INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW

VOLUME 6 AND ISSUE 9 OF 2026

INSTITUTE OF LEGAL EDUCATION

INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW

APIS – 3920 – 0001 | ISSN - 2583-2344

(Open Access Journal)

Journal's Home Page – https://ijlr.iledu.in/

Journal's Editorial Page - https://ijlr.iledu.in/editorial-board/

Volume 6 and Issue 9 of 2026 (Access Full Issue on - https://ijlr.iledu.in/volume-6-and-issue-9-of-2026/)

Publisher

Prasanna S,

Chairman of Institute of Legal Education

No. 08, Arul Nagar, Seera Thoppu,

Maudhanda Kurichi, Srirangam,

Tiruchirappalli – 620102

Phone : +91 73059 14348 - info@iledu.in / Chairman@iledu.in

INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW [IJLR – IF SCORE – 7.58]

VOLUME 6 AND ISSUE 9 OF 2026

APIS – 3920 - 0001 *(and)* ISSN - 2583-2344

Published by

Institute of Legal Education

https://iledu.in

A COMPARATIVE STUDY ON INSIDER TRADING LAWS IN INDIA, UK, AND USA

AUTHOR - GODHAWARI P* & DR. S.M. AZIZUNNISAA BEGUM**

* RESEARCH SCHOLAR, SCHOOL OF LAW, VISTAS, CHENNAI

** RESEARCH SUPERVISOR, SCHOOL OF LAW, VISTAS, CHENNAI.

BEST CITATION – GODHAWARI P & DR. S.M. AZIZUNNISAA BEGUM, A COMPARATIVE STUDY ON INSIDER TRADING LAWS IN INDIA, UK, AND USA, *INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW (IJLR),* 6 (9) OF 2026, PG. 901-907, APIS – 3920 – 0001 & ISSN - 2583-2344.

ABSTRACT

Insider trading, the trading of securities based on unpublished price-sensitive information (UPSI), poses a significant threat to market integrity, investor confidence, and the principle of fair disclosure. As financial markets become increasingly complex and interconnected, effective regulation of insider trading has become a global priority. This study provides a comparative analysis of the legal and regulatory frameworks governing insider trading in India, the United Kingdom, and the United States. It examines the relevant legislation, enforcement mechanisms, regulatory authorities, and penalties applicable in each jurisdiction. The study highlights the strengths and limitations of India's SEBI (Prohibition of Insider Trading) Regulations, 2015, in comparison with the more established regulatory regimes of the UK and USA. By analysing international best practices, the paper identifies areas for reform and recommends measures to strengthen India's insider trading framework. Effective regulation is essential for promoting transparency, protecting investors, and ensuring the stability and credibility of securities markets.

INTRODUCTION

Insider trading refers to the buying, selling, or dealing in securities by individuals who possess unpublished price-sensitive information (UPSI) that is not available to the general public. Such practices undermine investor confidence, distort market efficiency, and violate the principle of equal access to information, which is fundamental to fair and transparent securities markets. As financial markets become increasingly interconnected and technology-driven, the prevention and detection of insider trading have become critical concerns for regulators across the globe.

Different jurisdictions have adopted diverse legal and regulatory approaches to combat insider trading. The United States pioneered the regulation of insider trading through judicial interpretations of federal securities laws and has developed a robust enforcement mechanism through the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC). The United Kingdom addresses insider trading through a combination of criminal and civil regulations, emphasizing market abuse prevention under its comprehensive financial services framework. India, through the Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI), has progressively strengthened its insider trading regulations, particularly with the enactment of the SEBI (Prohibition of Insider Trading) Regulations, 2015.

Despite these developments, insider trading remains a persistent challenge due to the complexity of financial transactions, difficulties in gathering evidence, technological advancements, and the increasing sophistication of offenders. The banking sector, in particular, is highly vulnerable because of the sensitive financial information accessible to directors, senior management, auditors, and employees. Unauthorized use of such information can result in significant market distortions and financial losses to investors.

This comparative study examines the legal frameworks governing insider trading in India, the United Kingdom, and the United States. It analyzes the definition of insider trading, the scope of insider liability, disclosure obligations, enforcement authorities, investigative powers, and penalties imposed in each jurisdiction. The study further evaluates the effectiveness of regulatory mechanisms and judicial approaches adopted by these countries. By identifying best practices and regulatory innovations from the UK and USA, the paper seeks to suggest reforms that can strengthen India's insider trading regime and enhance the transparency, accountability, and integrity of its securities market.

A comparative analysis is particularly significant in the contemporary globalized financial environment, where cross-border transactions and multinational corporations operate across multiple jurisdictions. Understanding international regulatory standards can assist policymakers in developing a more effective legal framework capable of addressing emerging challenges and ensuring investor protection. Ultimately, a strong and efficient insider trading regulatory regime contributes to market stability, economic growth, and public confidence in the financial system

INSIDER TRADING LAWS IN INDIA

The regulation of insider trading in India, the United Kingdom, and the United States is governed by distinct legal frameworks and enforcement authorities. In India, insider trading is primarily regulated by the Securities and Exchange Board of India (Prohibition of Insider Trading) Regulations, 2015, which are administered and enforced by the Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI). These regulations prohibit trading based on unpublished price-sensitive information (UPSI) and impose disclosure and compliance obligations on listed companies and insiders.

The SEBI (Prohibition of Insider Trading) Regulations, 2015 were introduced with the objective of promoting transparency, fairness, and investor confidence in the securities market. The regulations define key concepts such as "insider," "connected person," and "unpublished price-sensitive information," thereby expanding the scope of liability beyond traditional corporate insiders. Information relating to financial results, dividends, mergers and acquisitions, changes in capital structure, and significant managerial decisions is treated as UPSI, and any trading based on such information is prohibited. The regulations also require listed companies to establish internal controls, formulate codes of conduct, and maintain structured digital databases to monitor the flow of sensitive information.

SEBI possesses extensive investigative and enforcement powers to address insider trading violations. It may call for documents, inspect records, summon individuals for examination, and investigate suspicious transactions. Where violations are established, SEBI can impose monetary penalties, issue directions restraining individuals from accessing the securities market, disgorge unlawful gains, and initiate adjudication proceedings. These powers enable SEBI to act as both a regulatory and enforcement authority in safeguarding market integrity.

Over the years, India has witnessed several significant insider trading cases that have shaped the regulatory landscape. Judicial and regulatory decisions have clarified the interpretation of insider trading provisions and strengthened compliance standards for listed entities. The introduction of stricter disclosure requirements and enhanced corporate governance measures reflects India's commitment to aligning its insider trading framework with international best practices.

Despite these advancements, challenges continue to exist in the effective enforcement of insider trading laws. The clandestine nature of insider trading, difficulties in obtaining direct evidence, increasing use of digital communication platforms, and complex financial transactions often make detection and prosecution difficult. Furthermore, proving the connection between possession of unpublished information and the execution of trades remains a significant legal challenge.

To address these concerns, SEBI has increasingly relied on technology-driven surveillance mechanisms, data analytics, and enhanced reporting systems. Continuous regulatory reforms, investor awareness initiatives, and stronger corporate compliance frameworks are essential for ensuring the effectiveness of insider trading laws. By maintaining a robust enforcement regime and adopting global best practices, India seeks to create a transparent and efficient securities market that protects investors and promotes economic growth.

INSIDER TRADING LAWS IN UK

In the United Kingdom, insider trading is governed through a combination of the Criminal Justice Act 1993, the Financial Services and Markets Act (FSMA) 2000, and the Market Abuse Regulation (MAR). The principal regulatory authority responsible for enforcing these laws is the Financial Conduct Authority (FCA), which possesses extensive powers to investigate, prosecute, and impose civil sanctions for market abuse and insider dealing.

The UK insider trading regime is characterized by its dual approach of imposing both criminal and civil liability. Under the Criminal Justice Act 1993, insider dealing is a criminal offence that occurs when an individual trades in securities while in possession of inside information, encourages another person to trade, or improperly discloses such information. Criminal convictions may result in substantial fines and imprisonment, reflecting the seriousness with which insider dealing is treated under UK law.

The Financial Services and Markets Act 2000 complement the criminal framework by empowering the Financial Conduct Authority (FCA) to address market abuse through civil and administrative measures. The FCA has broad authority to investigate suspicious transactions, require the production of documents, interview individuals, and impose financial penalties. Unlike criminal proceedings, civil enforcement actions require a lower standard of proof, enabling the FCA to take swift action against conduct that threatens market integrity.

The Market Abuse Regulation (MAR), which forms a central component of the UK's market abuse framework, provides detailed rules regarding insider dealing, unlawful disclosure of inside information, and market manipulation. MAR imposes significant obligations on issuers of securities to publicly disclose inside information as soon as possible, maintain insider lists, and establish procedures to prevent the misuse of confidential information. Persons discharging managerial responsibilities (PDMRs), such as directors and senior executives, are also subject to specific disclosure requirements regarding their transactions in company securities.

A notable feature of the UK regime is its emphasis on preventive compliance measures. Listed companies are required to implement effective internal controls, maintain accurate records of individuals who have access to inside information, and ensure that employees receive appropriate training on market abuse regulations. These measures are designed to reduce the risk of insider trading before violations occur.

The FCA employs sophisticated market surveillance systems and data analytics to identify unusual trading patterns and potential insider dealing. Cooperation with domestic and international regulatory agencies further enhances its ability to investigate cross-border market abuse cases. This proactive and technology-driven approach has strengthened the UK's capacity to detect and deter insider trading activities.

Despite its comprehensive framework, the UK continues to face challenges in combating insider dealing due to the increasing complexity of financial markets, technological advancements, and the use of indirect channels for transmitting confidential information. Nevertheless, the combination of criminal sanctions, civil enforcement mechanisms, and robust compliance requirements has made the UK one of the most effective jurisdictions in addressing insider trading and maintaining investor confidence in the securities market.

INSIDER TRADING LAWS IN USA

In the United States, insider trading laws are primarily derived from the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, particularly Section 10(b) and Rule 10b-5 promulgated thereunder. Additional legislative measures, such as the Insider Trading Sanctions Act of 1984, strengthen the enforcement framework. The Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) serves as the primary civil enforcement agency, while the Department of Justice (DoJ) is responsible for criminal prosecutions. The combined efforts of these agencies have contributed to one of the most stringent and actively enforced insider trading regimes in the world.

Unlike many jurisdictions that rely on a specific statutory definition of insider trading, the United States has developed its insider trading law largely through judicial interpretation and case law. Courts have played a significant role in defining the scope of insider trading by establishing legal doctrines such as the "classical theory" and the "misappropriation theory." Under the classical theory, corporate insiders who possess material non-public information are prohibited from trading in the securities of their company. The misappropriation theory extends liability to individuals who misuse confidential information obtained through a position of trust, even if they are not directly associated with the company whose securities are traded.

The Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) possesses extensive investigative powers to detect and prosecute insider trading violations. It may examine trading records, subpoena documents, compel testimony, and conduct detailed market investigations. When violations are established, the SEC can seek civil penalties, disgorgement of unlawful profits, injunctions, and trading bans. These remedies are intended not only to punish offenders but also to deter future misconduct and preserve investor confidence in the securities markets.

The Department of Justice (DoJ) complements the SEC's enforcement efforts by pursuing criminal prosecutions against individuals involved in insider trading schemes. Criminal convictions may result in substantial monetary fines and lengthy prison sentences. The possibility of both civil and criminal liability creates a powerful deterrent effect and demonstrates the United States' commitment to maintaining fair and transparent securities markets.

Several landmark judicial decisions have significantly shaped the development of insider trading law in the United States. Cases such as *Chiarella v. United States*, *Dirks v. SEC*, and *United States v. O'Hagan* established important principles concerning fiduciary duties, tipper-tippee liability, and the misappropriation of confidential information. These decisions have provided greater clarity regarding the circumstances under which insider trading liability arises and has influenced the regulatory approaches adopted by other jurisdictions.

The United States also employs sophisticated surveillance technologies and inter-agency cooperation to identify suspicious trading activities. The SEC utilizes advanced data analytics and market monitoring systems to detect unusual trading patterns, while cooperation with stock exchanges, financial institutions, and international regulators facilitates the investigation of cross-border insider trading cases. This technology-driven approach enhances the effectiveness of enforcement and enables regulators to respond rapidly to emerging market risks.

Despite its robust framework, the United States continues to face challenges in combating insider trading due to the evolving nature of financial markets, digital communications, and complex investment structures. Nevertheless, its combination of strong statutory provisions, influential judicial precedents, aggressive enforcement practices, and severe penalties has established one of the most comprehensive insider trading regulatory regimes in the world. The U.S. model is frequently cited as a benchmark for jurisdictions seeking to strengthen their legal and institutional mechanisms for preventing insider trading and protecting market integrity.

COMPARATIVE TABLE

Country	Primary Legislation	Regulatory Body
India	SEBI (Prohibition of Insider Trading) Regulations, 2015	Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI)
UK	Criminal Justice Act 1993, Financial Services and Markets Act (FSMA) 2000, Market Abuse Regulation (MAR)	Financial Conduct Authority (FCA)
USA	Securities Exchange Act, 1934 (esp. Section 10(b) and Rule 10b-5), Insider Trading Sanctions Act, 1984	Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC), Department of Justice (DoJ)

CONCLUSION

Insider trading remains one of the most significant threats to the fairness, transparency, and efficiency of securities markets. The comparative analysis of India, the United Kingdom, and the United States reveals that although all three jurisdictions share the common objective of protecting investors and preserving market integrity, they adopt different legislative and enforcement approaches. The United States relies heavily on judicial precedents, aggressive enforcement, and stringent civil and criminal penalties. The United Kingdom follows a dual civil and criminal enforcement model supported by comprehensive market abuse regulations. India, through the SEBI (Prohibition of Insider Trading) Regulations, 2015, has established a strong regulatory framework that continues to evolve in response to emerging market challenges.

The study demonstrates that effective regulation of insider trading requires not only comprehensive legislation but also proactive enforcement, technological surveillance, corporate compliance mechanisms, and strong institutional coordination. While India has made considerable progress in strengthening its insider trading regime, lessons from the UK and USA suggest the need for continuous reforms to address evolving market practices and technological advancements.

A transparent and well-regulated securities market is essential for economic growth, investor confidence, and financial stability. Therefore, by adopting international best practices and enhancing its enforcement capabilities, India can further strengthen its insider trading framework and ensure a fair, efficient, and trustworthy market environment. Ultimately, effective prevention of insider trading contributes to the broader goals of corporate accountability, good governance, and sustainable development of the financial sector.

SUGGESTIONS

Based on the comparative analysis of insider trading laws in India, the United Kingdom, and the United States, several measures can be adopted to strengthen the Indian regulatory framework. First, SEBI should further enhance its technological surveillance mechanisms by employing advanced data analytics, artificial intelligence, and real-time monitoring systems similar to those used by regulators in the UK and USA. Such tools can improve the detection of suspicious trading patterns and facilitate timely investigations.

Second, India may consider introducing clearer statutory provisions regarding insider trading liability. While the SEBI (Prohibition of Insider Trading) Regulations, 2015 provide a comprehensive framework, greater legislative clarity on issues such as tipper-tippee liability, indirect communication of unpublished price-sensitive information, and digital information sharing can reduce ambiguity and improve enforcement effectiveness.

Third, corporate governance standards within listed companies should be strengthened. Companies must establish robust internal compliance systems, maintain accurate insider lists, conduct regular employee training programs, and ensure strict control over the dissemination of confidential information. Periodic compliance audits can further help in identifying vulnerabilities and preventing violations.

Fourth, greater coordination between SEBI, stock exchanges, financial institutions, and law enforcement agencies is necessary to combat sophisticated insider trading schemes. Enhanced information sharing and inter-agency cooperation can improve the efficiency of investigations and facilitate effective prosecution.

Fifth, whistle-blower protection and incentive mechanisms should be expanded. The experience of the United States demonstrates that whistle-blower programs can play a significant role in uncovering insider trading activities. Encouraging individuals to report violations through secure and confidential channels can strengthen market surveillance and regulatory enforcement.

Finally, investor education and awareness initiatives should be promoted to create a culture of compliance and ethical conduct in securities markets. Market participants should be regularly informed about the legal consequences of insider trading and the importance of maintaining market integrity.

REFERENCES

Books

1. STEPHEN M. BAINBRIDGE, *INSIDER TRADING LAW AND POLICY* (2d ed. 2014).
2. V.K. AHUJA, *SECURITIES LAW AND FINANCIAL MARKETS* (3d ed. 2017).
3. PAUL L. DAVIES & SARAH WORTHINGTON, *GOWER'S PRINCIPLES OF MODERN COMPANY LAW* (10th ed. 2016).
4. MARC I. STEINBERG, *UNDERSTANDING SECURITIES LAW* (7th ed. 2018).
5. AVTAR SINGH, *COMPANY LAW* (18th ed. 2022).

Statutes and Regulations

6. Securities and Exchange Board of India (Prohibition of Insider Trading) Regulations, No. LAD-NRO/GN/2014-15/21/85, Gazette of India, Extraordinary, Part III, Section 4 (2015).
7. Securities and Exchange Board of India Act, No. 15 of 1992, INDIA CODE (1992).
8. Criminal Justice Act 1993, c. 36 (U.K.).
9. Financial Services and Markets Act 2000, c. 8 (U.K.).
10. Market Abuse Regulation (EU) No. 596/2014, 2014 O.J. (L 173) 1.

11. Securities Exchange Act of 1934, 15 U.S.C. §§ 78a–78qq (2018).

12. Insider Trading Sanctions Act of 1984, Pub. L. No. 98-376, 98 Stat. 1264.

INSTITUTE OF LEGAL EDUCATION

GRASP - EDUCATE - EVOLVE

INSTITUTE OF LEGAL EDUCATION

(Managed by L TO J LAW ASSOCIATES)

NO. 08, ARUL NAGAR, SEERA THOPPU,
MARUDHAANDA KURICHI, SRIRANGAM - 620102,
TAMILNADU, INDIA.

ISSN 2583-2344

9 772583 234004