Page 4398 - 4407 **DOI:** *https://doij.org/10.10000/IJLMH.1111997*

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LAW MANAGEMENT & HUMANITIES

[ISSN 2581-5369]

Volume 9 | Issue 2

2026

Regulatory Oversight of Initial Public Offerings: SEBI vis-à-vis Australian and Canadian Securities Regulators

UJALA KUMARI[1] AND PURNIMA TYAGI[2]

ABSTRACT

Initial Public Offerings (IPOs) represent a critical mechanism through which companies access capital markets and broaden ownership structures. Effective regulation of IPOs is essential to ensure transparency, investor protection, market integrity, and efficient capital formation. In India, the Securities and Exchange Board of India plays a central role in supervising IPO processes through disclosure norms, eligibility criteria, pricing regulations, merchant banker obligations, and post-listing compliance requirements. Comparable regulatory functions are performed in Australia by the Australian Securities and Investments Commission and in Canada by provincial securities regulators coordinated through the Canadian Securities Administrators.

This article undertakes a comparative study of the regulatory oversight of IPOs under these three jurisdictions. It examines the legal framework governing prospectus disclosures, due diligence standards, investor remedies, enforcement mechanisms, and listing supervision. While SEBI has adopted a disclosure-based regulatory model with increasing emphasis on governance and retail investor safeguards, Australia relies on strong corporate disclosure obligations under the Corporations Act, and Canada employs a decentralized but harmonized securities framework.

The study highlights both common objectives and structural divergences. India's centralized regulator enables quicker policy intervention, whereas Canada's provincial model offers flexibility but may generate fragmentation. Australia demonstrates a balanced approach combining statutory liability and market efficiency. The article concludes that SEBI can further strengthen IPO regulation by enhancing scrutiny of issue pricing, simplifying compliance for emerging companies, and adopting global best practices in digital disclosures and crossborder offerings.

Keywords: *IPO, SEBI, ASIC, CSA, Securities Regulation, Investor Protection, Capital Markets, Comparative Law.*

[1] Author is a Student at Law College Dehradun, Uttaranchal University, Dehradun, Uttarakhand, India

[2] Author is an Assistant Professor at Law College Dehradun, Uttaranchal University, Dehradun, Uttarakhand, India.

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

I. INTRODUCTION

Initial Public Offerings (IPOs) are among the most significant events in the life cycle of a company, marking its transition from private ownership to public participation through stock exchange listing. IPOs enable companies to raise substantial capital for expansion, debt repayment, innovation, and market visibility. At the same time, public offerings expose investors to information asymmetry, pricing risks, governance concerns, and speculative market behaviour. Consequently, regulatory oversight of IPOs is indispensable to preserve fairness, transparency, and confidence in capital markets.

In India, the Securities and Exchange Board of India regulates IPOs under the SEBI Act, 1992, the Companies Act, 2013, and the SEBI (Issue of Capital and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations. SEBI has progressively refined the IPO framework by mandating extensive disclosures, monitoring use of proceeds, strengthening the role of merchant bankers, and protecting retail investors through reservation norms and grievance mechanisms. India's recent surge in IPO activity has further intensified the importance of effective regulatory supervision.

In Australia, IPO regulation is principally administered by the Australian Securities and Investments Commission under the Corporations Act 2001, emphasizing prospectus liability, continuous disclosure, and gatekeeper accountability. In Canada, securities regulation is administered at the provincial level through coordinated bodies such as the Canadian Securities Administrators, with harmonized prospectus standards and investor protection measures.

A comparative analysis of these jurisdictions is valuable because each reflects a distinct regulatory architecture: centralized supervision in India, federal coordination in Canada, and principles-based enforcement in Australia. Studying these models reveals how different legal systems balance market development with investor safeguards. This article therefore examines the regulatory oversight of IPOs by SEBI vis-à-vis Australian and Canadian securities regulators, focusing on disclosure standards, enforcement tools, procedural efficiency, and policy lessons for improving India's capital market regulation.

II. CONCEPT AND IMPORTANCE OF IPO REGULATION

An Initial Public Offering (IPO) is the first sale of shares by a private company to the public, enabling it to raise capital through stock exchanges. IPOs are vital to economic growth because they help businesses secure long-term funding, expand operations, generate employment, and improve corporate governance through public accountability. However, IPOs also create risks such as misleading disclosures, overvaluation, insider advantages, market manipulation, and

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

misuse of investor funds. Therefore, securities regulators play a crucial role in ensuring that public issues occur in a transparent and fair manner.

The central objective of IPO regulation across jurisdictions is to reduce information asymmetry between issuers and investors. Regulators require companies to disclose material information relating to finances, business risks, management structure, pending litigation, related-party transactions, and future use of proceeds. Investors can then make informed decisions. Another purpose of regulation is to maintain confidence in the securities market by deterring fraud and ensuring accountability of intermediaries such as underwriters, merchant bankers, auditors, and legal advisors.

Although the underlying objectives remain common, the regulatory structures differ in India, Australia, and Canada. India follows a centralized model through SEBI, Australia has a federal statutory framework under ASIC, and Canada uses a decentralized provincial system coordinated through national instruments. These variations provide useful comparative insights into effective IPO governance.

III. ROLE OF SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE BOARD OF INDIA IN IPO REGULATION

In India, IPO oversight is primarily governed by the Securities and Exchange Board of India Act, 1992, the Companies Act, 2013, and the SEBI (Issue of Capital and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations (ICDR Regulations). SEBI functions as the principal market regulator responsible for protecting investors and promoting orderly market development.

SEBI requires companies proposing an IPO to file a Draft Red Herring Prospectus (DRHP) containing detailed disclosures on financial statements, risk factors, objects of the issue, promoter holdings, litigation history, corporate governance practices, and industry outlook. SEBI reviews the DRHP and may issue observations requiring clarifications or modifications before the public issue opens. This pre-issue scrutiny acts as a preventive regulatory mechanism.

SEBI also regulates pricing transparency. Although India has largely moved to free pricing, the book-building process must comply with procedural safeguards. Allocation rules reserve portions for qualified institutional buyers, non-institutional investors, and retail individual investors, thereby broadening participation.

Merchant bankers registered with SEBI play a gatekeeping role. They must conduct due diligence, certify the accuracy of disclosures, monitor issue proceeds, and ensure compliance with listing conditions. SEBI may impose penalties, suspend intermediaries, or prohibit market access in case of misconduct.

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

Recent reforms by SEBI include stricter norms for anchor investors, lock-in requirements for promoters, monitoring of funds raised for acquisitions, restrictions on vague objects of the issue, and enhanced disclosure of key performance indicators for new-age technology companies. These measures demonstrate SEBI's adaptive approach in response to evolving market practices.

IV. IPO OVERSIGHT IN AUSTRALIA: ROLE OF AUSTRALIAN SECURITIES AND INVESTMENTS COMMISSION

Australia regulates IPOs principally under the Corporations Act 2001. The Australian Securities and Investments Commission (ASIC) acts as the chief regulator responsible for market integrity, consumer protection, and corporate compliance.

Companies undertaking an IPO must issue a prospectus containing all information that investors and their professional advisers would reasonably require to make an informed assessment of the company's assets, liabilities, profits, losses, rights attached to securities, and future prospects. This broad disclosure test emphasizes substance over form.

ASIC has powers to review disclosure documents and issue stop orders where a prospectus is defective, misleading, or incomplete. Such stop orders can prevent fundraising until deficiencies are corrected. This provides strong preventive enforcement.

Australia places considerable emphasis on liability standards. Directors, promoters, underwriters, and persons involved in preparing a prospectus may incur civil or criminal liability for misleading statements or omissions. The prospect of litigation creates strong incentives for careful due diligence.

The Australian Securities Exchange also plays an important complementary role by imposing listing rules concerning minimum spread of shareholders, profit or asset tests, escrow arrangements, and continuous disclosure obligations after listing.

A notable feature of the Australian system is the balance between regulatory flexibility and enforcement rigor. While the law permits market-based pricing and efficient fundraising, it imposes strict responsibility on gatekeepers. This model encourages credible disclosures rather than excessive merit regulation.

V. IPO REGULATION IN CANADA: ROLE OF CANADIAN SECURITIES ADMINISTRATORS

Unlike India and Australia, Canada does not have a single national securities regulator.

Securities law is administered by provincial and territorial regulators such as the Ontario Securities Commission, Autorité des marchés financiers (Quebec), and others. Coordination is achieved through the Canadian Securities Administrators (CSA), which develops harmonized national instruments.

For IPOs, issuers must file a preliminary prospectus followed by a final prospectus after regulatory review. Regulators examine whether disclosure complies with statutory requirements and whether material facts have been fairly presented. The receipt of a prospectus permits distribution of securities to the public.

Canada's "passport system" allows issuers to access multiple provinces through a principal regulator, reducing duplication and facilitating inter-provincial offerings. This is an innovative solution within a federal framework.

Canadian law imposes civil liability for misrepresentation in prospectuses. Investors who purchase securities under a misleading prospectus may sue issuers, directors, experts, and underwriters. This enhances accountability and compensatory remedies.

The Toronto Stock Exchange and other exchanges also impose listing standards regarding financial thresholds, governance structures, and timely disclosure. Venture issuers may access junior markets such as the TSX Venture Exchange, creating pathways for smaller companies.

Canada's model demonstrates that decentralized regulation can function effectively when supported by harmonization, inter-agency cooperation, and efficient passport mechanisms.

VI. INTRODUCTIONCOMPARATIVE ANALYSIS: INDIA, AUSTRALIA, AND CANADA

A. Regulatory Structure

India has a centralized regulator in SEBI, allowing quick rulemaking and uniform national standards. Australia also has a nationally integrated framework through ASIC. Canada differs by relying on provincial regulators coordinated through the CSA. While Canada's system may appear fragmented, harmonized instruments mitigate inconsistency.

B. Disclosure Standards

All three jurisdictions prioritize disclosure-based regulation. India mandates detailed DRHP disclosures under ICDR Regulations. Australia uses a principles-based "reasonable investor" disclosure standard. Canada relies on prescribed prospectus requirements with continuous updating obligations. Australia's broader standard may better capture unforeseen material matters, while India's detailed schedules improve certainty.

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

C. Enforcement Powers

SEBI can impose monetary penalties, issue directions, bar entities from markets, and initiate adjudication proceedings. ASIC can issue stop orders and pursue civil or criminal action. Canadian regulators can deny receipts, impose sanctions, and coordinate enforcement across provinces. Australia is particularly strong in prospectus liability litigation culture.

D. Investor Protection

India reserves shares for retail investors and mandates ASBA-style application processes, promoting participation. Canada and Australia focus more on disclosure quality and remedies rather than allocation quotas. India's approach is more interventionist and socially inclusive.

E. Market Access for SMEs

Canada's venture exchanges and Australia's junior listings offer flexible pathways for smaller issuers. India has SME platforms on exchanges, but compliance burdens and liquidity constraints remain challenges. Lessons may be drawn from foreign models to deepen SME capital formation.

VII. CHALLENGES IN IPO REGULATION

Despite regulatory advances, several common issues persist across jurisdictions.

Overpricing and speculative valuations: Technology and startup issuers may command high valuations unsupported by profitability. Retail investors bear risks when post-listing prices decline sharply.

Information overload: Excessively lengthy prospectuses may technically disclose risks while failing to communicate them effectively.

Conflict of interest: Intermediaries paid by issuers may face incentives to prioritize deal completion over objective scrutiny.

Cross-border offerings: Global capital raising creates jurisdictional issues regarding enforcement, accounting standards, and investor remedies.

Digital promotion and social media hype: Modern IPO marketing through influencers or online forums may distort fair dissemination of information.

SEBI, ASIC, and Canadian regulators increasingly address these concerns through better disclosures, surveillance technology, and intermediary accountability.

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

VIII. LESSONS FOR INDIA FROM AUSTRALIA AND CANADA

India can derive several lessons from comparative study:

1. **Enhanced prospectus readability:** Like Australia's concise disclosure approach, India can promote shorter and clearer risk summaries.
2. **Stronger civil liability remedies:** Easier investor compensation mechanisms may supplement SEBI's administrative enforcement.
3. **SME capital access:** Borrowing from Canadian venture market structures can improve financing channels for startups and MSMEs.
4. **Co-regulatory exchange model:** Greater collaboration between SEBI and stock exchanges can improve post-listing compliance.
5. **Technology-based supervision:** AI-driven review of prospectus inconsistencies and fund utilization can strengthen oversight.

IX. CONCLUSION OF COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT

The comparison shows that SEBI has built a robust IPO framework combining disclosure mandates, procedural controls, investor reservations, and enforcement powers. Australia emphasizes legal accountability and efficient markets, while Canada demonstrates successful coordination within a federal regulatory structure. Each jurisdiction balances investor protection with capital formation differently.

For India, the future lies not in excessive control but in smarter regulation clear disclosures, effective enforcement, proportionate compliance, and easier access for genuine enterprises. As Indian capital markets deepen and attract global investors, SEBI's continuing evolution, informed by international best practices, will remain central to the credibility and competitiveness of the IPO ecosystem.

A. Conclusion

Initial Public Offerings remain one of the most significant instruments for corporate fundraising and economic expansion, as they connect private enterprises with public capital while promoting broader market participation. However, the success of an IPO market depends not merely on the number of listings, but on the strength, credibility, and responsiveness of its regulatory framework. The comparative study of Securities and Exchange Board of India, Australian Securities and Investments Commission, and the Canadian Securities Administrators demonstrates that although each jurisdiction follows a distinct regulatory structure, all share

common objectives of investor protection, market integrity, transparency, and efficient capital formation.

In India, SEBI has established a comprehensive and increasingly sophisticated IPO framework through disclosure norms, due diligence obligations, book-building safeguards, retail investor participation measures, and post-listing compliance monitoring. Its centralized structure enables swift reforms and uniform nationwide implementation. Australia offers an effective model based on strong prospectus liability, gatekeeper accountability, and balanced market flexibility, while Canada demonstrates how decentralized regulation can function efficiently through inter-provincial harmonization and cooperative supervision.

The study also reveals continuing global challenges such as aggressive valuations, complex prospectus disclosures, conflicts of interest among intermediaries, and technological changes affecting securities promotion. These concerns require regulators to move beyond traditional compliance models toward smarter supervision driven by transparency, data analytics, and timely enforcement.

For India, valuable lessons emerge from comparative experience. SEBI can further enhance the IPO ecosystem by simplifying disclosures, strengthening civil remedies for investors, promoting SME listings, improving scrutiny of issue pricing, and integrating technology into regulatory review. Such reforms would encourage responsible entrepreneurship while maintaining investor confidence.

Ultimately, SEBI's evolving approach reflects the broader transformation of Indian capital markets into a globally relevant investment destination. By adopting best practices from Australia and Canada while retaining domestic priorities, India can create a modern IPO regime that is both growth-oriented and investor-centric.

*****

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

X. REFERENCES

1. Securities and Exchange Board of India, *Securities and Exchange Board of India Act, 1992* (India).
2. Securities and Exchange Board of India, *SEBI (Issue of Capital and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2018* (last amended 2026).
3. Securities and Exchange Board of India, *SEBI (Merchant Bankers) Regulations, 1992*.
4. Securities and Exchange Board of India, *SEBI (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2015*.
5. National Stock Exchange of India, *Eligibility Criteria – Public Issues Main Board*.
6. Australian Securities and Investments Commission, *Corporations Act 2001* (Cth) (Australia).
7. Australian Securities and Investments Commission, *Regulatory Guide 228: Prospectuses – Effective Disclosure for Retail Investors*.
8. Australian Securities Exchange, *ASX Listing Rules*.
9. Canadian Securities Administrators, *National Instrument 41-101 – General Prospectus Requirements*.
10. Ontario Securities Commission, *Securities Act* (Ontario).
11. Toronto Stock Exchange, *TSX Company Manual*.
12. Canadian Securities Administrators, *Passport System for Securities Regulation in Canada*.
13. World Bank, *Doing Business Reports: Protecting Minority Investors*.
14. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, *Corporate Governance Factbook*.
15. International Organization of Securities Commissions, *Objectives and Principles of Securities Regulation*.
16. Reserve Bank of India, *Handbook of Statistics on Indian Economy*.
17. Ministry of Finance, *Economic Survey of India* (latest editions).
18. Securities and Exchange Board of India, *General Information Document for Investing in Public Offers*.

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

19. Securities and Exchange Board of India, *Consultation Paper on Ease of Doing Business in IPOs under ICDR Regulations* (2025).

20. Securities and Exchange Board of India, *Review of Minimum Public Offer and Retail Reservation in IPO Allocations* (2025).

21. Afra Afsharipour & J. Robert Brown Jr., *The Rise of IPO Regulation in Comparative Perspective*, Journal of Corporate Law.

22. Douglas Cumming & Sofia Johan, *Venture Capital, IPOs and Securities Regulation*, Financial Markets Review.

23. Umakanth Varottil, *The Evolution of India's Securities Market Regulation*, Indian Law Review.

24. John C. Coffee Jr., *Gatekeepers: The Professions and Corporate Governance* (Oxford University Press).

25. Jennifer G. Hill, *Investor Protection in Public Offerings: Comparative Perspectives*, Company and Securities Law Journal.

*****

 [ISSN 2581-5369]