International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews

Journal homepage: www.ijrpr.com ISSN 2582-7421

A Comparative Study of Anticompetitive Regulatory Frameworks in Stock Markets: India vs. US/EU

Aman Lashkari[1], Dr. Ratnesh Kumar Srivastava[2]

[1] B.A.LL.B. (H), Law College Dehradun, Faculty of Uttaranchal University.
(lashkariaman1999@gmail.com)
[2] Assistant professor, Law College Dehradun, Faculty of Uttaranchal University.
(ratneshsrivastava@uumail.in)

ABSTRACT :

"This research study compares anticompetitive regulatory regimes controlling Indian stock markets to those in the United States and the European Union. The paper investigates the evolution of competition law in various jurisdictions, emphasising significant disparities in regulatory methods, enforcement mechanisms, and institutional structures. The report highlights each system's strengths and limitations by analysing key cases, legislation, and regulatory results, as well as suggesting possible areas for regulatory convergence and improvement. The findings show that, whereas the US and EU have mature antitrust regimes with a long jurisprudential history, India's relatively new competition system is swiftly changing, incorporating components from both jurisdictions while addressing unique market dynamics. The report closes with recommendations for improving the effectiveness of anticompetitive rules in stock markets throughout these jurisdictions."

Keywords: competition law, stock markets, anticompetitive practices, regulatory frameworks, market manipulation, India, United States, European Union

1. Introduction

Financial markets are the foundation of contemporary economies, with stock exchanges playing critical roles in capital generation, price discovery, and resource allocation. The proper operation of these markets is dependent on fair competition, transparency, and the absence of market manipulation. However, the complexity of securities trading, along with knowledge asymmetries and the possibility for huge financial advantages, provides fertile ground for anticompetitive behaviour (Bhattacharjee & De, 2020).

Recognising these issues, countries throughout the world have developed regulatory frameworks to prohibit and penalise anticompetitive behaviour in stock markets. These frameworks range greatly in terms of historical history, institutional structures, enforcement methods, and remedial capabilities. The United States and the European Union, with their significant expertise in antitrust regulation, have built complex systems that impact international norms. Meanwhile, India's fast rising economy and changing financial markets provide a counterexample of a jurisdiction applying international best practices to local conditions (Acharya, 2023).

This article compares the anticompetitive regulatory frameworks controlling India's stock markets to those in the United States and the European Union. The contrast is especially pertinent given the growing globalisation of capital markets, the development of cross-border securities transactions, and the necessity for regulatory cooperation to combat market abuses that span national borders. By studying the similarities and differences in various regulatory methods, this study hopes to identify best practices and recommend potential reforms to promote market integrity and investor protection across countries.

2. Historical Evolution of Anticompetitive Regulation

2.1 United States

The United States pioneered contemporary antitrust legislation with the passing of the Sherman Antitrust Act in 1890, in reaction to the concentration of economic power in trusts and monopolies during the late nineteenth century's rapid industrialisation (Kovacic & Shapiro, 2000). However, formal regulation of anticompetitive conduct in securities markets arose later, primarily through the Securities Act of 1933 and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, which were passed in reaction to the 1929 market crash and the accompanying Great Depression.

The Securities Exchange Act created the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC), which was responsible for enforcing federal securities laws and regulating securities markets, including stock exchanges. The Act expressly prohibits several types of market manipulation, such as wash sales, matching orders, and other deceptive acts intended to generate false market activity (Langevoort, 2019).The regulatory structure was expanded by subsequent legislation, such as the Williams Act of 1968, the Insider Trading Sanctions Act of 1984, and the Insider Trading and Securities Fraud Enforcement Act of 1988, which addressed particular types of market abuse. The Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act of 2010, passed in response to the 2008 financial crisis, expanded the SEC's ability to combat market manipulation and anticompetitive conduct (Coffee, 2015).

2.2 European Union

The European Union's approach to anticompetitive regulation in stock markets has evolved within the larger context of its competition law framework, which dates back to the Treaty of Rome (1957). Articles 101 and 102 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU), originally Articles 81 and 82 of the EC Treaty, ban agreements that limit competition and abuse of dominant market positions, respectively (Whish & Bailey, 2018). Specific regulation of securities markets at the EU level gained traction with the Financial Services Action Plan (1999-2004), which intended to create a unified financial market across the EU. The Market Abuse Directive (MAD) of 2003, the Markets in Financial Instruments Directive (MiFID) of 2004, and the Transparency Directive of 2004 all helped to develop a comprehensive framework for dealing with market manipulation and insider trading (Moloney, 2014).

The 2008 financial crisis spurred a comprehensive revision of the regulatory system. The Market Abuse Regulation (MAR) and the Criminal Sanctions for Market Abuse Directive (CSMAD) of 2014 superseded the MAD, implementing stricter prohibitions on market manipulation and broadening the scope of regulation to include new trading platforms and financial products. Similarly, MiFID II and MiFIR (Markets in Financial Instruments Regulation) reinforced the regulatory framework by implementing new transparency and trading requirements (Veil, 2017).

2.3 India

In comparison to the United States and the European Union, India has just recently begun to regulate anticompetitive conduct in stock markets. The Securities Contracts (Regulation) Act of 1956, passed soon after independence, established the fundamental framework for regulating stock exchanges and securities transactions. However, extensive regulation of securities markets began with the creation of the Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI) in 1988, which was granted legislative powers by the SEBI Act of 1992 (Varottil, 2021).

The SEBI (Prohibition of Fraudulent and Unfair Trade tactics in Securities Markets) Regulations, first issued in 1995 and later updated in 2003, expressly address market manipulation, insider trading, and other deceptive tactics. The Competition Act of 2002, which succeeded the Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Act of 1969, established the Competition Commission of India (CCI) as the principal antitrust enforcement body, supplementing SEBI's role in securities markets (Mehta & Dube, 2019).

Recent changes include the SEBI (Prohibition of Insider Trading) Regulations, 2015, which toughened the regime against insider trading, as well as modifications to the SEBI Act that increased the regulator's authority to investigate and penalise market abuses. The continual evolution of India's regulatory system indicates efforts to harmonise with international norms while resolving market-specific difficulties (Chandrasekhar, 2022).

3. Regulatory Frameworks and Institutional Structures

3.1 United States

The US regulatory system for combatting anticompetitive behaviour in stock markets includes many authorities with overlapping responsibilities. The SEC is the principal regulator of securities markets, having wide jurisdiction to investigate and penalise breaches of securities laws such as market manipulation, insider trading, and other fraudulent activities. The SEC's Division of Enforcement investigates and proposes enforcement proceedings, which may include civil fines, disgorgement of ill-gotten earnings, and injunctive relief (Cox et al., 2018).

The Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice (DOJ) is crucial in dealing with anticompetitive behaviour in the securities markets, notably cases involving price fixing, bid rigging, and market allocation schemes. The DOJ has the jurisdiction to prosecute antitrust offences, which may result in hefty penalties and jail for anyone implicated (Kovacic, 2018).

The Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC) oversees derivatives markets, such as stock index futures and options, and has the jurisdiction to fight market manipulation and fraud. The Financial Industry Regulatory Authority (FINRA), a self-regulatory organisation (SRO) representing broker-dealers, works alongside these government authorities to formulate and enforce regulations aimed at maintaining market integrity and safeguarding investors (Dombalagian, 2016).

The Sherman Antitrust Act, the Clayton Antitrust Act, the Securities Act, the Securities Exchange Act, and the Dodd-Frank Act serve as the legislative foundation for this regulatory system. These statutes provide authorities broad investigative authority, including the ability to demand records, compel testimony, and undertake market monitoring (Easterbrook & Fischel, 2019).

3.2 European Union

The EU's regulatory framework for countering anticompetitive behaviour in stock markets is implemented at both the Union and state levels. At the EU level, the European Securities and Markets Authority (ESMA), formed in 2011, seeks to improve investor protection while also promoting stable and orderly financial markets. ESMA helps shape the EU's regulatory framework and encourages supervisory convergence among national competent authorities (NCAs) (Moloney, 2018).

The European Commission's Directorate-General for Competition implements EU competition regulations by examining and penalising anticompetitive agreements and abuses of dominant positions in securities markets. National competition agencies and securities regulators in member states supplement the Commission's role by enforcing both EU and national competition and securities rules (Geradin & Henry, 2019).

Key legal measures include TFEU Articles 101 and 102, the Market Abuse Regulation (MAR), the Criminal Sanctions for Market Abuse Directive (CSMAD), MiFID II, and MiFIR. These tools create a comprehensive framework for combating various types of market abuse, such as insider trading, illegal publication of inside information, and market manipulation (Veil, 2017).

The EU system focusses on administrative punishments, with NCAs able to levy hefty fines, disgorge earnings, and disqualify professionals. The CSMAD compels member states to criminalise major incidents of market abuse, allowing for prosecution of the most egregious infractions (Siems & Nelemans, 2020).

3.3 India

India's institutional system for regulating anticompetitive behaviour in stock markets is centred on two key agencies: the Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI) and the Competition Commission of India. SEBI oversees securities markets and has wide authority to investigate and penalise market manipulation, insider trading, and other fraudulent activities. The CCI is responsible for broader competition problems, including those impacting securities markets, and has the ability to examine anticompetitive agreements, abuses of dominant positions, and mergers and acquisitions that may undermine competition.

The legislative framework consists of the SEBI Act of 1992, the Securities Contracts (Regulation) Act of 1956, the Competition Act of 2002, and several rules enacted under these laws. The SEBI (Prohibition of Fraudulent and Unfair Trade Practices in Securities Markets) Regulations and the SEBI (Prohibition of Insider Trading) Regulations are very important for combating market abuse (Varottil, 2021).

SEBI's enforcement procedures include administrative proceedings before its Adjudicating Officer, appeals to the Securities Appellate Tribunal (SAT), and finally to the Supreme Court of India. The CCI has a similar structure, with appeals to the National Company Law Appellate Tribunal (NCLAT) and finally the Supreme Court (Chandrasekhar, 2022).

One distinguishing characteristic of India's regulatory structure is the explicit acknowledgement of the necessity for collaboration between SEBI and the CCI in problems impacting securities markets. Section 21A of the Competition Act permits statutory agencies (including SEBI) to send competition-related concerns to the CCI, whereas Section 21B enables the CCI to refer matters to other statutory authorities (Sachdev, 2020).

4. Key Areas of Anticompetitive Regulation in Stock Markets

4.1 Market Manipulation

Market manipulation refers to a variety of methods aimed at intentionally influencing the price or trading volume of securities, altering the regular price discovery process. Wash trades, matching orders, tape painting, spoofing, and stacking are all examples of common types.

In the United States, Section 9(a) of the Securities Exchange Act expressly forbids price manipulation. The SEC has pursued many enforcement proceedings against market participants who participate in such tactics. In *SEC v. Masri* (2007), the court established that manipulation claims require proof of :

(1) manipulative acts;

(2) scienter (intent or recklessness);

(3) in connection with the purchase or sale of securities; and

(4) use of interstate commerce, mails, or a national securities exchange (Langlevoort, 2019).

The EU's Market Abuse Regulation gives a more precise definition of market manipulation, which includes transactions that send false or misleading signals, hold prices at artificial levels, utilise fictional devices or trickery, and disseminate incorrect information. In *Spector Photo Group NV v. CBFA* (2009), the European Court of Justice confirmed that simple possession of inside knowledge while trading constitutes insider dealing, subject to limited defences (Veil, 2017).

In India, the SEBI (Prohibition of Fraudulent and Unfair Trade activities) Regulations ban manipulative, fraudulent, and unfair business activities. In *SEBI v. Rakhi Trading Pvt. Ltd.* (2018), the Supreme Court of India confirmed SEBI's authority to penalise synchronised trading that artificially impacts prices, even if the trading pattern itself implies manipulation (Varottil, 2021).

4.2 Insider Trading

Insider trading is the trading of stocks while in possession of substantial, non-public knowledge, which is often obtained through a position of trust or confidence. All three governments ban such trade, however they use different ways to establishing insider status and substantial knowledge.

The US approach to insider trading has grown mostly through court rulings rather than clear legislative requirements. In *Dirks v. SEC* (1983), the Supreme Court created the "tipper-tippee" liability framework, which requires the tipper to breach a fiduciary obligation and obtain a personal gain for both parties to be held liable. More recently, in *United States v. Newman* (2014) and *Salman v. United States* (2016), courts revised the criteria for what constitutes a "personal benefit" (Nagy, 2019).

The EU's approach, as stated in the Market Abuse Regulation, uses a broader definition of inside knowledge and insider status. In *Geltl v. Daimler AG* (2012), the European Court of Justice established that knowledge concerning intermediate phases in a lengthy process might be considered inside information provided it fits the specificity and price-sensitivity requirements.

Insider trading in India is prohibited when insiders have unpublished price-sensitive information (UPSI), according to substantially amended legislation issued in 2015. In *Hindustan Lever Ltd. v. SEBI* (1998), the Securities Appellate Tribunal recognised that circumstantial evidence might be adequate to show insider trading in circumstances when direct evidence is impossible to collect. The Ambani insider trading case (2020) indicated SEBI's readiness to investigate high-profile persons for suspected infractions (Chandrasekhar, 2022).

4.3 Cartelization and Collusive Bidding

Cartelisation refers to agreements between rivals to control prices, allocate markets, or generally limit competition. In financial markets, such tactics might take the form of collusion among underwriters in initial public offers (IPOs), set commissions among brokers, or coordinated trading techniques.

In the United States, the Department of Justice has filed criminal antitrust cases against financial institutions for bid-rigging in a variety of marketplaces. In *United States v. Salomon Brothers* (1992), the business acknowledged to making misleading bids in Treasury securities auctions, which resulted in major penalties and market changes (Kovacic, 2018).

The European Commission has taken similar efforts to combat financial industry cartelisation. In the Euribor case (2016), the Commission fined multiple banks €1.27 billion for participating in cartels to manipulate interest rate swaps linked to Euribor and Libor, which had an indirect impact on equities markets (Geradin & Henry, 2019).

The Competition Commission of India has examined allegations of stock broker cartelisation. In *MCX Stock Exchange v. National Stock Exchange* (2011), the CCI determined that the NSE had abused its dominant position in the currency derivatives market by engaging in predatory pricing and effectively creating a barrier to competitors, but it did not find explicit cartelisation (Mehta & Dube, 2019).

4.4 Abuse of Dominance

Abuse of dominance is defined as anticompetitive behaviour by a market member with considerable market power. In stock markets, this might include exchanges imposing unreasonable terms on listed businesses or brokers, or major institutional investors influencing prices due to their enormous trading volumes.

The US strategy is centred on monopolisation and attempted monopolisation under Section 2 of the *Sherman Act. In United States v. Microsoft Corp.* (2001), the court determined that monopolisation necessitates both monopolistic power and anticompetitive behaviour in order to gain or keep such power. Although not directly relevant to stock markets, this case developed rules that apply to dominating platforms in a variety of markets, including exchanges (Easterbrook & Fischel, 2019).

The EU forbids the misuse of dominant positions under Article 102 TFEU, with an emphasis on exploitative and discriminatory actions. In *Deutsche Börse AG v. Commission* (2012), the General Court supported the Commission's decision to reject the merger of Deutsche Börse and NYSE Euronext, ruling that it would establish a near-monopoly in European financial derivatives traded on exchanges (Veil, 2017).

India's Competition Act also outlaws the misuse of dominant positions. In *NSE v. MCX* (2011), the Competition Appellate Tribunal confirmed the CCI's determination that the National Stock Exchange abused its dominance by engaging in predatory pricing in the currency derivatives area, which was later upheld by the Supreme Court (Sachdev, 2020).

5. Enforcement Mechanisms and Remedial Approaches

5.1 United States

The US enforcement system is distinguished by its multilayered approach, which includes administrative, civil, and criminal actions. The SEC can file administrative procedures before its own administrative law judges or civil cases in federal courts, seeking remedies such as injunctions, disgorgement of ill-gotten earnings, civil fines, and disqualification from acting as an officer or director of a public company (Langevoort, 2019).

Criminal enforcement, particularly by the Department of Justice, can result in substantial penalties and incarceration. In *United States v. Rajaratnam* (2011), the founder of Galleon Group received an 11-year jail sentence and a $10 million fine for insider trading, one of the heaviest punishments ever issued (Nagy, 2019).

The US system relies heavily on private enforcement. Class actions under Rule 10b-5 of the Securities Exchange Act enable investors to seek compensation for fraud-related losses. In *Halliburton Co. v. Erica P. John Fund, Inc.* (2014), the Supreme Court confirmed the "fraud-on-the-market" doctrine, which assumes that investors rely on market price integrity, allowing for class certification in securities fraud lawsuits (Coffee, 2015).

The whistleblower provisions of the Dodd-Frank Act incentivise people to disclose breaches to the SEC by giving compensation ranging from 10% to 30% of monetary penalty exceeding $1 million. This initiative has considerably improved the SEC's capacity to discover and prosecute breaches that could otherwise go undetected (Kovacic, 2018).

5.2 European Union

The EU's enforcement mechanism functions on both the Union and state levels. The European Securities and Markets Authority (ESMA) oversees enforcement measures taken by national competent authorities (NCAs), who are primarily responsible for investigating and penalising market breaches. NCAs have the authority to impose administrative punishments such as large fines, profit forfeiture, and professional disqualification (Veil, 2017).

The Criminal Sanctions for Market Abuse Directive compels member states to criminalise major incidents of market abuse, allowing for prosecution of the most egregious infractions. However, the application of criminal punishments differs between member states, resulting in inconsistencies in enforcement (Siems and Nelemans, 2020).

Private enforcement in the EU has typically been less established than in the United States, although recent attempts, such as the Antitrust Damages Directive of 2014, have attempted to improve private lawsuits for damages. In *Kone AG v. ÖBB-Infrastruktur AG* (2014), the European Court of Justice established that cartel members can be liable for "umbrella pricing" damages, when non-cartel members raise their prices in response to the cartel's price increases, expanding the scope of potential liability (Geradin & Henry, 2019).

The Market Abuse Regulation compels member states to implement methods for reporting infractions, including whistleblower protections, but without the financial incentives offered by the US system (Moloney, 2018).

5.3 India

India's enforcement structure combines administrative actions by SEBI and CCI with the possibility of criminal prosecution for some major offences. SEBI's Adjudicating Officer has the authority to impose penalties, give instructions, and begin quasi-judicial processes. Appeals are heard by the Securities Appellate Tribunal, which finally reports to the Supreme Court.
The Competition Commission has a similar structure, with appeals to the National Company Law Appellate Tribunal and finally the Supreme Court. Enterprises found to have participated in anticompetitive conduct may face fines of up to 10% of their average turnover for the previous three financial years (Mehta & Dube, 2019).
Certain securities law crimes, such as fraud and insider trading, can result in criminal prosecution; however, such cases are rare. The Companies Act of 2013 increases criminal culpability for certain business offences, particularly those involving securities (Chandrasekhar, 2022).
Private enforcement in India is weak as compared to the United States. While the Competition Act allows for compensation to be awarded to victims of anticompetitive practices, and securities laws allow for investor class actions for specific violations, procedural barriers and the lack of contingency fee arrangements limit the effectiveness of these mechanisms (Sachdev 2020).

6. Comparative Analysis: Convergences and Divergences

6.1 Regulatory Philosophy and Approach

The three jurisdictions have fundamentally different regulatory philosophies. The US regulatory system emphasises disclosure-based regulation, with stringent requirements for public firms to disclose relevant information, as well as rigorous enforcement of fraud and manipulation. This approach indicates a preference for market-based solutions, with regulation focussing on maintaining transparent and fair markets rather than prescribing results (Langevoort, 2019).
The EU system takes a more prescriptive approach, with precise laws covering different areas of market behaviour. This demonstrates a growing reliance on regulatory action to alter market behaviour, rather than only on transparency and enforcement. The EU's emphasis on administrative punishment, as opposed to the US's concentration on criminal prosecution and private lawsuits, exemplifies this conceptual divide (Moloney, 2018).
India's approach is a hybrid model, including features from both the US and EU systems and tailoring them to local needs. The SEBI Act gives the regulator considerable authority to defend investor interests and expand securities markets, showing a developmental orientation with the conventional regulatory focus on market integrity (Varottil, 2021).

6.2 Institutional Frameworks and Coordination

The three jurisdictions' institutional frameworks differ greatly. The US system has many authorities with overlapping jurisdictions (SEC, DOJ, CFTC, and FINRA), which creates opportunities for both collaboration and conflict. The EU system works at both the Union (ESMA, European Commission) and national levels (NCAs), necessitating complex coordinating procedures. India's system, with SEBI and the CCI as principal regulators, has a somewhat streamlined structure, while coordination issues persist (Mehta & Dube, 2019).
Coordination techniques also differ between jurisdictions. In the United States, memos of understanding between agencies allow information sharing and cooperative investigations. The EU established the European System of Financial Supervision, with ESMA coordinating among NCAs. India has formalised cooperation between SEBI and the CCI through statutory provisions for mutual referrals on matters impacting their respective domains (Sachdev, 2020).

6.3 Enforcement Effectiveness and Deterrence

Enforcement efficacy varies substantially by jurisdiction. The US system, which combines administrative, civil, and criminal actions, significant fines, and active private enforcement, provides a strong deterrent to anticompetitive behaviour. The SEC whistleblower program improves detection capabilities (Coffee, 2015).
While the EU system provides wide regulatory coverage, it poses issues in maintaining uniform enforcement throughout member states. The lack of US-style class actions and contingency fee agreements hinders private enforcement, while recent measures try to fill this void (Siems & Nelemans, 2020).
While India's enforcement system is quickly growing, it faces ongoing obstacles such as resource shortages, procedural delays, and little private enforcement. Recent high-profile cases, like as the NSE co-location case (2019) and the Reliance Industries insider trading case (2020), show SEBI's expanding enforcement powers (Chandrasekhar, 2022).

7. Conclusion and Recommendations

This comparative analysis reveals both significant divergences and emerging convergences in the anticompetitive regulatory frameworks governing stock markets in India, the United States, and the European Union. While these jurisdictions differ in their historical trajectories, institutional structures, and enforcement approaches, they share a common commitment to ensuring market integrity and investor protection.

The US system, with its emphasis on disclosure, robust enforcement, and private litigation, demonstrates the effectiveness of a multi-faceted approach to deterring market abuses. The EU system, with its detailed regulatory framework and administrative enforcement mechanism, highlights the importance of comprehensive rules addressing specific forms of market misconduct. India's evolving framework, adapting elements from both jurisdictions while addressing unique market conditions, illustrates the potential for regulatory learning and adaptation across borders.

Based on this analysis, several recommendations emerge for enhancing the effectiveness of anticompetitive regulations in stock markets:

1. **Enhanced International Coordination**: Given the growing global character of securities markets, improved methods for cross-border enforcement cooperation are required. Initiatives such as the International Organisation of Securities Commissions (IOSCO) lay the groundwork, but more formal agreements for information exchange, joint investigations, and reciprocal recognition of punishments would improve efficacy.
2. **Balanced Enforcement Approach**: Jurisdictions should strive for a balanced enforcement approach, incorporating administrative, civil, and criminal processes as needed. India, in particular, might benefit from increased criminal prosecution for significant market violations, whilst the EU could improve private enforcement measures.
3. **Technological Adaptation**: Regulatory frameworks must constantly adapt to technology advancements in securities markets, such as algorithmic trading, cryptocurrency exchanges, and decentralised finance platforms. The US SEC's Enforcement Division's Cyber Unit serves as a blueprint for combating technology-related market abuses.
4. **Whistleblower Protection and Incentives**: India and the EU should explore implementing features of the US whistleblower scheme, such as cash incentives for reporting significant crimes. Evidence indicates that such programs considerably improve regulatory detection skills.
5. **Regulatory Independence and Resources**: To ensure successful enforcement, regulatory authorities must be independent and adequately resourced. Political meddling and resource constraints can jeopardise even the most sophisticated regulatory structures.

As securities markets develop in response to technological innovation, cross-border integration, and shifting investor demographics, regulatory frameworks must adjust. The ongoing interaction between these three main countries, in which they learn from one another's experiences while respecting their respective legal and market environments, has the potential to lead to continual progress in addressing anticompetitive activities and strengthening market integrity.

REFERENCES

1. Acharya, V. V. (2023). Financial stability in emerging economies: The Indian experience. *Journal of Financial Stability*, 64, 101058.
2. Bhattacharjee, S., & De, O. (2020). Antitrust and innovation in the financial sector: The US and EU approach. *Journal of Competition Law & Economics*, 16(2), 151-192.
3. Chandrasekhar, K. (2022). Evolution of securities regulation in India: A critical analysis. *National Law School of India Review*, 34(1), 85-104.
4. Coffee, J. C. (2015). Entrepreneurial litigation: Its rise, fall, and future. Harvard University Press.
5. Cox, J. D., Hillman, R. W., & Langevoort, D. C. (2018). Securities regulation: Cases and materials (8th ed.). Wolters Kluwer.
6. Dombalagian, O. H. (2016). Principles of financial regulation. Oxford University Press.
7. Easterbrook, F. H., & Fischel, D. R. (2019). The economic structure of corporate law (2nd ed.). Harvard University Press.
8. Geradin, D., & Henry, D. (2019). The EC fining policy for violations of competition law: An empirical review of the Commission decisions between 2000 and 2017. *World Competition*, 42(1), 1-34.
9. Kovacic, W. E. (2018). The Chicago obsession in the interpretation of US antitrust history. *University of Chicago Law Review*, 85(2), 495-533.
10. Kovacic, W. E., & Shapiro, C. (2000). Antitrust policy: A century of economic and legal thinking. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 14(1), 43-60.
11. Langevoort, D. C. (2019). Selling hope, selling risk: Corporations, Wall Street, and the dilemmas of investor protection. Oxford University Press.
12. Mehta, P. S., & Dube, C. (2019). Competition policy and practice in India: Twenty years of implementation of the Competition Act. *Journal of Antitrust Enforcement*, 7(2), 169-195.
13. Moloney, N. (2014). EU securities and financial markets regulation (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.
14. Moloney, N. (2018). The age of ESMA: Governing EU financial markets. Hart Publishing.
15. Nagy, D. M. (2019). Beyond dirks: Gratuitous tipping and insider trading. *Journal of Corporation Law*, 42(1), 1-56.
16. Sachdev, A. (2020). Interplay between competition law and securities regulations in India. *NUJS Law Review*, 13(2), 1-28.
17. Siems, M., & Nelemans, M. (2020). The reform of the EU market abuse law: Revolution or evolution? *The Maastricht Journal of European and Comparative Law*, 19(1), 195-205.
18. Varottil, U. (2021). The evolution of corporate law and corporate governance in India: An analytical critique. *Cambridge University Press*.
19. Veil, R. (2017). European capital markets law (2nd ed). Hart Publishing.
20. Whish, R., & Bailey, D. (2018). Competition law (9th ed.). Oxford University Press.