WWW.IJRPR.COM

International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews

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

Harmonizing Startup Investment Regulations: A Comparative Legal Critique of India's Angel Fund Regime

Rashmi Sharma

Banasthali Vidyapith (Deemed to be University).
DOI : https://doi.org/10.55248/gengpi.6.0825.2946

Introduction

Angel investments are widely acknowledged as instrumental in bridging the early-stage financing gap between modest founder capital and later-stage venture capital. Beyond funding, angel investors contribute mentorship, networks, and strategic guidance, which studies associate with improved startup resilience and survival, a phenomenon particularly observable in developed innovation ecosystems like Silicon Valley and London.

In India, despite concerted policy efforts under Startup India and creation of the Fund of Funds for Startups (FFS), the formal bank of angel funding remains shallow (Surana et al., 2020). In response, the Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI) introduced Regulation 19A (Chapter III- A) under the SEBI (Alternative Investment Funds) Regulations, 2012, creating a legal category for "angel funds" and prescribing stringent criteria regarding investor accreditation, minimum corpus, and investment thresholds. These legal constructs aimed at enhancing transparency and protecting nascent capital market investors.

Nonetheless, empirical commentary and policy responses suggest that Regulation 19A has at times constrained angel activity rather than enabling it. Issues include the ₹25 lakh minimum per-startup investment, the restriction to AI- accredited investors, inflexible definitions excluding many startups, and governance requirements unsuited to deal- by- deal investments. SEBI's own consultation paper (Nov 2024) identified challenges such as investor exclusion, operational complexity, and lack of calibration to Indian EF realities (SEBI, 2024). Furthermore, reforms considered by SEBI, such as lowering investment thresholds and relaxing concentration caps, underscore deficiencies in the 2012 design (Reuters, 2024).

This study interrogates whether Regulation 19A has fulfilled its objectives without imposing disproportionate barriers on angel investing. It explores whether the legal architecture comprising accreditation norms, lock-in constraints, and corpus mandates, aligns with the operational realities and risk- reward profile of early-stage finance. A comparative lens situates India's regulatory design alongside international frameworks, notably the U.S. Regulation D accredited investor regime and UK's SEIS/EIS tax- incentive models, which favor flexibility and investor inclusiveness.

Methodologically, this paper follows a doctrinal and comparative legal research design. It initiates with a textual analysis of Regulation 19A and accompanying SEBI guidance. This is followed by a critical evaluation of the regulation's coherence, proportionality, and market impact. Finally, comparative insights from global regimes enable identification of feasible reforms to realign India's angel fund regime with best practices.

By treating entrepreneurial finance regulation as a domain worthy of scholarly investigation, this paper contributes to legal policy discourse on innovation finance. Its findings aim to inform both academic debate and policymaking amid ongoing SEBI reform deliberations.

Literature Review

Academic literature exploring the legal and regulatory dimensions of angel investing in India remains surprisingly sparse. The earliest structured research focused on how SEBI's Venture Capital Fund (VCF) Regulations, 1996, and later the AIF Regulations (2012), sought to institutionalize private capital into standardized vehicles. Recent studies by Surana et al. (2020) have highlighted continuing structural constraints, noting India's angel financing remains shallow despite investor networks like the Indian Angel Network (IAN) expanding over time. However, these remain finance-focused discussions rather than legal critiques, and Regulation 19A is largely unexamined in academic literature.

By contrast, international scholarship provides richer analyses of regulatory regimes in jurisdictions with mature angel ecosystems. U.S.-based studies examine how Regulation D and Regulation A+ frameworks facilitate both accredited and non- accredited investment via scalable instruments and limited disclosure burdens. UK and European scholarship critiques investor classification thresholds for excluding women and ethnic minorities, particularly when high-income thresholds impede equity inclusion, leading to policy reversals in financial promotion limits. Comparative reviews (e.g., Cambridge Centre for Alternative Finance) underscore that regulatory environments directly influence entrepreneurial finance levels and modes across geographies.

Grey literature, including policy reports, legal commentaries, and industry consultation paper, offers more targeted insights into the Indian context. A SEBI consultation paper issued November 2024 critiques features of Regulation 19A, such as accreditation mandates, investment thresholds, caps on single-company exposure, and applicability to non-DPIIT recognized startups, as overly rigid relative to market needs (SEBI, 2024). Subsequent coverage elaborates on operational limitations of Reg. 19A, and notes that SEBI has considered lowering investment thresholds, expanding investor definitions, and relaxing lock-in norms to stimulate early capital formation. Industry bodies like IVCA and DPIIT have similarly advocated for simplifying compliance and incentivizing angel networks, particularly after the abolition of angel tax in 2024 rendered formal angel fund registration less attractive for informal investors.

Despite this rich policy dialogue, there remains no focused academic legal analysis addressing how Reg. 19A's specific legal norms, such as investor accreditation, corpus size, lock-in periods, and diversification requirements, affect early-stage capital access. Nor has any comparative scholarship systematically assessed how these rules align or misalign with global best practices in regimes like the U.S. and UK that prioritize flexibility, self-certification, and minimal barriers for angel investing.

This gap is particularly critical given recent legal reforms and stakeholder feedback. SEBI's Alternative Investment Policy Advisory Committee (AIPAC) has recommended redesigning the angel fund framework to better align accreditation with suitability, and to reclassify accredited angel investors as QIBs for private placement under the ICDR Regulations, allowing fundraising freedom beyond the normal 200-investor cap in Companies Act Section 42(2). Critics caution that these changes may dilute portfolio diversification norms and weaken sponsor commitment alignment in high-risk early-stage investing.

In summary, while academic discourse on entrepreneurial finance regulation exists, legal analysis specifically targeting Regulation 19A is absent. Global and national policy literatures highlight both the importance of flexible angel frameworks and the growing misfit between Indian law and market realities. The research gap lies at the nexus of legal design and practical efficacy, justifying a doctrinal and comparative study that interrogates Reg. 19A's suitability in the 21st-century startup ecosystem.

Doctrinal Analysis of Regulation 19A

Textual Analysis of Regulation 19A

Regulation 19A of the SEBI (Alternative Investment Funds) Regulations, 2012, establishes the legal framework for Angel Funds as a special sub-category within Category I AIFs, delineating the permissible structure, investor profile, and investee eligibility (SEBI, 2025a). Under Regulation 19A (2), SEBI defines an "angel investor" as a person falling within one of three categories: (a) an individual with net tangible assets of at least ₹2 crore, who has early-stage investment experience, serial entrepreneurship, or ten years of senior managerial experience; (b) a body corporate possessing a minimum net worth of ₹10 crore; or (c) a pre-registered AIF or Venture Capital Fund under SEBI's prior regulatory regime.

Sub-regulation 19A (3) further delineates investee eligibility, mandating investments exclusively in DPIIT-recognized startups consistent with the Government's 2019 notification. Eligible companies must be incorporated in India, be less than three years old, have annual turnover not exceeding ₹25 crore, be unlisted, not related to industrial groups with a turnover above ₹300 crore, and have no statutory familial connections with the investing angel investor(s).

Additionally, Regulation 19D prescribes financial parameters for angel funds: minimum corpus of ₹5 crore, individual minimum subscription of ₹25 lakh (with a three-year contribution window), sponsor/manager continuing interest of at least 2.5% (or ₹50 lakh), and default diversification limits (maximum 25% exposure to a single investee). A mandatory lock-in period requires that at least 51% of capital remain committed for a minimum of three years or until exit, whichever is earlier.

Through this textual lens, Regulation 19A constructs a tightly circumscribed legislative regime centered on capital discipline, investor protection, and regulatory oversight. The static nature of these criteria—net-worth thresholds, DPIIT dependence, and investment limits—signals a regulatory approach more attuned to safeguarding financial integrity than fostering early, flexible, and rapid-stage capital flows. These features, while well-intentioned, diverge sharply from the fluid, deal-by-deal ethos characteristic of angel investing in more mature ecosystems.

Structural and Compliance Design of Angel Funds

Regulation 19A, together with related provisions in SEBI's Alternative Investment Funds (AIF) Regulations, 2012, sets out detailed structural and compliance rules for Angel Funds. Under Regulation 19D, Angel Funds must maintain a minimum corpus of ₹5 crore, considerably lower than Category I norm of ₹20 crore, and minimum per-investor subscription of ₹25 lakh, to be paid within three years of launch. Additionally, each fund sponsor or manager must retain a continuing interest of at least 2.5% of corpus or ₹50 lakh, ensuring alignment with investor outcomes.

A maximum investment cap of ₹5 crore per investment prevents overexposure, while a one-year lock-in requirement ensures capital continuity, mandating that at least 51% of committed investor capital remains invested until exit or maturity, whichever comes first. These provisions together reflect SEBI's objective of enforcing prudential norms and investor protection in high-risk early-stage financing.

Nonetheless, industry feedback and SEBI's November 2024 consultation paper have questioned the proportionality of these compliance requirements. In particular, the statutory thresholds were criticized as overly rigid, limiting smaller funds and deal-by-deal angel investors. SEBI has proposed

reducing the minimum per-investee investment from ₹25 lakh to ₹10 lakh, raising the maximum to ₹25 crore, removing the 25% concentration cap, and eliminating minimum corpus, provided at least five accredited investors ((Taxmann Advisory Services, 2025). Furthermore, the lock-in may be halved to six months, subject to the exit being made to third parties.

Taken together, the structural and compliance design of Regulation 19A embodies a risk-averse and portfolio-based regulatory regime. While these provisions potentially promote sponsor discipline and diversified exposure, they also diverge from deal-based flexibility, characteristic of global angel investing practices. SEBI's proposed reforms indicate a policy shift toward operational ease, lower entry barriers, and increased liquidity flexibility in the angel fund design.

Interpretative and Implementation Challenges

Despite Regulation 19A's textual clarity, its interpretation and implementation reveal significant mismatches with early-stage investment realities.

a) Inconsistent Investor Accreditation

SEBI's eligibility criteria for angel investors demand specific thresholds: individuals with ₹2 crore net worth and relevant entrepreneurial experience, or corporates with ₹10 crore net worth. SEBI's 2025 consultation paper proposes aligning these norms with global accredited investor frameworks and third-party verification. This proposal, while progressive, creates tension with existing SEBI self-declaration processes and conflict with Companies Act standards, forcing many angels toward informal syndication to retain deal agility.

b) Lock- In and Concentration Caps Out of Sync

A mandated one-year lock-in on 51% of capital restricts flexibility for early-stage investors who often need exit capability within shorter windows due to follow-on funding or venture failure expectations. Similarly, the 25% maximum exposure rule prevents high-conviction investment, contrary to global angel investing customs where small, concentrated bets are typical.

c) Compliance Overlap and Legal Friction

SEBI's 2022 circular attempted to clarify sponsor roles, but ambiguity remains in complying simultaneously with AIF rules, Companies Act §42, and residual angel tax implications. These overlapping regulatory demands complicate compliance for informal or small network-based funds.

The regulatory friction undermines transparency and raises legal uncertainty, particularly for early-stage market participants.

d) SEBI's Reform Signals Indicate Misalignment

In its November 13, 2024 consultation, SEBI proposed key reforms: lowering minimum investment per startup from ₹25 lakh to ₹10 lakh; raising the maximum cap to ₹25 crore; removing the 25% concentration limit; reducing lockdown periods to six months for third-party exits; and eliminating corpus minimums for smaller funds with ≥5 accredited investors. It also endorsed classifying accredited investors as QIBs under ICDR Regulations, allowing exemption from the Companies Act's 200-investor cap.

This section demonstrates that Regulation 19A's design, though structurally coherent, causes exclusion, operational rigidity, and regulatory friction. SEBI's reform proposals implicitly acknowledge these shortcomings, pointing toward a necessary recalibration for a more flexible and inclusive angel fund ecosystem.

Regulatory Circulars and Reform Signals

SEBI has engaged in a series of regulatory adjustments and reform consultations that highlight both evolving interpretations of Regulation 19A and broader attempts to recalibrate the angel fund framework in response to stakeholder concerns.

a) 2024 Consultation Paper Reforms (Nov 13, 2024)

As part of its broader review of the AIF regime, SEBI published a detailed consultation paper proposing key changes to Regulation 19A (SEBI, 2024). These include lowering the minimum per-investee investment threshold from ₹25 lakh to ₹10 lakh**,** eliminating corpus minimum for small-scale funds with five or more accredited investors, lifting the 25% cap on corpus concentration, and reducing the lock-in period to six months for third-party exits**.** It also advanced the idea of recognizing accredited angels as Qualified Institutional Buyers (QIBs) under ICDR regulations to bypass the 200-investor cap under Companies Act §42, thereby easing private placement.

b) Institutional Acknowledgement & Industry Pressure

Industry groups such as the Indian Angel Network, IVCA, and TiE India have consistently advocated for these regulatory reforms. Their input framed the 2022 circular and 2024 proposals. NITI Aayog and DPIIT policy briefs emphasized that angel fund rigidity was stalling early-stage capital deployment, urging flexible regulatory innovation suited to high-growth startup environments.

c) Significance

Together, these circulars and reform proposals reveal a regulatory system that, though initially rigid, demonstrates adaptive capacity. The proposed amendments signal SEBI's recognition of operational misalignment and an intention to pivot toward policy that balances investor protection with ecosystem flexibility. This dynamic stands in stark contrast to static regulatory regimes and suggests a legal regime in transition.

Critical Appraisal

Policy Objectives vs. Outcomes: Has Regulation 19A Really Unlocked Early- Stage Capital?

Regulation 19A was introduced with the explicit aim of formalizing angel investing in India—enhancing transparency, standardizing investor protection, and catalyzing access to early-stage capital. Yet, measurable outcomes from its implementation over more than a decade reveal a significant divergence between regulatory intent and real-world results**.**

From a quantitative standpoint, as of March 2023, only 82 angel funds were registered with SEBI, indicating a narrow funnel of capital and limited investor participation despite increasing startup activity (Reuters, 2024). Independent reports corroborate that this scale of investment constitutes a marginal share of India's early-stage financing, especially when compared to aggregate venture capital flows exceeding ₹3 lakh crores, signaling underperformance in the angel segment despite regulatory enclosure.

Interviews and policy commentary emphasize that Regulation 19A's high thresholds and accreditation norms act as systemic barriers. The ₹25 lakh minimum investment per startup rule, combined with DPIIT-recognition requirements, deters both informal angels and high-risk, early-stage ventures—particularly outside metro hubs—causing many to bypass formal funds.

Furthermore, SEBI's 2024 consultation proposals implicitly acknowledge failure in meeting objectives. By suggesting lowering investment thresholds to ₹10 lakh**,** removing corpus minima for funds with ≥5 accredited angels**,** relaxing concentration limits, and shortening lock-in durations**,** SEBI implicitly concedes that existing norms did more to constrain than facilitate capital deployment.

Market dynamics also point to unintended consequences. Abolition of the angel tax in 2024 reduced the incentive to use formal angel funds, pushing investors into direct and informal transactions to avoid regulatory friction, further reducing the impact of Regulation 19A on sprawling startup capital ecosystems (Startup India, n.d.).

Collectively, these developments suggest that while Regulation 19A succeeded in establishing a formal regime, it failed to unlock substantial early-stage capital. Instead of broadening the investor base and catalyzing agile funding, it produced a framework that is structurally exclusionary, benchmark-heavy, and misaligned with innovation financing norms. The reforms under consultation are itself a tacit admission: policy details matter significantly, and overly rigid legal design may achieve compliance without generating the intended innovation outcomes.

Practical Challenges: DPIIT Constraint, Minimum Investment, and Definition Problems

Regulation 19A's design reflects an ambition to codify angel investing within formal legal architecture, but practical implementation reveals critical misalignments with the realities of India's early-stage finance ecosystem.

(a) High Minimum Investment Threshold

The ₹25 lakh minimum investment per startup requirement under Regulation 19D (3) aims to ensure serious capital deployment. However, this threshold disproportionately affects emerging angels or micro-funds operating at deal-by-deal scale. SEBI itself identifies this as impractical, having proposed reducing the floor to ₹10 lakh in its November 2024 consultation paper, indicating tacit acknowledgment that the higher limit suppresses participation by smaller or newer angels.

(b) Narrow Definitions and Accreditation Barriers

Eligibility definitions restrict angel investors to individuals with ≥₹2 crore net worth or specific entrepreneurial experience, and bodies corporate with ≥₹10 crore net worth. SEBI has acknowledged that this definition excludes many sophisticated angels with deep domain knowledge but lacking the prescribed financial credentials. The 2024 consultation proposed third-party accreditation to standardize verification, but this may raise costs and still exclude experienced non-credentialed participants, narrowing the investor base even further.

(d) Structural Mismatch with Deal-Based Investing Culture

Many angels operate through flexible, deal-by-deal syndication rather than pooled fund structures with fixed corpus. Regulation 19A's corpus requirement (previously ₹10 crore and later ₹5 crore) and ongoing sponsor capital thresholds (2.5% or ₹50 lakh) reflect pooled-investment mindset. SEBI's own proposals suggest removing corpus mandates entirely for funds with ≥5 accredited investors, signaling recognition that the corpus model is structurally misfit for Indian angel investing realities (Mondaq, 2024).

(e) Fragmentation of Legal Definitions

Conflicts with overlapping legal regimes, such as Companies Act private placement caps under Section 42, and divergence between SEBI vs. corporate law investor definitions, create confusion. These fragmented definitions contribute to legal friction and drive many investors toward the informal segment, defeating the regulation's transparency intent.

The practical challenges with Regulation 19A, namely high minimum thresholds, narrow accreditation, structural mismatch, and fragmented definitions, reveal deep misalignment between regulatory design and market realities. These factors collectively restrict access, deter participation, and incentivize informal alternatives, thereby limiting the regulation's effectiveness as a mechanism to unlock early-stage entrepreneurial capital.

Consequences: Informal Markets, Stifled Innovation, Founder Dilution Early

Regulation 19A's restrictive framework has led to material consequences for India's early-stage finance environment, consequences that may undermine the regulation's original intent of broadening and formalizing angel investment.

(a) Growth of Informal Markets

Rather than channeling investment into regulated Angel Funds, investors increasingly operate via informal syndicates or direct investments. Data and commentary reveal firms structuring private deals under Section 42 of the Companies Act or investing as individuals to avoid regulatory thresholds and lock-ins of Regulation 19A. SEBI's 2024 consultation paper implicitly acknowledges this shift by proposing lower thresholds and relaxed accreditation norms, suggesting formal structures are losing traction.

(b) Innovation Stagnation

The narrow investor pool, filtered by high capital and experience thresholds, restricts investment in novel but non-traditional ventures, such as deep-tech startups led by first-time founders without institutional backing. This constraint disproportionately affects sectors and geographies outside India's major startup clusters, diminishing innovation diversity and slowing ecosystem development. Recent policy briefs (by DPIIT and NITI Aayog) note that early-stage innovation momentum remains geographically and sectorally limited, partly reflecting regulatory gating of angels (NITI Aayog, 2023).

(c) Founder Dilution and Deal Structure Rigidities

Formal Angel Funds impose high minimum ticket sizes and aggregated investment timelines, requiring founders to sell larger equity shares earlier or accept less favorable terms to meet Regulation 19A's criteria. Conversely, flexible informal syndicates offer smaller investments with customized deals that preserve founder control. The regulatory mismatch thus pressures founders to dilute more equity early on or shift to informal capital, which reduces transparency and founder leverage in negotiations.

(d) Economic and Ecosystem Implications

The combined effect of informal finance growth, constrained innovation, and early equity dilution hampers India's broader entrepreneurial finance landscape. While venture capital continues its growth trajectory, early-stage entry points remain structurally narrow, feeding a pipeline bottleneck at the seed-to-series A transition. The perennial gap in early financing access contrasts sharply with jurisdictions like the US and UK, where angel networks and micro-investments flourish under light regulation and generous incentives.

The outcomes of Regulation 19A, namely, proliferation of informal markets, dampened innovation diversity, and increased founder dilution, underscore a policy-regulation misalignment. Rather than formalizing and democratizing angel investing, the current structure often funnels early-stage capital outside regulated frameworks, compromising the original objectives of transparency, protection, and market expansion.

Contrast with U.S., UK, and Singapore: Accreditation, Self-Certification, Tax Incentives, and Use of SAFEs

To properly evaluate Regulation 19A's efficacy, it is instructive to contrast India's framework with international precedent, specifically the U.S., UK, and Singapore**,** which offer more flexible, incentive-aligned regulatory approaches for angel investing.

(a) United States

The U.S. operates under Regulation D, which allows accredited investors to self-certify their status and participate in private placements with minimal regulatory friction (U.S. SEC, n.d.). Unlike India's rigid thresholds, U.S. practice permits inclusion of sophisticated non-accredited investors under certain exemptions such as Rule 506(b) (U.S. SEC, n.d.). The market also widely uses Simple Agreements for Future Equity **(**SAFE**s)**, originating from Y Combinator, enabling rapid, deal-based investments without the structural rigidity of pooled funds (University at Buffalo, n.d.). These frameworks result in broad participation across investor types and low-cost deal execution.

(b) United Kingdom

The UK's Seed Enterprise Investment Scheme (SEIS) and Enterprise Investment Scheme (EIS) provide generous tax relief to angel investors, up to 50% income tax relief and capital gains tax exemption after a holding period which is under EIS up to £1 million and under SEIS up to £100,000 per annum (HMRC, 2023). HMRC's Advance Assurance system allows companies to secure prior eligibility status, reducing investor risk. Investor accreditation is largely self-declared, and regulatory oversight is light-touch, fostering diverse and geographically distributed angel networks.

(c) Singapore

Singapore's Angel Investors Tax Deduction (AITD) scheme offers a 50% tax deduction capped at S$250,000 (for S$100,000 qualifying investments) over a two-year holding period, for the investments made during the period between 1 Mar 2010 to 31 Mar 2020 (Inland Revenue Authority of Singapore, n.d.). The regulatory design favored direct investments in qualifying startups, with limited structure requirements and no pooled fund mandates. Additionally, institutional incentives such as Fund Management Incentive (FMI) for approved VCFs helped foster early-stage institutional

funding mechanisms (Ministry of Trade and Industry Singapore, 2020). Similarly, zero tax status under Section 13H also provided a much-needed boost (Monetary Authority of Singapore, n.d.). While the AITD has lapsed, its legacy underscores Singapore's historical preference for ecosystem-friendly, incentive-aligned angel finance regulation.

Comparative Insights

Dimension	India (Reg 19A)	U.S. / UK / Singapore
Investor Accreditation	Rigid, needs high net worth & SEBI acc.	Self-certification; flexible inclusion
Structural Requirements	Corpus thresholds, lock-in norms	Deal-based instruments like SAFEs
Tax Incentives	None for angel funds	Generous (SEIS/EIS, AITD, VCF tax breaks)
Participation Barriers	High excluding many angels and startups	Low with broad investor/startup access

U.S., UK, and Singapore frameworks demonstrate a shared philosophy: incentivize early-stage risk-taking through tax relief, flexibility in accreditation, minimal entry barriers, and deal-based investment models. In stark contrast, Regulation 19A imposes structural and procedural rigidity, potentially stifling precisely the type of dynamic, decentralized investment practice championed in other ecosystems.

This comparative analysis illuminates the structural shortcomings of India's angel regime, reinforcing the argument that Regulation 19A's overly prescriptive design is misaligned with global best practices that have demonstrably supported innovation and inclusive investor participation.

Policy Alternatives & Reform Options

Easing Definitions and Thresholds

A central policy critique of Regulation 19A is its reliance on rigid eligibility definitions and high entry thresholds—elements that now appear ripe for recalibration. The SEBI consultation paper (Nov 13, 2024) proposes significant modifications: reducing the minimum investment per startup from ₹25 lakh to ₹10 lakh, eliminating the minimum corpus requirement for small-scale angel funds comprising at least five accredited investors, and removing the 25% concentration cap, provided each deal involves contributions from at least three investors. These proposals implicitly admit that existing thresholds are overly exclusionary and function as barriers to entry rather than enablers of entrepreneurial finance.

Easing of thresholds aligns with global norms, where accredited investor statuses are typically self-certified, not mechanically enforced. The U.S. model under Regulation D allows eligible individuals or entities to participate in private placements after self-declaration or third-party verification, without corpus mandates or lock-in periods. This enables deal-based, flexible participation by angels without high capital entry barriers.

Beyond scaling down thresholds, another proposal is establishing third-party accreditation frameworks, where investment suitability and risk profile can be assessed without rigid net-worth ceilings. This reflects a shift from asset-based eligibility (₹2 crore) toward experience-based or domain-based accreditation, opening room for sophisticated but lower-net-worth investors.

In India, it is strongly advocated to expand the definition of eligible angel investors to include founders-turned-investors, serial entrepreneurs, and domain experts regardless of net worth. Such agency-based accreditation would democratize access without compromising investor protection.

Moreover, by lowering thresholds and broadening definitions, the regulatory system can better accommodate micro-funds or deal-by-deal syndicates, which characterize the emergent Indian angel ecosystem. Removing barriers for smaller pooled vehicles ensures annotated inclusion without undermining structural safeguards.

In sum, easing definitions and thresholds by adopting self-certification, lowering minimum investment requirements, and diversifying accredited eligibility criteria helps align Regulation 19A with both international regulatory precedents and India's sectoral growth patterns, facilitating greater participation, flexibility, and equity in early-stage capital deployment.

Introducing Flexible Instruments: SAFEs and No Lock-In

A crucial limitation of Regulation 19A is its insistence on pooled-fund structures and rigid lock-in periods**,** amenities that conflict with the operational dynamics of angel investing. The regulation mandates a minimum corpus and a three-year lock-in on 51% of capital, both of which impair founder and investor flexibility, hamper deal speed, and elevate transactional friction.

A promising policy alternative is the formal recognition of deal-based instruments, such as Simple Agreements for Future Equity (SAFEs), a legal innovation widely adopted in Silicon Valley and U.S. ecosystems. SAFEs allow investors to inject capital at early stages, deferring valuation and governance terms until a priced round occurs. They are scalable, founder-friendly, and inherently flexible, aligning well with the short cycle and high uncertainty profile of seed-stage deals. The Y Combinator model**,** which popularized SAFEs, has shown global efficacy in reducing transaction friction and standardizing early angel agreements.

In India, early-stage investments still gravitate toward pure convertible notes or equity**,** often negotiated ad hoc due to the absence of formal SAFE recognition. Integrating SAFEs into SEBI's regulatory framework, by permitting their use under Angel Fund or deal-by-deal categories, while ensuring minimal disclosure, sponsor alignment, and investor eligibility, can formalize the existing informal practice without imposing fund-level infrastructure.

Equally important is the removal or significant reduction of the mandatory lock-in period. Sectoral feedback indicates that the lock-in dilutes both investor agility and founder flexibility, especially since many startups raise follow-on capital or pivot within 12–18 months. While SEBI has now reduced the lock-in requirement to One year in its latest amendment, allowing even shorter lock-in, e.g., six months for third-party exits, would mitigate the mismatch without entirely abandoning oversight.

Implementation of these flexibilities can benefit from a regulatory sandbox approach, where SEBI permits pilot use of SAFEs and deal-based investing under controlled conditions, tracked for compliance, risk exposure, and deal performance. This nurtures experimentation and helps ensure policy coherence before broad adoption.

International models reinforce the advantage. The United States widely accepts SAFEs and convertible notes, with no mandatory lock-ins or corpus constraints for angel syndicates. The United Kingdom allows similar flexibility under EIS-pre-qualified status, and Singapore historically supported deal-based early-stage instruments alongside its now-phased-out AITD scheme.

By recognizing deal-based instruments like SAFEs and relaxing lock-ins, regulators can better align with how angel investing naturally operates, without compromising investor protection or market integrity. Such reform not only legitimizes informal innovation but anchors it within transparent, scalable legal frameworks, enhancing both ecosystem dynamism and policy relevance.

Regulatory Sandbox for Early-Stage Entrepreneurial Finance

India's current regulatory environment for angel investing is rigid and structural, making it difficult to accommodate novel financing instruments and emergent early-stage models. One way to pilot flexibility while maintaining oversight is through a regulatory sandbox specifically tailored for entrepreneurial finance, a live-testing space where select early-stage funding mechanisms can be trialled under controlled relief from formal rules.

The Securities and Exchange Board of India introduced a broader Regulatory Sandbox framework (2020), which permits limited-duration exemptions, up to 12 months, from regulatory obligations for innovative products or business models under SEBI's AIF regulations (SEBI, 2020). Although initially focused on fintech innovation, this mechanism could be adapted to test deal-by-deal angel investing structures**,** permissible use of SAFEs**,** or streamlined accreditation models in collaboration with angel networks or incubators.

SEBI's Innovation Sandbox embodied this experimental ethos by allowing anonymized access to stock market data, participant testing in virtual environments, and cooperation with entities like exchanges and registrars, provisioning innovation resources without disrupting live markets. Translating this approach to angel finance would enable trial of relaxed corpus, lock-in, or accreditation norms under monitored conditions.

Notably, SEBI's initial sandbox uptake has been disappointing (SEBI, n.d.). Industry analysts attribute slow adoption to conservative regulatory posture and statutory rigidity. A dedicated EF-specific sandbox could overcome these constraints by focusing on deal pipelines, investor feedback, exit timelines, and legal modularity to test the feasibility of simplified rules, without compromising investor protection.

Such an experimental sandbox model could incorporate stages: stage one for controlled pilots (e.g., SAFEs under exception to lock-in and corpus mandates) and stage two for scale testing with limited cohorts. Upon success, regulators could integrate these models into permanent frameworks via graduated inclusion. India's fintech sandbox shortlisted fractional shares and custody models; an angel-finance sandbox could similarly catalyze legal adoption of flexible EF practices.

By deploying a fintech-style sandbox model for EF, SEBI can proactively coexist with innovation rather than retroactive enforcement. This provides regulatory experimentation with minimal risk exposure, facilitating evidence-based reforms**,** iterative rule-making, and responsive oversight, thereby fostering a more inclusive, dynamic early-stage financing ecosystem.

Strengthening the Market Without Over-Regulating

India's regulatory landscape for angel investing is defined by an inherent caution, aimed at deterring misuse, but often at the cost of stifling legitimate early-stage capital formation. The challenge is to fortify investor confidence and market integrity without burdening nascent actors with disproportionate compliance.

A core reform principle is **proportionality**, tailoring regulations to the scale and risk of transactions. Regulation 19A under the SEBI (AIF) Regulations imposes minimum investment thresholds of ₹25 lakhs**,** strict lock-ins, and detailed reporting obligations. While intended to ensure investor sophistication, these provisions create high entry barriers, pushing many informal transactions outside the regulatory perimeter.

Rather than over-regulating, SEBI could promote soft-regulatory mechanisms**,** such as registration-based accreditation, as practiced in the UK via the Financial Conduct Authority (Financial Conduct Authority, n.d.). Similarly, standard model documents**,** and industry-led certification for angel networks as in FCA Handbook, UK, is practiced widely globally. These tools would guide behavior without legally binding all early-stage investment models

Transparency frameworks, such as simplified disclosure templates, suggested by the Indian Venture and Alternate Capital Association (IVCA), can also improve market discipline without legal coercion (SEBI, 2023). This aligns with global best practices, where regulators publish standard terms for seed-stage equity or hybrid instruments without enforcing one-size-fits-all templates.

Further, establishing self-regulatory organizations (SROs) for angel networks, recognized by SEBI, can foster compliance through peer monitoring and community-driven norms, reducing reliance on formal enforcement (IOSCO, 2021). Singapore's MAS has adopted this approach with startup platforms, leveraging soft law over statutory mandates to foster innovation (Monetary Authority of Singapore, 2021).

Finally, improving tax clarity and incentive alignment**,** such as streamlined treatment under Section 56(2)(viib) of the Income Tax Act or broader applicability of Angel Tax exemptions, would strengthen trust in formal channels (Government of India, 2021). This approach reinforces regulatory inclusion without statutory escalation.

Thus, a layered strategy, proportionality, soft law, fiscal predictability, and ecosystem-led compliance, can build a robust market without overreach. It aligns investor incentives with entrepreneurial innovation while preserving space for regulatory discretion when needed.

Conclusion

This paper set out to critically assess the regulatory framework governing angel investing in India, with particular focus on Regulation 19A under the SEBI (Alternative Investment Funds) Regulations, 2012. Through a doctrinal and comparative lens, it examined how the regulation has shaped the contours of early-stage capital formation and whether it aligns with India's broader ambitions to foster a dynamic startup ecosystem.

The core finding is that Regulation 19A, though well-intentioned in seeking transparency and investor protection, has not effectively catalyzed the angel investment market**.** Instead, its rigid eligibility thresholds, investment minimums, and lock-in requirements have created structural disincentives, limiting participation, pushing transactions into informal channels, and discouraging the use of flexible instruments such as SAFEs (Simple Agreements for Future Equity). In contrast, jurisdictions like the United States and Singapore have adopted light-touch accreditation regimes**,** built innovation sandboxes, and offered tax incentives to unlock capital while maintaining baseline safeguards.

The Indian regulatory approach, by contrast, remains risk-averse and compliance-heavy**,** often treating early-stage investing with the same regulatory lens as institutional finance. Such an approach underestimates the agile, relationship-based nature of angel capital and its dependence on trust, experimentation, and rapid iteration. By prioritizing investor vetting over market development, the current framework inadvertently stifles innovation at the point it is most fragile.

Given India's strategic push toward becoming a global startup hub, underscored by initiatives like *Startup India* and the growth of DPIIT-recognized startups**,** regulatory inertia on early-stage finance is a missed opportunity. If India is to harness its entrepreneurial potential, it must shift toward an ecosystem-enabling regulatory logic, one that facilitates legitimate investment flows, lowers entry barriers, and evolves with market realities.

Urgent reform is needed, not in dismantling investor protection, but in recalibrating the balance between oversight and opportunity**.** Regulation 19A must be reimagined as a tool not just of control, but of capability-building**,** paving the way for a more inclusive, innovative, and resilient entrepreneurial finance landscape in India.

References

Angel Investors Tax Deduction Scheme (AITD). (n.d.). *Inland Revenue Authority of Singapore.* Retrieved from https://www.iras.gov.sg/taxes/individual-income-tax/basics-of-individual-income-tax/special-tax-schemes/angel-investors-tax-deduction-scheme-(aitd)

Buffalo University. (n.d.). *What is a SAFE?*. Startup Ventures Blog. Retrieved from https://www.buffalo.edu/partnerships/startup-support/startup-blog/suv-news.host.html/content/shared/www/partnerships/suv-blog/startup-news/what-is-safe.detail.html

CDSL. (n.d.). *Master Circular for Alternative Investment Funds*. Central Depository Services (India) Ltd. Retrieved from https://www.cdslindia.com/downloads/Publications/Communique/SEBI-CIR-Master-Circular-for-Alternative-Investment-Funds.pdf

Financial Conduct Authority. (n.d.). *FCA Register*. Retrieved from https://register.fca.org.uk/s/

Government of India. (2021, September 2). *Press release on consolidated e-ban-nasic reforms [Press release]*. Embassy of India, Washington, D.C. https://www.indianembassyusa.gov.in/pdf/taxcorner/PressRelease_Consolidated_2sep.pdf

Gov.uk. (n.d.-a). *Venture capital schemes: Apply for the Enterprise Investment Scheme*. Retrieved from https://www.gov.uk/guidance/venture-capital-schemes-apply-for-the-enterprise-investment-scheme

Gov.uk. (n.d.-b). *Venture capital schemes: Apply to use the Seed Enterprise Investment Scheme*. Retrieved from https://www.gov.uk/guidance/venture-capital-schemes-apply-to-use-the-seed-enterprise-investment-scheme

Ministry of Trade and Industry Singapore. (2020). *Section 13H and Fund Management Incentive – Media Fact Sheet*. Retrieved from https://www.mti.gov.sg/-/media/MTI/COS-2020/Microsite/Factsheets/ESG-Media-Fact-Sheet-on-Section-13H-and-Fund-Management-Incentive-at-MTI-COS.pdf

Mondaq. (2024, December). *Recent developments in India's corporate & commercial laws – December 2024*. Retrieved from https://www.mondaq.com/india/shareholders/1560822/recent-developments-in-indias-corporate-commercial-laws-december-2024?utm_source=chatgpt.com

Monetary Authority of Singapore. (2021). *Financial Stability Review 2021*. Retrieved from https://www.mas.gov.sg/publications/financial-stability-review/2021/financial-stability-review-2021

Monetary Authority of Singapore. (n.d.). *Fund tax incentive scheme for family offices*. Retrieved from https://www.mas.gov.sg/schemes-and-initiatives/fund-tax-incentive-scheme-for-family-offices

NITI Aayog. (2023). *Annual report 2022–2023*. Retrieved from https://www.niti.gov.in/sites/default/files/2023-02/Annual-Report-2022-2023-English_06022023_compressed.pdf

Reuters. (2024, November 13). *India markets regulator proposes higher investment limits for angel funds*. Retrieved from https://www.reuters.com/world/india/india-markets-regulator-proposes-higher-investment-limits-angel-funds-2024-11-13/

Securities and Exchange Board of India. (2020, June 5). *Framework for regulatory sandbox* [Circular]. Retrieved from https://www.sebi.gov.in/legal/circulars/jun-2020/framework-for-regulatory-sandbox_46778.html

Securities and Exchange Board of India. (2024, November). *Consultation paper on review of regulatory framework for angel funds in AIF Regulations*. Retrieved from https://www.sebi.gov.in/reports-and-statistics/reports/nov-2024/consultation-paper-on-review-of-regulatory-framework-for-angel-funds-in-aif-regulations_88449.html

Securities and Exchange Board of India. (2025, February 10). *Securities and Exchange Board of India (Alternative Investment Funds) Regulations, 2012 (last amended on February 10, 2025)*. Retrieved from https://www.sebi.gov.in/legal/regulations/feb-2025/securities-and-exchange-board-of-india-alternative-investment-funds-regulations-2012-last-amended-on-february-10-2025-_92424.html

Securities and Exchange Board of India. (2025, May 23). *Securities and Exchange Board of India (Alternative Investment Funds) Regulations, 2012 (last amended on May 23, 2025)*. Retrieved from https://www.sebi.gov.in/legal/regulations/may-2025/securities-and-exchange-board-of-india-alternative-investment-funds-regulations-2012-last-amended-on-may-23-2025-_94150.html

Securities and Exchange Board of India. (n.d.). *SEBI regulatory sandbox page*. Retrieved from https://www.sebi.gov.in/sebiweb/other/RegulatorySandbox.jsp

Surana, K., Pal, P., & Sampath, P. G. (2023). Strengthening science, technology, and innovation-based incubators to help achieve Sustainable Development Goals: Lessons from India. *Technology in Society, 72*, 102232. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2022.102232

Taxmann. (2024, February 12). *SEBI board meeting highlights: Major reforms in IPOs, AIFs, SSE & more*. Retrieved from https://www.taxmann.com/post/blog/analysis-sebi-board-meeting-highlights-major-reforms-in-ipos-aifs-sse-and-more?utm_source=chatgpt.com

U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission. (n.d.-a). *Private placements – Rule 506(b)*. Retrieved from https://www.sec.gov/resources-small-businesses/exempt-offerings/private-placements-rule-506b

U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission. (n.d.-b). *Regulation D offerings*. Investor.gov. Retrieved from https://www.investor.gov/introduction-investing/investing-basics/glossary/regulation-d-offerings

Startup India. (n.d.). *Comprehending the angel tax exemption*. Retrieved from https://www.startupindia.gov.in/content/sih/en/bloglist/blogs/comprehending_the_angel_tax_Exemption.html