



06.06.2016

**Notice given by Rajasthan Marudhara Gramin Bank and State Bank of Bikaner and Jaipur pursuant to an inquiry under sub-section (1) of Section 20 of the Competition Act, 2002**

**CORAM:**

Mr. Devender Kumar Sikri  
Chairperson

Mr. S. L. Bunker  
Member

Mr. Sudhir Mital  
Member

Mr. Augustine Peter  
Member

Mr. U. C. Nahta  
Member

Mr. M. S. Sahoo  
Member

Mr. G. P. Mittal  
Member

**Legal representative of the parties:** Mr. Varun Rajpal

**Order under Section 31(1) of the Competition Act, 2002**

1. On 24.02.2016, the Competition Commission of India (“**Commission**”) received a notice jointly given by Rajasthan Marudhara Gramin Bank (“**RMGB**”) and State Bank of Bikaner and Jaipur (“**SBBJ**”) (hereinafter RMGB and SBBJ are collectively referred to as the “**Parties**”), pursuant to the Commission’s directions issued under sub-section (1) of Section 20 of the Competition Act, 2002 (“**Act**”). The combination relates to



**COMPETITION COMMISSION OF INDIA**  
(Combination Registration No.C-2016/02/377)



amalgamation of Marudhara Gramin Bank (“**MGB**”), sponsored by SBBJ; and Mewar Aanchalik Gramin Bank (“**MAGB**”), sponsored by ICICI bank; into a single regional rural bank (“**RRB**”), i.e., RMGB with SBBJ as its sole sponsor bank (“**Combination**”).

2. The amalgamation came into being vide a Gazette of India Notification dated 01.04.2014 issued by the Department of Financial Services, Ministry of Finance, Government of India under sub-section (1) of Section 23A of the Regional Rural Banks Act, 1976 (“**RRB Act**”) (“**Notification**”).
3. In terms of Regulation 14 of the Competition Commission of India (Procedure in regard to transaction of business relating to combinations) Regulations, 2011 (“**Combination Regulations**”), vide letter dated 05.04.2016, the Parties were required to remove defects and furnish certain information/document(s) pertaining to market shares of the Parties and their competitors by 12.04.2016. The Parties filed their response on 11.05.2016 after seeking extension of 30 days. The Parties have also submitted some additional information vide emails dated 13.05.2016 and 18.05.2016.
4. The Commission noted that the Parties had earlier filed a notice on 08.10.2015 with regard to the Combination. The same was considered by the Commission in its ordinary meeting held on 20.10.2015 wherein it was noted that the notice filed by the Parties was incomplete in all material aspects. In view of the foregoing, the Commission decided that the notice filed by the Parties is not in conformity with the provisions of sub-regulation (1) of Regulation 5 read with sub-regulation (1) of Regulation 14 of the Combination Regulations. Accordingly the Commission decided that the Parties be directed to file a fresh notice for the Combination within a period of thirty days from the date of receipt of communication in this regard. In view of the foregoing, a fresh notice was filed by the Parties on 24.02.2016, pursuant to the said directions of the Commission.
5. MGB was established consequent to the amalgamation of erstwhile MGB Gramin Bank and Jaipur Thar Gramin Bank in 2013 with its head office at Jodhpur. MGB was engaged in provision of banking services in its notified area which included 12 districts of Rajasthan namely Pali, Jalore, Sirohi, Sriganaganagar, Hanumahgarh, Bikaner, Jaipur, Jodhpur, Nagaur, Dausa, Jaisalmer and Barmer.



**COMPETITION COMMISSION OF INDIA**  
(Combination Registration No.C-2016/02/377)



6. MAGB was established in 1983 with its head office at Udaipur. MAGB was engaged in provision of banking services in its notified area which included 3 districts of Rajasthan viz. Udaipur, Rajasmand and Pratapgarh.
7. RMGB, the amalgamated entity, established pursuant to the Combination has its head office at Jodhpur, Rajasthan. It is engaged in provision of banking services in its notified area, which is the combined area of operations of MGB and MAGB, i.e. 15 districts of Rajasthan namely, Pali, Jalore, Sirohi, Sriganganagar, Hanumangarh, Bikaner, Jaipur, Jodhpur, Nagaur, Dausa, Jaisalmer, Barmer Udaipur, Rajasmand and Pratapgarh.
8. The Commission noted that the share capital of a RRB is held by Central Government, State Government and sponsor bank in the ratio of 50:15:35. Further, the sponsor bank, apart from subscribing to the share capital of a RRB, is entrusted with certain responsibilities in running the RRBs; such as, nominating directors on board of a RRB, providing refinance, expert guidance to RRBs etc.
9. As regards working of the RRBs, the Commission noted that RRBs were established with a view to develop the rural economy and to enlarge institutional credit for the rural and agriculture sector. The RRBs are expected to mobilise deposits primarily from rural/semi-urban areas and provide loans and advances mostly to small and marginal farmers, agricultural labourers, rural artisans and other segments of priority sector. The Commission further noted that a process of consolidation of RRBs had been initiated in the year 2005 with amalgamation of RRBs in a state under the sponsorship of same sponsor bank. The second phase of consolidation was initiated in 2012 with amalgamation of RRBs across the sponsor banks in a state. The process was initiated with a view to provide better customer service by having better infrastructure, computerization, experienced work force, common publicity and marketing efforts etc.
10. In this backdrop, the Commission observed that, both MGB and MAGB were engaged in provision of banking services in their respective notified areas in Rajasthan. At district level, there was no overlap in the operations of MGB and MAGB.
11. For the purposes of competition assessment, the Commission considered market share of the Parties in various segments of banking services and observed that given the low incremental market shares, insignificant change in market concentration and presence



**COMPETITION COMMISSION OF INDIA**  
(Combination Registration No.C-2016/02/377)



of other substantial competitors at the district as well as state level and lack of overlaps at the district level, the Combination does not seem likely to cause appreciable adverse effect on competition in any of possible relevant markets that could be delineated.

12. Considering the facts on record, details provided in the notice and assessment of the Combination on the basis of factors stated in sub-section (4) of Section 20 of the Act, the Commission is of the opinion that the Combination is not likely to have an appreciable adverse effect on competition in India and, therefore, the Commission hereby approves the same under sub-section (1) of Section 31 of the Act.
13. This order is issued without prejudice to any proceedings under Section 43A of the Act.
14. This order shall stand revoked if, at any time, information provided by the Parties is found to be incorrect.
15. The Secretary is directed to communicate to the Parties accordingly.