emphasises how corporate decisions are interrelated and how moral business conduct that puts the interests of all parties involved first is essential. Furthermore, this theory supports company practices that advance social and environmental sustainability in addition to financial performance, which is consistent with the tenets of corporate social responsibility.

(H) Information Asymmetry Theory:

The disparity in information between the general public and business insiders is addressed by this idea. It makes the case that insider trading makes information asymmetry worse by establishing an unfair playing field where insiders may make money off of regular investors. Such actions undermine the integrity of the market and make it more difficult to allocate resources effectively. To reduce information asymmetry and guarantee that all market players have equal access to important information, regulatory actions are necessary. This theory also emphasises how crucial prompt and accurate company announcements are to closing information gaps and improving market transparency.

In conclusion, the regulation of insider trading is a multifaceted issue that draws upon diverse economic and ethical theories. These theoretical perspectives collectively underscore the importance of fairness, transparency, and market integrity in fostering investor confidence and promoting sustainable economic growth. A robust regulatory framework is vital for addressing the complex challenges posed by insider trading, safeguarding the interests of all stakeholders, and upholding the principles of justice and equity in financial markets. Future research and policy development should continue to explore the evolving dynamics of insider trading, incorporating insights from emerging fields such as behavioural finance, digital technology, and global governance to strengthen regulatory responses and enhance market resilience.

III. Regulatory frameworks

Different jurisdictions regulate insider trading under distinct legal and regulatory frameworks, reflecting variations in market structures, legal traditions, and enforcement mechanisms. The regulatory landscape for insider trading has evolved globally, with many countries adopting stringent measures to promote market integrity and protect investors.

1. United States:

Through the Regulating Act[2], the United States enforces prohibitions against insider trading, and the SEC[3] is the main regulating agency. The legal landscape has been impacted by seminal instances such as in the cases.[4] The Act[5] gave whistleblowers incentives and gave regulators more authority to fight insider trading. In order to identify questionable trading trends, the US regulatory framework is constantly changing and integrating technology techniques like data analytics, machine learning, and artificial intelligence. In order to handle instances involving cross-border insider trading, the SEC regularly works with foreign regulators.

2. India:

SEBI[6] plays a crucial role in regulating insider trading through the SEBI Regulation[7]. These regulations require companies to maintain structured digital databases of unpublished price-sensitive information. SEBI also imposes severe penalties on offenders, with increased collaboration between regulatory bodies and law enforcement agencies. Rajiv Gandhi case [8] set a precedent for holding insiders accountable and protecting investor confidence. SEBI's proactive approach includes market surveillance, investor education, and the use of technology-driven platforms for detecting suspicious transactions.

3. United Kingdom:

The Market Abuse Regulation (MAR) governs insider trading in the UK, enforced by the Financial Conduct Authority (FCA). The UK framework encourages voluntary self-reporting by companies, aiming to improve transparency and prevent market abuse. Recent reforms have emphasized greater collaboration with international regulators to tackle cross-border insider trading cases. The FCA uses data-sharing agreements and advanced surveillance equipment to keep an eye on market activity and identify any infractions.

4. European Union:

EU's MAR [9] harmonizes insider trading laws across member states. The European Securities and Markets Authority (ESMA) ensures consistent enforcement, with cross-border cooperation and data-sharing agreements among member states. The MAR framework also mandates the

---

[2] Securities Exchange Act of 1934.
[3] Securities and Exchange Commission.
[4] United States v. O'Hagan (1997) and SEC v. Texas Gulf Sulphur Co. (1969).
[5] Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (2010).
[6] The Securities and Exchange Board of India.
[7] SEBI (Prohibition of Insider Trading) Regulations, 2015.
[8] The SEBI v. Rajiv Gandhi (2009).
[9] The EU's Market Abuse Regulation.

use of surveillance technology to monitor trading activities, reflecting the EU's commitment to enhancing market integrity and investor protection.

5. Australia:

The Corporations Act 2001 governs insider trading, with the ASIC[10] employing advanced surveillance systems like the Market Analysis and Intelligence Platform (MAIP) to detect suspicious transactions. ASIC has also introduced public awareness campaigns to deter insider trading, emphasizing the importance of ethical conduct and regulatory compliance.

6. Japan:

Japan's FIEA[11] mandates pre-emptive disclosure requirements for listed companies. SESC[12] employs AI-based systems to identify abnormal trading patterns and collaborates with international regulatory bodies to combat cross-border insider trading.

7. Singapore:

SFA[13] under the MAS[14] requires real-time transaction reporting and imposes hefty penalties for insider trading. Singapore's regulatory framework emphasizes proactive market surveillance, investor education, and collaboration with global regulatory authorities.

In conclusion, the regulation of insider trading is a multifaceted issue that draws upon diverse economic and ethical theories. These theoretical perspectives collectively underscore the importance of fairness, transparency, and market integrity in fostering investor confidence and promoting sustainable economic growth.

IV. CASE LAW ANALYSIS

Several landmark cases have significantly influenced the development and enforcement of insider trading laws across jurisdictions. This section provides a detailed analysis of notable case laws:

1. SEC v. Texas Gulf Sulphur Co. (1969):

One of the most important decisions in the field of U.S. securities law, especially with regard to insider trading restrictions, is the seminal case of Securities and Exchange Commission v. Texas Gulf Sulphur Co., 401 F.2d 833 (2d Cir. 1968). The decision created the fundamental rule that business insiders with substantial non-public information (MNPI) have to either refrain

[10] Australian Securities and Investments Commission.
[11] Financial Instruments and Exchange Act.
[12] The Securities and Exchange Surveillance Commission.
[13] The Securities and Futures Act.
[14] Monetary Authority of Singapore.

from trading completely or reveal the knowledge to the public before trading stocks. This idea became well-known as the "disclose or abstain" rule and served as the foundation for insider trading regulations in the United States. The dispute started when Texas Gulf Sulphur business management and staff bought business shares without telling anybody important about a big mineral find in Canada. Once made public, the discovery—which pointed to a sizable ore deposit—was probably going to have a big effect on the company's stock price. However, a number of insiders covertly purchased business stock prior to the formal announcement in anticipation of the subsequent price spike. The corporation and its officials were sued by the SEC, which claimed that their acts were against Rule 10b-5, which forbids fraud and deception in securities dealing, and Section 10(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934. According to the Second Circuit Court of Appeals' decision in support of the SEC, anybody in possession of significant, non-public information is required to either disclose it or abstain from trading until it is made public. The court underlined that insider trading erodes the public's trust in the securities markets' fairness and integrity. By guaranteeing that business insiders cannot use sensitive information for their own benefit at the detriment of regular investors, the ruling reaffirmed the significance of equitable access to information among investors. The current framework for insider trading prohibitions was shaped by the Texas Gulf Sulphur case, which continues to be a significant precedent in U.S. securities law. It established the framework for later decisions and legislative actions that supported investor protection, equity, and market transparency.

2. Dirks v. Securities and Exchange Commission (1983):

The United States Supreme Court rendered a landmark decision in the 1983 case of Dirks v. SEC, 463 U.S. 646, which had a significant impact on the legal framework surrounding insider trading laws in the United States, especially with regard to the liability of tippees who receive and act upon insiders' non-public information. The decision tackled the intricate question of whether and under what conditions an individual who obtains sensitive insider information from a company insider (the tipper) may be held accountable for insider trading. The lawsuit started when a former Equity Funding Corporation official gave securities analyst Raymond Dirks exclusive information about the company's alleged enormous financial malfeasance. Before the deception was made public, Dirks' clients sold their firm shares after he looked into the claims and informed them of the information. Dirks did not, however, trade on the knowledge directly. The SEC accused Dirks of aiding and abetting a breach of insider trading regulations by disclosing the knowledge, leading to charges of insider trading.

The Supreme Court's decision overturned the SEC's ruling, setting important legal standards for

tippee liability in insider trading cases. The Court held that:

- Tipper Breach of Fiduciary Duty: The tippee is not always liable. Only in cases where the tipper the insider who revealed the information broke a fiduciary obligation by disclosing the information for personal benefit whether that be monetary gain, reputational enhancement, or any other benefit can a tippee be held accountable.
- Knowledge of the Tippee: By revealing the knowledge, the insider violated their fiduciary responsibility, and the Tippee must have known or should have known this. The tippee has equal responsibility for trading on the insider's actions if they knew that the insider was acting against their obligation.
- No Liability Without Personal Benefit: The Court clarified that not all disclosures of confidential information constitute insider trading. If the tipper disclosed information without seeking any personal benefit (such as whistleblowing or exposing fraud), neither the tipper nor the tippee could be held liable.

By emphasising that responsibility cannot be imposed based only on the receipt of inside information, the Dirks case set a significant precedent in insider trading law. Rather, the relationship between the tipper and the tippee, as well as the motivation for the disclosure, were highlighted. This ruling struck a compromise between safeguarding lawful market analysis and whistleblower efforts and the requirement to control insider trading.

Moreover, the case reaffirmed the principle that insider trading laws are rooted in the protection of fiduciary duties rather than merely restricting the flow of information. This precedent remains a cornerstone in insider trading jurisprudence, guiding courts and regulators in distinguishing between legitimate market activity and improper exploitation of confidential information.

3. United States v. O’Hagan (1997):

The United States Supreme Court introduced the misappropriation approach in the landmark case of United States v. O'Hagan, 521 U.S. 642 (1997), which greatly broadened the application of insider trading statutes. By expanding the scope of responsibility to encompass outsiders who abuse sensitive information gained via a breach of trust, even if they have no direct link with the corporation whose stocks are traded, this case signalled a significant change in the interpretation of insider trading statutes. The case started when James O'Hagan, a partner at the legal firm Dorsey & Whitney, stole private material regarding a possible takeover offer for Pillsbury corporation, a client of the firm, from the British corporation Grand Metropolitan PLC. O'Hagan bought a lot of Pillsbury stock options after learning about the buyout through

his legal practice, despite not being personally involved in the discussions. Pillsbury's stock price soared after the acquisition attempt was made public, giving O'Hagan a profit of nearly $4.3 million. O'Hagan was charged by the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) with insider trading, mail fraud, and securities fraud.

Whether O'Hagan may be held accountable under insider trading laws while not being a Pillsbury employee or shareholder and having no direct fiduciary obligation to the corporation whose stocks he traded was the main legal challenge in this case. The Supreme Court established the misappropriation theory of insider trading and maintained O'Hagan's conviction in its ruling. The Court decided that:

- Violation of Insider Trading Laws by Misappropriation of Confidential Information According to the misappropriation theory, when someone misuses confidential information that has been entrusted to them and uses it for their own benefit, they are violating a duty of trust and confidence and committing fraud in connection with a securities transaction.
- Breach of Duty to the Source of the Information: According to this argument, even if the corporation whose stocks are traded is not directly engaged in the breach, the defendant nonetheless violates the law when they fail to uphold their fiduciary duty to the source of the information, which might be an employer or a client.
- Deceit as the Foundation of Fraud: The Court underlined that the principles of fraud and deceit are the foundation of insider trading regulations. The misappropriator commits a dishonest conduct that compromises the integrity of the securities markets when they exploit private information for their own benefit without telling the original source of the information.

By guaranteeing that the law might apply to both company insiders and outsiders who take advantage of private information given to them by others, the O'Hagan ruling greatly expanded the definition of insider trading liability. Given the growing complexity of financial markets and the variety of ways that private knowledge may be exploited, this decision represented the judicial system's changing perspective on insider trading. By stopping anyone from unfairly benefiting from dishonest activities, the decision also reaffirmed the core goal of insider trading regulations, which is to preserve equity, openness, and public trust in the securities markets. Since then, the misappropriation hypothesis has emerged as a crucial instrument in the prosecution of insider trading cases, enabling authorities to hold a wider spectrum of people responsible for the exploitation of private data for their own benefit.

4. SEBI v. Rajiv Gandhi (2009):

The case of SEBI[15] v. Rajiv Gandhi & Others (2009) is a landmark judgment that played a pivotal role in shaping India's insider trading regulations and strengthening the enforcement of securities laws. This case underscored the regulatory authority of SEBI in curbing insider trading practices and protecting investor interests, thereby promoting market integrity and transparency in India's rapidly evolving financial markets. The case arose when SEBI initiated proceedings against Rajiv Gandhi, a former employee of Wockhardt Ltd., a prominent pharmaceutical company, for allegedly indulging in insider trading. Gandhi, who had access to unpublished price-sensitive information (UPSI) regarding the company's financial performance, was accused of using this confidential information to trade in Wockhardt's shares before the information was made public. The trades allowed him to make substantial profits, giving him an unfair advantage over ordinary investors. SEBI conducted an investigation under the Regulation Act[16], which governed insider trading practices in India at that time. The primary legal issues in the case revolved around the following:

- According to the case, unpublished price-sensitive information (UPSI) is any information that may significantly impact the price of shares if it were made public. In this instance, it was determined that Wockhardt's financial performance data was price-sensitive and may affect investors' choices.
- Insider Definition: The judgement reiterated that an insider is anybody who has access to sensitive corporate information because of their commercial or professional relationship with the company, including employees and directors and officers.
- Insider Liability: SEBI stressed that any insider who uses UPSI to make transactions is subject to insider trading charges, regardless of whether the trades were done directly or indirectly or how much money was made.
- Authority of SEBI to Impose Penalties: The ruling upheld SEBI's authority to impose monetary penalties and initiate enforcement actions against individuals found guilty of insider trading under Section 15G of the SEBI Act, 1992.

SAT[17] upheld SEBI's order, reinforcing the regulator's power to take strict action against insiders who breach trust and exploit confidential information for personal gain. The decision set a critical precedent by highlighting the following:

---

[15] Securities and Exchange Board of India.
[16] SEBI (Prohibition of Insider Trading) Regulations, 1992.
[17] The Securities Appellate Tribunal.

© 2025. International Journal of Law Management & Humanities

- The zero-tolerance approach towards insider trading in India.
- The importance of protecting investor interests and market fairness in emerging markets.
- The need for transparency and accountability in corporate governance practices.

The SEBI v. Rajiv Gandhi case marked a significant milestone in India's regulatory framework by sending a strong message that insider trading would not be tolerated, regardless of the position or influence of the person involved. It also paved the way for the 2015 Regulation[18], which introduced more comprehensive guidelines, stricter penalties, and better mechanisms for detecting and preventing insider trading.

This case remains a cornerstone in India's efforts to foster investor confidence, market integrity, and the rule of law in its financial markets.

5. R v. McQuoid (2009):

An important step in the criminal prosecution of insider trading under the UK's market abuse rules was taken in the 2009 case of R v. McQuoid, which resulted in a historic ruling. By imposing jail terms on those found guilty of insider trading, this case showed the regulatory authorities' will to preserve market integrity and reaffirmed the UK's commitment to combatting market abuse by strict legal measures. James McQuoid, a former director of communications for TTP Communications, was accused with insider selling in violation of Section 52 of the Criminal Justice Act 1993. Before it was made public, McQuoid received price-sensitive, secret information from his company about Motorola Inc.'s impending acquisition of TTP Communications.

When the transaction was formally disclosed, McQuoid gave his father-in-law, Angus McQuoid, this unpublished price-sensitive information (UPSI), and he went on to buy 153,000 shares in TTP Communications, turning a profit of almost £48,000. After looking into the matter, the Financial Services Authority (FSA), which at the time was the main watchdog over market misuse in the UK, charged McQuoid and his father-in-law with crimes. James McQuoid was one of the first people in the UK to be sentenced to jail for insider trading under criminal law after the court found both of them guilty of insider trading and sentenced him to eight months in prison.

The ruling in this case highlighted several key aspects of insider trading laws in the UK:

- Criminal Liability for Insider Trading: The case demonstrated that insider trading is not merely a regulatory violation but a serious criminal offense punishable by imprisonment

[18] SEBI (Prohibition of Insider Trading) Regulations, 2015.

© 2025. International Journal of Law Management & Humanities [ISSN 2581-5369]

under the Criminal Justice Act 1993. This marked a shift from solely relying on civil penalties to pursuing criminal sanctions against market abusers.

- Tough Stance on Market Abuse: The decision reinforced the UK's zero-tolerance approach to insider trading, signaling that the authorities would pursue custodial sentences for those engaging in market abuse, regardless of the profit earned or the position of the offender.
- Deterrence and Market Integrity: By imposing a prison sentence, the court sought to deter insider trading and promote investor confidence by ensuring that those who misuse confidential information would face severe consequences.
- Role of the FSA[19]: The case demonstrated the FSA's proactive approach in prosecuting insider trading cases and its commitment to enhancing the credibility of regulatory enforcement in the UK's financial markets.

The R v. McQuoid decision established that insider trading is a criminal crime that carries a jail sentence in addition to being a breach of fiduciary responsibility, marking an important turning point in the development of the UK's insider trading legislation. It helped fortify the regulatory framework for combating market abuse and established a precedent for further convictions. Additionally, by bringing the UK's enforcement strategy into line with international norms, this case sent the message that market manipulation would not be accepted in one of the most important financial markets in the world. The decision was essential in promoting openness, equity, and investor protection in the financial markets and helped to increase the legitimacy of the UK's regulatory framework.

6. ASIC v. Citigroup Global Markets Australia Pty Ltd. (2007):

The case of ASIC[20] v. Citigroup Global Markets Australia Pty Ltd. (2007) is a landmark decision in Australian corporate and securities law, addressing the critical issue of conflict of interest between investment banking activities and insider trading. The ruling underscored the importance of maintaining robust internal controls, corporate governance standards, and ethical practices to prevent insider trading, especially within large financial institutions where access to sensitive information is common. The case arose when the ASIC, the primary regulator of financial markets in Australia, brought proceedings against Citigroup Global Markets Australia Pty Ltd., the Australian arm of the multinational financial services corporation Citigroup. ASIC alleged that Citigroup had engaged in insider trading and breached its fiduciary duties while

---

[19] Financial Services Authority.

[20] Australian Securities and Investments Commission.

acting as an adviser in a corporate takeover bid for Toll Holdings Ltd.

Background of the Case:

In 2005, Toll Holdings, a logistics company, announced its intention to make a takeover bid for Patrick Corporation Ltd. Citigroup was engaged by Toll Holdings to provide investment banking advisory services regarding the proposed bid. While providing advisory services, Citigroup's proprietary trading desk purchased shares in Patrick Corporation, allegedly using unpublished price-sensitive information (UPSI) that Citigroup had obtained through its advisory role.

ASIC alleged that Citigroup:

1. Had misused confidential information obtained in the course of its advisory role.
2. Failed to implement adequate Chinese walls (information barriers) between its advisory and proprietary trading divisions to prevent the flow of confidential information.
3. Had a conflict of interest between its advisory services (which owed a fiduciary duty to Toll Holdings) and its proprietary trading activities (which sought to profit from market transactions).

Legal Issues:

The primary legal issues in the case were:

1. Conflict of Interest: Whether Citigroup's simultaneous involvement in both investment advisory services and proprietary trading created an unacceptable conflict of interest.
2. Insider Trading: Whether Citigroup's proprietary trading activities were based on unpublished price-sensitive information obtained through its advisory role.
3. Fiduciary Duty: Whether Citigroup owed a fiduciary duty to Toll Holdings and, if so, whether it had breached that duty by engaging in proprietary trading.
4. Internal Controls and Corporate Governance: Whether Citigroup had implemented adequate internal controls (such as Chinese walls) to prevent the misuse of confidential information.

Court Ruling:

The Federal Court of Australia ultimately dismissed ASIC's insider trading claims, ruling in favour of Citigroup. However, the case set several important precedents:

1. Corporate Fiduciary Duty: The court held that an investment bank may not automatically owe a fiduciary duty to its corporate clients unless there is a clear and

explicit agreement establishing such a duty. However, the ruling emphasized that where such a duty exists, the institution must act in the best interests of its client and avoid conflicts of interest.

2. Chinese Walls (Information Barriers): The judgment highlighted the importance of implementing robust internal controls such as Chinese walls to prevent the flow of confidential information between different business divisions. The court acknowledged that while Citigroup had established such barriers, the effectiveness of these controls would be critical in avoiding insider trading violations.
3. Corporate Governance and Compliance: The ruling underscored the need for financial institutions to adopt stringent compliance policies, training programs, and monitoring mechanisms to mitigate the risk of insider trading and ensure adherence to legal and ethical obligations.
4. Market Confidence: The case serves as a reminder of how important corporate governance is to preserving investor and market trust in financial institutions, especially in very competitive and rising markets.

Significance of the Case:

Although Citigroup was ultimately not found liable for insider trading, the case had far-reaching implications for corporate governance and regulatory enforcement in Australia. It emphasized that:

- Financial institutions must proactively implement internal controls to prevent conflicts of interest and insider trading.
- The effectiveness of Chinese walls and other compliance measures would be scrutinized by regulators to assess the institution's commitment to ethical practices.
- Companies must balance their profit-driven proprietary trading activities with their fiduciary duties to clients and the broader responsibility of maintaining market integrity.

The ASIC v. Citigroup ruling reinforced Australia's commitment to combating market abuse and served as a warning to financial institutions that regulators would not hesitate to investigate and prosecute insider trading allegations, even where the breach involved complex organizational structures.

The case also prompted many financial institutions to strengthen their internal controls and adopt best practices in corporate governance to mitigate the risk of insider trading and enhance investor confidence.

This decision remains a cornerstone of Australian securities law, reflecting the evolving approach to corporate responsibility, regulatory compliance, and the protection of market integrity in the global financial landscape.

7. Rajaratnam v. United States (2011):

One of the most important and well-known insider trading trials in US history, Rajaratnam v. United States (2011), marked a sea change in the application of technology surveillance techniques in financial crime investigations and the enforcement of securities laws. The wealthy founder of the Galleon Group, one of the biggest hedge funds globally, Raj Rajaratnam, was found guilty of masterminding a complex and wide-ranging insider trading operation. Rajaratnam's conviction revealed the hedge fund industry's pervasive exploitation of private, non-public information and brought attention to the growing use of technology surveillance techniques like wiretaps in investigations of white-collar crime. The case also illustrated how international collaboration is becoming more and more important in the fight against insider trading in international financial markets.

Background of the Case:

The Galleon Group, a hedge fund with billions of dollars in assets, was founded and managed by Raj Rajaratnam, a Sri Lankan-American hedge fund manager. Rajaratnam participated in a broad-based insider trading conspiracy from 2003 to 2009, receiving unpublished price-sensitive information (UPSI) from business insiders, including staff members of significant corporations including IBM, Intel, Google, and Goldman Sachs. One of the biggest insider trading cases in US history, Rajaratnam made over $72 million in illegal gains by using this sensitive knowledge to make lucrative transactions. A network of consultants, investment experts, and company insiders participated in the program, giving Rajaratnam access to private information in return for cash or other advantages.

Legal Issues:

The primary legal issues in the case revolved around:

1. Wiretap Evidence: The case was noteworthy because it was the first insider trading trial in the US to primarily depend on wiretap evidence, a method commonly employed in investigations into narcotics trafficking and organised crime. The prosecution obtained direct proof of insider trading conversations by using wiretaps to intercept hundreds of phone conversations between Rajaratnam and his accomplices.
2. Conspiracy and Fraud: The prosecution argued that Rajaratnam orchestrated a criminal

© 2025. International Journal of Law Management & Humanities [ISSN 2581-5369]

conspiracy involving multiple participants, demonstrating the organized and systematic nature of the insider trading scheme.

3. MNPI[21]: Section 10(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and Rule 10b-5 of the US Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) rules are violated when trading on substantial, non-public information that has been received from insiders, as the case reaffirmed.
4. Use of Technology in White-Collar Crime Investigations: The case highlighted the increasing reliance on technological tools such as wiretaps, data analysis, and surveillance to detect and prosecute insider trading schemes in the digital age.
5. International Cooperation: Given Rajaratnam's connections to global financial markets, the case underscored the importance of cross-border cooperation between regulatory authorities in different countries to address insider trading cases involving multiple jurisdictions.

Court Ruling:

The United States District Court for the Southern District of New York found Raj Rajaratnam guilty on 14 charges of conspiracy and securities fraud in 2011. In addition to a $10 million fine and the seizure of $53.8 million in illegal earnings, he received one of the harshest jail terms ever given for insider trading in the United States—11 years. The court's ruling made it clear that insider trading, especially involving well-known figures in the financial sector, would result in harsh prosecution. The decision established a precedent for upcoming insider trading cases and underlined the importance of wiretap evidence in white-collar crime investigations.

Significance of the Case:

The Rajaratnam v. United States case marked a watershed moment in the global fight against insider trading, with several key implications:

1. Technological Surveillance in Insider Trading Investigations: The case demonstrated that wiretaps and advanced surveillance tools could be highly effective in gathering direct evidence of insider trading conversations, significantly enhancing the enforcement capabilities of regulators and law enforcement agencies.
2. Deterrence and Tougher Sentences: The lengthy prison sentence imposed on Rajaratnam signalled a zero-tolerance approach to insider trading and served as a powerful deterrent

[21] Material Non-Public Information.

against market abuse.

3. International Cooperation: The case highlighted the need for cross-border regulatory cooperation to combat insider trading in an increasingly interconnected global financial system. The US authorities collaborated with regulators in several countries to gather evidence and track financial transactions across jurisdictions.
4. Corporate Governance and Compliance: The case reaffirmed how crucial it is for financial institutions to have strong internal controls and compliance initiatives in place in order to identify and stop insider trading.
5. Public Trust in Financial Markets: Following the global financial crisis of 2008, the prosecution of a well-known hedge fund manager contributed to the restoration of public trust in the integrity and fairness of the financial markets.

Conclusion:

An important illustration of how insider trading rules are changing and how enforcement efforts are increasingly depending on technology is the Rajaratnam v. United States (2011) case. It proved that insider trading is a major criminal offence that compromises investor trust and market integrity in addition to being a breach of fiduciary responsibility. The case established a strong precedent for authorities throughout the world and demonstrated the increasing significance of global collaboration and diverse enforcement tactics in handling instances involving cross-border insider trading. This case upheld the fundamental rule that no one is above the law, regardless of their money, power, or standing in the financial sector. This rule continues to be a pillar in the worldwide campaign against insider trading and market manipulation.

8. Hindustan Lever Limited Case (1998):

A seminal case in India's insider trading laws, the Hindustan Lever Limited Case (1998) made a substantial contribution to the development of the nation's securities laws and the upholding of corporate governance standards. The case established a precedent for guaranteeing market fairness, transparency, and investor protection while highlighting the crucial role that fiduciary obligations play in insider trading legislation. It emphasised that business insiders have a duty to behave in the best interests of shareholders and refrain from abusing price-sensitive knowledge for their own benefit.

Background of the Case:

The case involved HLL[22] now known as HUL[23] one of India's largest consumer goods companies, which was a subsidiary of the multinational conglomerate Unilever Plc. The controversy arose in 1996 when HLL purchased 8 lakh shares (800,000 shares) of BBLIL[24] from the UTI[25] in a private off-market transaction, just weeks before the official announcement of the merger between the two companies.

At the time of the transaction, HLL held a significant stake in BBLIL, and both companies were subsidiaries of Unilever Plc. The merger between HLL and BBLIL, announced shortly after the transaction, was expected to result in a rise in BBLIL's share price, making the acquisition of shares by HLL highly profitable.

Legal Issues:

The case raised several critical legal issues, including:

1. Insider Trading Allegations: Whether HLL, being in possession of UPSI[26] about the impending merger, had engaged in insider trading by purchasing shares of BBLIL before the merger announcement.
2. Fiduciary Duties of Corporate Insiders: Whether HLL's directors, who were privy to confidential information about the merger, had breached their fiduciary duties by using such information to gain an unfair advantage.
3. Market Manipulation and Corporate Governance: Whether the transaction violated principles of corporate governance and market integrity, undermining investor confidence.
4. Regulatory Jurisdiction: The role of the SEBI in investigating and enforcing insider trading regulations.

SEBI Investigation and Findings:

Based on claims of insider trading, SEBI, the regulatory body in charge of monitoring the Indian securities markets, opened an inquiry into the deal.

After a detailed inquiry, SEBI concluded that:

- At the time of the share transaction, HLL had access to price-sensitive information that had not yet been made public regarding the upcoming merger between HLL and BBLIL.

[22] Hindustan Lever Limited.
[23] Hindustan Unilever Limited.
[24] Brooke Bond Lipton India Limited.
[25] Unit Trust of India.
[26] unpublished price-sensitive information.

© 2025. International Journal of Law Management & Humanities

- The transaction constituted insider trading as defined under the SEBI (Insider Trading) Regulations, 1992.
- Because they had access to private information, HLL's directors had a fiduciary obligation to the company's shareholders and the general investing public to act honestly and refrain from abusing it.

SEBI held that HLL had breached insider trading regulations by exploiting confidential information for its own benefit, setting a precedent for holding corporate insiders and companies accountable for insider trading.

Legal Principles Established:

The Hindustan Lever Limited Case established several important legal principles in India's insider trading regulations:

1. Corporate Insiders' Fiduciary Duties: The decision upheld the principle that directors and other corporate insiders have a fiduciary duty to shareholders to behave in the company's best interests and refrain from using price-sensitive information for their own benefit.
2. Definition of Insider Trading: The case helped clarify the definition of insider trading under the 1992 Regulation [27], emphasizing that trading on unpublished price-sensitive information constitutes a violation of securities laws.
3. Role of SEBI in Insider Trading Enforcement: In order to preserve market integrity and investor trust, the case demonstrated SEBI's proactive role in looking into claims of insider trading and enforcing laws.
4. Corporate Governance: The ruling underscored the importance of corporate governance practices in preventing insider trading and promoting transparency and fairness in the securities markets.
5. Deterrent Effect: By holding a prominent corporate entity accountable for insider trading, the case sent a strong message that no company or individual is above the law, reinforcing the need for compliance with securities regulations.

Impact and Significance:

An important turning point in India's strategy for enforcing laws against insider trading was the Hindustan Lever Limited Case. The case illustrated SEBI's dedication to maintaining investor

[27] SEBI (Insider Trading) Regulations, 1992.

interests and market integrity, especially in the face of corporate wrongdoing by big, powerful corporations.

The ruling also prompted the Indian regulatory authorities to strengthen insider trading laws, eventually leading to the introduction of the 2015 Regulations[28] which provided a more comprehensive and robust framework for preventing insider trading.

Moreover, the case served as a wake-up call for corporate India, emphasizing the importance of:

- Transparency in corporate transactions
- Robust internal controls
- Strict compliance with fiduciary duties
- Ethical corporate governance practices

Conclusion:

The Hindustan Lever Limited Case (1998) remains a cornerstone of India's insider trading jurisprudence, highlighting the role of fiduciary duties in insider trading regulations and setting a powerful precedent for future enforcement actions. The case reinforced the principle that corporate insiders must act with integrity, prioritize shareholder interests, and avoid misusing confidential information for personal gain.

By holding one of India's most prominent companies accountable for insider trading, the case played a pivotal role in fostering market transparency, investor confidence, and corporate accountability key pillars of a healthy and fair securities market.

This case continues to serve as a guiding example of India's commitment to combating market abuse and promoting ethical corporate practices in the financial markets.

9. Reliance Industries Limited Case (2021):

The Reliance Industries Limited Case (2021) is a landmark case in India's securities market that highlights the SEBI’s proactive approach in enforcing insider trading regulations. This case reinforced SEBI’s commitment to ensuring market integrity, transparency, and fairness by closely monitoring insider transactions and imposing strict penalties on violators. The case underscored the growing emphasis on preventive surveillance mechanisms, technological tools, and regulatory vigilance to detect and prosecute insider trading activities in India's rapidly evolving financial markets.

[28] SEBI (Prohibition of Insider Trading) Regulations, 2015.

Background of the Case:

The case involved RIL[29] India's largest conglomerate with diversified business interests in sectors like petrochemicals, telecommunications, retail, and energy along with its promoters and related entities. The controversy stemmed from alleged manipulative trades and insider trading activities conducted by RIL and its related parties during the sale of RIL's shares in the cash and futures market in 2007.

The transactions occurred when RIL was planning to sell a large block of its own shares through the stock exchange to comply with the statutory requirements of reducing its promoter shareholding. The sale was executed through Reliance Petro investments Limited (RPIL) a wholly-owned subsidiary of RIL. However, SEBI found that RIL had entered into proprietary trading in the futures segment while simultaneously offloading its own shares in the cash segment, resulting in artificial price suppression and market manipulation.

Allegations:

The primary allegations made by SEBI were:

1. Insider Trading: SEBI alleged that RIL and its related entities were in possession of UPSI regarding the sale of RIL shares and misused this information to execute trades in the futures and options market.
2. Market Manipulation: The coordinated trading strategy between RIL and RPIL was designed to artificially depress the share price of RIL in the cash market, allowing the company to profit from its futures market position, thereby violating the PFUTP[30] Regulations, 2003.
3. Failure to Maintain Market Integrity: The trades were executed in a manner that compromised market fairness and investor confidence, undermining the principles of transparent price discovery and market efficiency.

SEBI's Investigation:

SEBI conducted a detailed investigation into the transactions, relying on trade data analysis, surveillance systems, and advanced technological tools to detect the patterns of market manipulation and insider trading. The investigation revealed that:

- RIL had prior knowledge of the sale of its own shares, which constituted unpublished price-sensitive information (UPSI).

[29] Reliance Industries Limited.
[30] Prohibition of Fraudulent and Unfair Trade Practices.

© 2025. International Journal of Law Management & Humanities

- The proprietary trades executed through RPIL were designed to create artificial demand-supply pressure in the market, resulting in the manipulation of RIL's share price.
- The trades caused losses to retail investors while generating illicit profits for the company.

Court Ruling and Penalties:

In 2021, SEBI passed a final order holding Reliance Industries Limited (RIL) and its promoters guilty of insider trading and market manipulation. The regulatory authority imposed the following penalties:

- A monetary penalty of ₹25 crore on Reliance Industries Limited.
- A ₹15 crore penalty on Reliance Petro investments Limited (RPIL).
- Ban on certain key executives from participating in the securities market for a specified period.

The ruling sent a strong message that SEBI would not tolerate market manipulation or insider trading, even if it involved the largest corporate entities in India.

Legal Principles Established:

The Reliance Industries Limited Case (2021) established several important legal principles, including:

1. Proactive Role of SEBI: The case highlighted SEBI's proactive surveillance systems in detecting and investigating insider trading activities, even in complex corporate transactions involving large companies.
2. Technological Surveillance Tools: The ruling showcased SEBI's use of advanced data analytics, trade patterns, and electronic surveillance mechanisms to uncover market manipulation schemes.
3. Strict Liability on Corporates and Insiders: The case demonstrated that corporate entities and their promoters can be held directly liable for insider trading and market manipulation, reinforcing the accountability of corporate governance structures.
4. Market Integrity and Investor Protection: The case reinforced the importance of fair price discovery mechanisms and transparent market practices to protect investor confidence in the securities market.
5. Corporate Governance: The ruling emphasized the need for companies to implement strong internal controls and compliance programs to prevent insider trading and market

© 2025. International Journal of Law Management & Humanities

abuse.

Significance of the Case:

The Reliance Industries Limited Case (2021) marks a significant milestone in India's journey toward market transparency and regulatory enforcement. The case is notable for:

- SEBI’s increasing reliance on technological tools and surveillance systems to detect insider trading activities.
- Imposing hefty penalties on one of India's largest corporations, signalling that no company, regardless of its size or influence, is above the law.
- Strengthening the role of corporate governance and compliance frameworks in preventing insider trading and market abuse.
- Demonstrating SEBI's commitment to investor protection and market fairness by holding powerful corporate entities accountable.

Conclusion:

The Reliance Industries Limited Case (2021) serves as a landmark example of SEBI's proactive and technology-driven approach to combating insider trading and market manipulation. The case underscores the critical role of corporate governance, fiduciary duties, and regulatory vigilance in maintaining market integrity and protecting investor confidence.

By imposing strict penalties on one of India's most influential companies, the ruling reaffirmed the principle that all market participants—irrespective of their size or stature—must adhere to the highest standards of transparency and fairness.

The case sets a powerful precedent for future enforcement actions, signaling SEBI's unwavering commitment to ensuring a level playing field in India's capital markets and upholding the principles of corporate accountability and investor trust.

V. Enforcement challenges

Despite the existence of robust legal frameworks, the enforcement of insider trading regulations faces several significant challenges that impede the effectiveness of regulatory efforts. These challenges stem from the complexity of financial markets, technological advancements, and jurisdictional limitations, making insider trading detection and prosecution a formidable task. The primary enforcement challenges include:

1. Evidentiary Issues: One of the biggest obstacles in insider trading prosecutions is proving an insider's purpose and establishing a clear causal connection between trading

decisions and Material Non-Public Information (MNPI). Prosecutions for insider trading need proving the accused:

- Had access to material non-public information.
- Intended to use this information for personal gain.
- Executed trades based on the privileged information.

Since insider trading often involves circumstantial evidence rather than direct proof, regulators must rely on transaction patterns, communication records, and witness testimony, which can make legal proceedings prolonged and uncertain.

2. Technological Evolution: The rapid advancement of technology in financial markets complicates insider trading detection. The proliferation of:
    - High-frequency trading (HFT) systems
    - Dark pools (private exchanges for trading securities)
    - Algorithmic trading platforms

enables market participants to execute trades at lightning speeds, making it difficult for regulators to identify suspicious transactions in real-time. The complexity of these systems requires regulators to deploy advanced surveillance algorithms and artificial intelligence tools to detect irregular trading patterns.

3. Cross-Border Transactions: The globalization of financial markets allows securities transactions to be conducted across multiple jurisdictions. Cross-border transactions present several challenges, including:
    - Differing legal definitions of insider trading across countries.
    - Variations in evidentiary standards and enforcement priorities.
    - Limited jurisdictional reach of regulatory authorities.

Cooperation between international regulatory bodies, such as through MLATs[31] and information-sharing agreements, is essential but often time-consuming and bureaucratic.

4. Resource Constraints: Regulatory agencies often operate under budgetary limitations and staff shortages, which hinder their ability to monitor market activities comprehensively. The sheer volume of daily market transactions and the increasing complexity of financial instruments create significant demands on enforcement bodies,

[31] Mutual Legal Assistance Treaties.

making it challenging to prioritize investigations and allocate resources effectively.

5. Whistleblower Protection: Whistleblower programs can play a crucial role in uncovering insider trading schemes. However, the lack of adequate protections for whistleblowers and fear of retaliation can deter individuals from reporting insider trading activities. Moreover, the absence of financial incentives in some jurisdictions further reduces the likelihood of whistleblowers coming forward.
6. Anonymity in Digital Markets: The rise of DeFi[32] platforms and cryptocurrency markets presents new enforcement challenges. Blockchain networks allow transactions to be conducted without revealing the identities of participants, making it difficult for regulators to:
    - Trace insider trading activities.
    - Identify market participants.
    - Establish links between MNPI and suspicious trades.

Regulators must develop innovative technological solutions and collaborate with blockchain analytics firms to enhance their ability to monitor digital transactions.

7. Public Perception and Political Influence: High-profile insider trading cases involving politically influential individuals or corporations can attract significant public scrutiny. Political pressure may influence the outcome of investigations, creating inconsistencies in enforcement and potentially undermining public confidence in regulatory institutions.

Addressing Enforcement Challenges

To overcome these challenges, regulatory authorities must adopt a multifaceted approach that includes:

- Investing in cutting-edge machine learning and artificial intelligence-powered surveillance technologies.
- Enhancing international cooperation through information-sharing networks and cross-border partnerships.
- Strengthening whistleblower protection frameworks by offering financial incentives and legal safeguards.
- Developing specialized units to monitor cryptocurrency markets and blockchain

[32] Decentralized finance.

transactions.

- Increasing financial and human resources to improve investigative capacity.
- Promoting legislative reforms to harmonize insider trading laws across jurisdictions.

By leveraging technology, fostering global collaboration, and enhancing regulatory frameworks, enforcement agencies can improve their capacity to detect, investigate, and prosecute insider trading cases more effectively, thereby upholding market integrity and protecting investor interests.

VI. Conclusion and Recommendations

In the context of regulating insider trading, adopting a balanced approach requires integrating legal frameworks, technological advancements, and cooperative strategies. This section outlines key recommendations that regulatory bodies can implement to enhance their enforcement efforts while maintaining the efficiency of financial markets.

1. **Enhanced Surveillance Mechanisms:** The identification of insider trading can be greatly enhanced by the application of cutting-edge technology like big data and AI.[33] AI systems can analyse enormous volumes of financial data in real-time, spot questionable trading patterns, and quickly and reliably detect possible instances of insider trading. Regulators will be able to respond quickly to market wrongdoing thanks to this proactive surveillance technology.
2. **International Cooperation:** Given the global nature of financial markets, collaboration between regulatory bodies across different countries is essential. Strengthening international partnerships can facilitate better information sharing, streamline cross-border investigations, and enhance the prosecution of insider trading cases. Such cooperation ensures that regulatory efforts are consistent and effective across jurisdictions.
3. **Proportional Penalties:** Implementing a tiered penalty system can help differentiate between accidental and deliberate insider trading violations. This approach ensures that minor infractions receive lighter penalties while serious offenses attract more severe punishments. Proportional penalties promote fairness and serve as a deterrent without discouraging legitimate market participation.
4. **Whistleblower Incentive Programs:** Establishing comprehensive whistleblower

[33] Artificial intelligence.

© 2025. International Journal of Law Management & Humanities [ISSN 2581-5369]

protection laws alongside financial reward schemes can encourage individuals to report suspicious trading activities. Providing adequate legal safeguards and monetary incentives to whistleblowers can improve the detection of insider trading and support regulatory enforcement efforts.

5. **Technological Investments:** Investing in blockchain technology and smart contracts can enhance market transparency and accountability. Blockchain-based systems create permanent, tamper-proof transaction records, making it more difficult for insiders to manipulate market information without detection. This technological advancement strengthens the integrity of financial markets.
6. **Public Awareness Campaigns:** It is essential to educate market players, company insiders, and investors on the moral and legal ramifications of insider trading. By promoting moral conduct and a stronger adherence to market laws, educational initiatives can help create a culture of compliance.
7. **Periodic Review of Regulations:** Financial markets are constantly evolving, especially with the emergence of digital assets and decentralized finance. Regular reviews of insider trading laws will help ensure that regulatory frameworks remain relevant and effective in addressing new challenges. Periodic updates will enhance the adaptability and robustness of the regulatory environment.

By adopting these recommendations, regulatory bodies can effectively deter illicit trading activities while promoting a dynamic and transparent financial ecosystem. This balanced approach not only strengthens investor confidence but also supports the long-term stability and growth of financial markets.

*****

© 2025. International Journal of Law Management & Humanities

VII. References

1. Bainbridge, S.M. (2000). *Insider Trading: An Overview.* Edward Elgar Publishing.
2. Bhattacharya, U., & Daouk, H. (2002). *The World Price of Insider Trading.* Journal of Finance.
3. Chiarella v. United States, 445 U.S. 222 (1980).
4. Dirks v. SEC, 463 U.S. 646 (1983).
5. Fischel, D.R. (1984). *Insider Trading and Investment Analysts: An Economic Analysis.* University of Chicago Law Review.
6. Gilson, R.J., & Kraakman, R.H. (1984). *The Mechanisms of Market Efficiency.* Virginia Law Review.
7. Karpoff, J.M., Lee, D.S., & Martin, G.S. (2008). *The Consequences to Managers for Financial Misrepresentation.* Journal of Financial Economics.
8. Manne, H.G. (1966). *Insider Trading and the Stock Market.* Free Press.
9. Padilla, J. (2003). *Should Insider Trading Be Prohibited?* Journal of Economic Surveys.
10. Securities Exchange Act of 1934, 15 U.S.C. § 78a et seq.
11. SEC v. Texas Gulf Sulphur Co., 401 F.2d 833 (1968).
12. Bainbridge, S.M. (1999). *Insider Trading Regulation: The Path-Dependent Choice between Property Rights and Securities Fraud.* SMU Law Review.
13. The Insider Trading Prohibition Act, 2021.
14. U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (2023). *Annual Report.*
15. Bebchuk, L.A., & Fried, J.M. (2004). *Pay without Performance: The Unfulfilled Promise of Executive Compensation.* Harvard University Press.
16. UK Financial Services and Markets Act 2000.
17. EU Market Abuse Regulation (MAR), 2016.
18. SEBI (Prohibition of Insider Trading) Regulations, 2015.
19. Australian Securities and Investments Commission (ASIC) Reports.
20. Goel, A.M., & Thakor, A.V. (2010). *Do Insider Trading Laws Matter?* Journal of Finance.
21. Bhattacharya, U., & Daouk, H. (2009). *When No Law Is Better Than a Good Law.*

Review of Finance.

22. Hill, C.A. (1997). *Insider Trading and the Economic Theory of Markets.* Washington University Law Review.
23. Elliott, J. (2002). *The Role of the SEC in the Regulation of Insider Trading.* Law and Contemporary Problems.
24. Arshadi, N., & Eyssell, T. (1993). *The Law and Finance of Insider Trading: Theory and Evidence.* Kluwer Academic Publishers.
25. Park, J. (2004). *Insider Trading and Market Efficiency.* Journal of Law and Economics.

*****