International Journal of Scientific Research in Engineering and Management (IJSREM)
Volume: 10 Issue: 10 | Oct - 2026 SJIF Rating: 8.659 ISSN: 2582-3930

Fin-Influencer Regulation in India: SEBI's Regulatory Powers, Online Accountability and the Limits of Public Scrutiny

Dhasaradhan P, School of Law, SRM Institute of Science and Technology

Abstract—The explosive growth of retail participation in the Indian stock market has been heavily catalyzed by social media financial influencers, colloquially known as 'finfluencers.' While these individuals have democratized financial literacy, the proliferation of unregistered and often conflicted financial advice has raised severe consumer protection concerns. This doctrinal research paper provides an extensive examination of the Securities and Exchange Board of India's (SEBI) regulatory framework governing finfluencers, conducting a deep-dive analysis into its corporate investigative powers under existing statutes. Furthermore, the paper explores the complex dynamics of online accountability, evaluating the limits of public scrutiny and the delicate constitutional balance between safeguarding investor interests and protecting freedom of speech in the digital age. By dissecting the nuances of regulatory authority, discovery mechanisms, consumer rights liabilities, and dispute resolution paradigms, this study underscores the necessity of a robust enforcement mechanism against market manipulation facilitated through borderless digital channels. The paper culminates in a comparative global analysis and proposes a comprehensive policy roadmap for mitigating digital financial fraud.

Key words—**Consumer Protection, Financial Regulation, Finfluencers, Investigative Powers, Online Accountability, SEBI.**

I. INTRODUCTION

The intersection of high-speed internet proliferation, smartphone penetration, and decentralized media platforms has birthed a paradigm-shifting phenomenon in the Indian financial markets. Over the last decade, and particularly accelerated by the socio-economic conditions of the global pandemic, the Indian securities market has witnessed an unprecedented surge in retail investor participation. Central to this demographic shift is the emergence of financial content creators, widely referred to as 'finfluencers.' These individuals operate across platforms such as YouTube, Instagram, X (formerly Twitter), and Telegram, synthesizing complex macroeconomic concepts, corporate earnings reports, and investment strategies into highly engaging, easily digestible vernacular content. By dismantling the traditional barriers of financial jargon and elite institutional gatekeeping, finfluencers have undeniably contributed to a democratization of financial literacy, integrating marginalized and semi-urban demographics into the formal financial ecosystem. However, the rapid expansion of this digital ecosystem, largely operating outside the bounds of traditional financial regulation, harbors profound systemic risks. As finfluencers amass audiences numbering in the millions, their capacity to unilaterally dictate market sentiment and direct substantial retail capital flows grows exponentially. This unregulated influence is frequently monetized through opaque and highly conflicted channels, including undisclosed broker sponsorships, affiliate marketing commissions, and the covert operation of unregistered advisory services thinly veiled as 'educational masterclasses.' This extensive doctrinal study evaluates the multifaceted legal parameters of the finfluencer phenomenon. It critically examines the jurisdictional and investigative powers of the Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI), scrutinizing its capacity to regulate borderless digital advice. Furthermore, the paper interrogates the prevailing paradigms of consumer rights, delving into the liabilities of digital endorsers and the efficacy of current dispute resolution mechanisms. By analyzing the inherent limitations of public online scrutiny and weighing the constitutional imperatives of free speech against investor protection, this paper aims to delineate a rigorous legal framework for establishing online accountability in the digital financial age.

II. THE FINFLUENCER ECOSYSTEM AND SYSTEMIC MARKET RISKS

To fully comprehend the necessity of a stringent regulatory response, it is imperative to dissect the operational mechanics and business models driving the finfluencer ecosystem. Traditional financial intermediaries, such as registered investment advisers and research analysts, operate within a strict institutional framework characterized by mandatory compliance audits, ethical Chinese walls, and fiduciary duties to their clients. In stark contrast, finfluencers function as independent digital entities whose primary metric of success is algorithmic engagement rather than the financial well-being of their audience. The algorithmic architecture of modern social media platforms inherently prioritizes sensationalism and high-velocity engagement. Consequently, finfluencers who guarantee exorbitant returns, promote high-risk derivatives trading (F&O), or offer 'sure-shot' multi-bagger stock tips receive disproportionate visibility compared to creators advocating for prudent, long-term, risk-adjusted wealth management. This dynamic creates a perverse incentive structure that consistently rewards aggressive, speculative, and often misleading financial content. This environment serves as a fertile breeding ground for sophisticated market manipulation tactics, most notably modernized 'pump-and-dump' schemes. In these scenarios, market operators accumulate substantial positions in illiquid, small-cap equities. They subsequently leverage networks of finfluencers to disseminate overwhelmingly positive, synchronized analyses of these specific stocks. Driven by the finfluencers' perceived authority, retail investors rush to acquire the asset, artificially inflating its price. The operators and complicit finfluencers then liquidate their holdings at the peak, precipitating a rapid price collapse that inflicts

catastrophic losses on unsophisticated retail participants. Furthermore, the ecosystem is plagued by severe conflicts of interest through the 'broker affiliate' model. Finfluencers frequently embed referral links for discount brokers in their content, earning commissions based on the trading volume generated by their audience. This incentivizes the finfluencer to promote hyper-active trading strategies, such as intraday options trading, directly contradicting the established financial wisdom that excessive trading erodes retail wealth. The sheer information asymmetry between the finfluencer and the consumer creates a massive deficit in consumer protection, leaving victims of unregistered advice without access to the standard grievance redressal mechanisms mandated for regulated entities.

III. STATUTORY FRAMEWORK AND SEBI'S REGULATORY JURISDICTION

The Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI) serves as the vanguard of investor protection in India. Its regulatory scaffolding is primarily housed within the Securities and Exchange Board of India Act, 1992. Section 11 of the SEBI Act confers upon the Board sweeping powers to protect the interests of investors in securities and to promote the development of, and to regulate, the securities market by such measures as it thinks fit. To specifically address the dispensation of financial advice, SEBI utilizes the SEBI (Investment Advisers) Regulations, 2013 (IA Regulations), and the SEBI (Research Analysts) Regulations, 2014 (RA Regulations). These regulations are unambiguous in their mandate: no person shall act as an investment adviser or research analyst, or hold themselves out as such, unless they have obtained a certificate of registration from the Board. An 'investment adviser' is defined broadly to include any person who for consideration provides investment advice to clients or other persons or groups of persons. The core legal contention surrounding finfluencers hinges on the interpretation of 'consideration' and 'investment advice.' Many finfluencers argue that their content is strictly educational and provided free of charge on public platforms, thus exempting them from the IA Regulations. However, doctrinal analysis reveals that SEBI's interpretation of these definitions is expansive and teleological. 'Consideration' is not limited to direct, upfront fees paid by the viewer. It encompasses indirect financial benefits, such as YouTube ad revenue, sponsorships, and affiliate commissions derived from the dissemination of the content. Furthermore, when a finfluencer transitions from explaining general macroeconomic concepts to providing stock-specific recommendations, price targets, or buy/sell signals—even under the guise of an 'educational case study'—they cross the threshold into regulated advisory and research analyst activities. The statutory framework, therefore, provides SEBI with the foundational jurisdiction to regulate finfluencers; the primary challenge lies not in the absence of law, but in the complexities of its enforcement in the digital domain.

IV. SEBI'S CORPORATE INVESTIGATIVE POWERS: REACH AND LIMITATIONS

The efficacy of any regulatory framework is contingent upon the robustness of its investigative and enforcement mechanisms. SEBI's investigative powers, delineated primarily under Section 11C of the SEBI Act, are formidable, paralleling those vested in a civil court under the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908. The regulator possesses the authority to summon and enforce the attendance of persons, examine them on oath, require the discovery and production of books, registers, and other documents, and inspect any book, or register, or other document or record of any person under investigation. In the context of the digital finfluencer ecosystem, these corporate investigative powers are deployed to trace intricate digital footprints and establish the critical nexus between social media content and illicit financial gains. When investigating a suspected pump-and-dump scheme or an unregistered advisory operation, SEBI's enforcement wing can compel telecom operators to provide call data records (CDRs), mandate digital platforms to reveal IP logs and subscriber information, and order banks to produce detailed transaction histories. By cross-referencing trading data from the stock exchanges with the publication timestamps of social media posts and the subsequent flow of funds into the finfluencer's bank accounts, SEBI can construct a compelling chain of circumstantial and direct evidence. Recent enforcement orders against high-profile finfluencers demonstrate the practical application of these powers. SEBI has utilized advanced data analytics to identify synchronized trading patterns and trace them back to specific, ostensibly anonymous Telegram channels or WhatsApp broadcast groups. By piercing the veil of digital anonymity, the regulator has successfully issued impounding orders, freezing bank accounts and demanding the disgorgement of crores of rupees in unlawful gains. Furthermore, SEBI leverages its power to issue debarment orders, restricting fraudulent actors from accessing the securities market for extended periods, thereby neutralizing the financial incentive that drives their operations. Despite these robust capabilities, the digital sphere presents inherent limitations to conventional investigative methodologies. The borderless nature of the internet allows operators to host servers and route communications through jurisdictions that do not possess mutual legal assistance treaties (MLATs) with India, severely hampering cross-border discovery. Furthermore, the widespread adoption of end-to-end encrypted messaging applications creates significant evidentiary hurdles. While SEBI can prove that a message was sent, determining the exact nature of the advice provided within an encrypted channel often requires the cooperation of a whistleblower or the physical seizure of devices. Thus, the continuous evaluation and enhancement of SEBI's corporate investigative powers remain critical to maintaining market integrity.

V. CONSUMER PROTECTION JURISPRUDENCE AND ENDORSER LIABILITY

The regulation of finfluencers extends significantly beyond the purview of traditional securities law, deeply intersecting with the evolving landscape of consumer protection jurisprudence. The enactment of the Consumer Protection Act (CPA), 2019, fundamentally modernized India's approach to consumer rights, specifically introducing provisions to address the unique challenges of the digital economy, e-commerce, and misleading advertisements. Under the CPA 2019, an 'advertisement' is defined broadly to include any audio or visual publicity, representation, or pronouncement made by means of any light, sound, smoke, gas, print, electronic media, internet, or website. Consequently, financial advice or product endorsements promulgated by finfluencers fall squarely within the ambit of the Act. The Central Consumer Protection Authority (CCPA) is empowered to investigate misleading advertisements and impose stringent penalties on manufacturers, publishers, and crucially, endorsers. For finfluencers, this introduces a profound paradigm shift regarding liability. Historically, endorsers could claim ignorance regarding the underlying nature of the product they promoted. However, the CPA 2019 mandates that endorsers conduct due diligence to verify the claims made in the advertisement. If a finfluencer promotes a fraudulent cryptocurrency exchange, an unregulated forex trading platform, or a deceptive algorithmic trading software without conducting adequate due diligence, they can be held personally liable by the CCPA. Penalties can range from substantial monetary fines to prohibitions on endorsing any products or services for up to three years. Furthermore, the statutory timelines and operational efficiencies of consumer dispute redressal commissions play a pivotal role in this ecosystem. Investors defrauded by deceptive digital marketing or unregistered financial courses have the right to approach District, State, or National Consumer Disputes Redressal Commissions, depending on the pecuniary jurisdiction. The CPA 2019 emphasizes expedited dispute resolution, theoretically providing a faster avenue for redressal compared to traditional civil litigation. However, navigating the intersection of SEBI's specialized jurisdiction over securities markets and the broader consumer courts' jurisdiction over 'deficiency in service' requires careful legal maneuvering, highlighting the need for harmonization between financial and consumer protection statutes.

VI. THE ROLE OF SROS AND THE LIMITATIONS OF VOLUNTARY COMPLIANCE

In an attempt to bridge the regulatory gap before statutory intervention becomes strictly necessary, self-regulatory organizations (SROs) have attempted to establish guidelines for online accountability. The Advertising Standards Council of India (ASCI), a voluntary self-regulatory body, has been proactive in this regard, issuing comprehensive 'Guidelines for Influencer Advertising in Digital Media.' These guidelines mandate that influencers must clearly, prominently, and unambiguously label promotional content using standardized disclosure tags such as #Ad, #Sponsored, or #Partnership. Furthermore, ASCI updated its guidelines specifically for financial influencers, stating that individuals providing advice on stocks, investments, or other financial instruments must possess relevant credentials—such as SEBI registration—and must prominently display their registration numbers alongside their content. While ASCI's framework represents a commendable effort to instill ethical practices, doctrinal analysis highlights the severe limitations of voluntary compliance in a highly lucrative, decentralized environment. ASCI lack’s statutory authority; it cannot compel discovery, freeze assets, or issue legally binding debarment orders. Its primary enforcement mechanism involves requesting the influencer or the platform to modify or remove the non-compliant content. For malicious actors operating pump-and-dump schemes, the threat of an ASCI notice is an insufficient deterrent compared to the massive illicit profits generated through market manipulation. Therefore, while SROs play a vital educational and standard-setting role, establishing true online accountability necessitates the coercive power of statutory regulators like SEBI and the CCPA.

VII. THE LIMITS OF PUBLIC SCRUTINY IN THE DIGITAL AGE

A persistent argument advanced by proponents of an unregulated digital economy is the reliance on the 'marketplace of ideas' and the self-correcting nature of public scrutiny. The hypothesis suggests that the internet acts as an ultimate democratizer, where fraudulent claims, poor financial advice, and manipulative schemes will inevitably be crowdsourced, analyzed, and debunked by vigilant communities of rational actors. Under this theoretical model, heavy-handed state regulation is deemed unnecessary and overly paternalistic. However, empirical evidence and behavioral finance doctrines reveal that this reliance on public scrutiny is critically flawed, particularly within financial markets. The velocity of digital misinformation vastly outpaces the speed of truth. A highly produced, emotionally manipulative video promising 500% returns can reach millions of vulnerable investors in hours. By the time the scheme is publicly scrutinized, mathematically debunked by independent analysts, and exposed by whistleblowers, the manipulative operators have already executed their exit liquidity strategies, and retail capital has been irreversibly lost. Furthermore, social media algorithms inherently foster echo chambers and confirmation bias. Users who engage with aggressive trading content are continuously fed similar content, reinforcing a distorted perception of market realities and isolating them from dissenting, prudent financial analysis. Herd mentality and the Fear of Missing Out (FOMO) override critical public scrutiny during speculative market rallies. In these heightened emotional states, audiences actively defend their chosen finfluencers against

legitimate criticism, viewing warnings from regulators or independent analysts as institutional interference rather than protective guidance. Consequently, public scrutiny, while valuable, is a reactive and structurally inadequate mechanism for preempting and preventing organized digital financial fraud.

VIII. CONSTITUTIONAL DYNAMICS: FREE SPEECH VS. REGULATORY OVERREACH

Regulating the finfluencer ecosystem requires navigating one of the most delicate constitutional balancing acts in contemporary jurisprudence: safeguarding market integrity without infringing upon the fundamental right to freedom of speech and expression. Article 19(1)(a) of the Constitution of India guarantees every citizen the right to freedom of speech and expression. The dissemination of knowledge, including discussions on macroeconomic trends, the analysis of historical market data, the teaching of financial modeling, and general advocacy for personal budgeting and wealth creation, falls squarely within the protective ambit of this constitutional provision. Any regulatory intervention by SEBI must, therefore, be tested against the anvil of Article 19(2), which permits the State to impose 'reasonable restrictions' on the exercise of this right in the interests of, inter alia, public order, decency, morality, or in relation to defamation or incitement to an offense. A blanket ban on citizens discussing the stock market online would undoubtedly fail the test of proportionality and be struck down as constitutional overreach. It would also severely regress the advancements made in national financial literacy. The regulatory challenge is surgical precision. SEBI must carefully delineate the boundary between protected educational speech and unprotected, actionable, and potentially fraudulent commercial speech. The restriction becomes 'reasonable' when it specifically targets localized, stock-specific tipping, the operation of unregistered, fee-based advisory services, and the intentional dissemination of false information designed to manipulate market prices. The current regulatory approach—which does not ban financial content but requires registration for the provision of specific, actionable advice—generally aligns with constitutional principles. However, as enforcement actions increase, courts will continually be tasked with evaluating whether SEBI's interpretation of 'advice' in specific digital contexts inadvertently chills legitimate, educational financial discourse.

IX. COMPARATIVE GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES ON FINFLUENCER REGULATION

The regulatory friction generated by financial influencers is not a phenomenon unique to India; it is a complex, global regulatory challenge. Analyzing the paradigms adopted by leading international securities regulators provides vital context and potential blueprints for refining the domestic framework. In the United States, the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) has adopted a highly aggressive enforcement posture, particularly concerning the endorsement of crypto asset securities. The SEC relies heavily on the anti-touting provisions embedded within Section 17(b) of the Securities Act of 1933. This provision makes it unlawful for any person to publish or circulate any communication describing a security in exchange for compensation from the issuer without fully disclosing the receipt and amount of such compensation. The SEC has successfully utilized this statute to impose multi-million dollar fines on high-profile celebrities and digital influencers, establishing a clear precedent that undisclosed financial promotions are strictly prohibited, regardless of the medium. Conversely, the Australian Securities and Investments Commission (ASIC) has focused heavily on preemptive clarity. ASIC issued Information Sheet 269 (INFO 269), which meticulously details the distinction between providing general financial information and operating an unlicensed financial services business. ASIC explicitly warns influencers that sharing affiliate links for financial products or providing actionable advice without an Australian Financial Services (AFS) license will invite severe civil and criminal penalties. In the United Kingdom, the Financial Conduct Authority (FCA) has collaborated extensively with the Advertising Standards Authority (ASA) to crack down on misleading financial promotions, actively warning consumers that finfluencers often lack the qualifications to provide suitable advice. These comparative global perspectives underscore a unified international consensus: the digitization of communication does not grant immunity from the foundational principles of financial regulation, and robust disclosure regimes are the cornerstone of online accountability.

X. PROPOSED REGULATORY ROADMAP AND POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

To effectively mitigate the systemic risks posed by unregulated finfluencers while preserving the benefits of digital financial education, a multifaceted, forward-looking policy roadmap is required. First, SEBI must formalize a distinct, possibly tiered, registration framework tailored for digital financial creators. The current IA/RA regulations are designed for traditional corporate entities and may be excessively onerous for individual creators. A 'light-touch' registration category for digital educators—requiring mandatory baseline financial certifications, strict conflict-of-interest disclosures, and algorithmic auditing—would bring the ecosystem within the regulatory perimeter. Second, addressing the financial incentive structures is paramount. SEBI's recent proposals to prohibit registered market intermediaries, such as mutual fund houses and stockbrokers, from associating with or paying referral fees to unregistered finfluencers represent a highly effective strategy. By severing the primary revenue arteries, the regulator can starve the unregulated ecosystem of institutional capital, forcing creators to either register and comply or cease operations. Third, the concept of platform accountability must be

enshrined in law. Social media platforms cannot act purely as passive conduits when their algorithms actively amplify fraudulent financial schemes. Legislative amendments should require platforms to implement enhanced algorithmic filters for financial content, actively flag unregistered advisory channels, and cooperate expeditiously with SEBI's investigative demands. Finally, a collaborative task force comprising SEBI, the CCPA, and cyber-crime units must be established to ensure rapid, inter-agency enforcement actions, ensuring that the jurisdictional gaps between securities law and consumer protection law are not exploited.

XI. CONCLUSION

The ascendancy of finfluencers represents a permanent, structural evolution in the dissemination and consumption of financial information in India. While acknowledging their contribution to the democratization of financial knowledge, the sheer scale of their influence necessitates a rigorous, enforceable framework of online accountability. SEBI's current regulatory posture, anchored in its extensive investigative powers under the SEBI Act and augmented by the IA and RA regulations, forms a vital bulwark against predatory digital practices. The regulator's capacity to trace digital footprints, compel discovery, and order the disgorgement of unlawful gains demonstrates that the principles of market integrity extend firmly into the digital realm. However, doctrinal analysis confirms that statutory enforcement by a securities regulator alone cannot completely eradicate the multifarious risks of digital fraud. Relying on the inherent limits of public scrutiny is a demonstrably flawed strategy. A holistic, inter-jurisdictional framework is required—one that seamlessly integrates the investigative powers of SEBI with the endorser liability and expedited dispute resolution mechanisms of the Consumer Protection Act. By mandating absolute transparency in revenue models, modernizing registration frameworks, and imposing stringent obligations on digital platforms, India can foster a safe, transparent, and equitable retail investment ecosystem. Ultimately, ensuring online accountability mandates a continuous, collaborative effort to guarantee that the democratization of finance does not devolve into the systematic exploitation of the uninformed.

REFERENCES

[1] Securities and Exchange Board of India Act, 1992, No. 15, Acts of Parliament, 1992 (India).

[2] Securities and Exchange Board of India (Investment Advisers) Regulations, 2013, SEBI Notification No. LAD-NRO/GN/2012-13/31/1778, Jan. 21, 2013.

[3] Securities and Exchange Board of India (Research Analysts) Regulations, 2014, SEBI Notification No. LAD-NRO/GN/2014-15/07/1414, Sep. 1, 2014.

[4] Consumer Protection Act, 2019, No. 35, Acts of Parliament, 2019 (India).

[5] Code of Civil Procedure, 1908, No. 5, Acts of Parliament, 1908 (India).

[6] Advertising Standards Council of India, "Guidelines for Influencer Advertising in Digital Media," ASCI, 2021 (Updated 2023).

[7] Central Consumer Protection Authority, "Guidelines for Prevention of Misleading Advertisements and Endorsements for Misleading Advertisements," 2022.

[8] P. K. Sharma and R. Singh, "The Impact of Social Media on Retail Investor Behavior in Emerging Markets: A Behavioral Finance Perspective," Journal of Behavioral Finance, vol. 18, no. 4, pp. 312-325, Nov. 2022.

[9] M. Desai, "Regulatory Challenges of Finfluencers in the Indian Securities Market: Intersections of Law and Technology," Asian Journal of Law and Economics, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 45-67, 2023.

[10] Australian Securities and Investments Commission (ASIC), "Discussing financial products and services online (INFO 269)," 2022.

[11] U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission, "Statement on Potentially Unlawful Promotion of Initial Coin Offerings and Other Investments by Celebrities and Others," Nov. 2017.

[12] S. K. Jain, "Corporate Investigative Powers of SEBI: A Critical Evaluation," Indian Journal of Corporate Law, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 89-112, 2021.