AN EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS OF SELECTED COMPANIES FROM NON-METAL, REAL ESTATE AND MINING INDUSTRIES IN INDIAN CAPITAL MARKET

Dr. Ravi Kant *

ABSTRACT

There exists a relationship between stock returns and trading volume in the world capital market and the changes in stock return does impact trading volume or trading volume does impact stock return. Some studies show that there is high degree relationship and some research studies show moderate or low or no relationship between stock return and trading volume. The present research paper attempts to examine empirical status of selected companies from non-metal, real estate and mining industries in India for finding out relationship between stock returns and trading volume. Hence, changes in returns and volume do reflect a relationship in non-metal industry but not in mining and real estate. Therefore, there is no randomness in the behaviour of stock return and trading volume changes in this study of non-metal industry in India. But in case of empirical analysis of three industries at firm level the result shows moderate degree of relationship between returns and volume of all 81 companies from non-metal, real estate and mining industries.

KEYWORDS: Empirical analysis, Non-metal, Real estate, Mining.

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper investigates the relationship between stock returns and volume for 81 Indian companies from non-metal, real estate and mining industries. From the analysis, results and discussions we can say that the empirical result of granger causality test on firm level in non-metal, real estate and mining industries, 51 companies (see table 1.4) shows Return cause volume, 04 companies (CTIL, OAL, REL, RIL) shows Volume cause return, 03 companies (KCL, MCL, SCL) shows Bi-directional Causation and 23 companies (see table 1.4) shows No causation. Hence, we can say that most of the companies show Return cause volume at all. It means that the variables trading volume and stock return are moderate mutually granger cause to each other. But in case of empirical analysis of three industries at industry level the result shows that only non-metal industry do not have randomness in the behaviour However, in case of mining and real estate industries there exists randomness in the behaviour between returns and volume relationship.

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

^{*} Assistant Professor, Department of Commerce, Shaheed Bhagat Singh College E-mail: ravi.kant@sbs.du.ac.in

In the last decades a number of studies have been conducted to explain the relationship between volume and returns in India.

We argue that the enhancement in volume and returns volatility may be attributed to index arbitrage process as derivative markets provide more ways for index arbitrageurs to trading. In the literature we reviewed the following article and research papers: Ahmad k. Masood, Ashraf S. & Ahmed S. (2008), Asai M. and Unite A. (2008), Ali (2006), Baklaci&Kasman (2006), Brajesh and Priyanka (2010), Chen C. and Zhou Z. (2001), Chen S. and Wei (2008) ,Chi-liang C. (2004), Christos F. and Dimitrios V. Vougas (2007), Chuntao Li and Jigang Ding (2003), Deo M., Srinivasan K. and Devanadhen K. (2008), Floros and Vougas (2007), Gebka B. (2005),Hasan B. and Adnam K. (2006). The objective of this research paper is to find a rational economic model to explain the relationship between volume and returns in India.

3. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

- 1. To study the correlation between returns changes and volume in the Indian capital market of non-metal, real estate and mining industries.
- 2. To check the causality relationship between the volume and returns through Granger Causality Test for non-metal, real estate and mining industries.
- To study that changes in trading volume leads the changes in stock returns or vice-versa. In other words we are examining, what are the causes of changes in stock returns and trading volume with two element return and volume of the industries.

4. DATA & SELECTED SAMPLE AND RESEARCH METHO-DOLOGY

The sample of this study comprises 81 Indian companies which is the main stocks of Indian industry. These companies are (for detail abbreviation see appendix). The data period is from Jan. 2002 to Dec. 2010. In this study, our data comprises stock returns calculated from adjusted monthly closing prices and traded quantity series of sample of all 81 major firms participating in Indian capital market because these firms are well representative of Indian companies. The volume and stock return data are provided by CMIE LTD and were taken from finance prowess finance database and $R_{c} = \frac{(Pt-P_{tc}) + Dt}{P_{tc}}$ newspaper and internet. The percentage returns of stock is

defined as where, R_t is logarithmic monthly percentage return at time t and P_{t-1} and P_t are monthly closing price of an asset on two successive days t-1 and t respectively.

5. STATISTICAL TECHNIQUES

In this study, in order to observe the relationship between stock return and RIJBR 118 ISSN: 2455-5959

volume, the methodology was used in the current study consists of three steps which are as follow: Descriptive Statistics for preliminary investigation, ADF Test for checking Stationarity of Time Series Data and Granger Causality Tests for testing causal relationship between Trading Volume and Stock Returns.

FIRST STEP

The Durbin-Watson Statistics: The Durbin-Watson Statistic is a test for first-order serial correlation. It is, the statistical measure for the linear association between adjacent from a regression model.

Dickey-Fuller Unit Root Test (Stationary Test):- We see that the hypothesis of a unit root is rejected by both the tests at 1%, 5% and 10% level, indicating both the series are stationary (i.e., a deterministic trend). It appears that there exits strong component of non-randomness in our stock return and trading volume. (E-View, 6)

SECOND STEP

Granger Causality Test

If we want to know whether

"TQ" causes "RTN" or "RTN" causes "TQ", or bilateral causes,

"Lags to include" is "2",

Table-1.1

ADF Test Statistic of Stock Returns and Trading Volume for all Companies (Jan. 2000 to Dec. 2010)							
Company	Lag	ADF Te	est-Stat.	Probability		Durbin-Watson Stat.	
Symbol		Rtn.	Vol.	Rtn.	Vol.	Rtn.	Vol.
CM&RL	0	-9.337514	-6.980175	0.0000	0.0000	1.969022	1.992410
GMDC	0	-9.423623	-7.239731	0.0000	0.0000	2.015156	2.252826
GNRE	0	-8.064892	-4.549422	0.0000	0.0000	2.027482	2.523550
HC&IL	0	-9.663465	-7.394062	0.0000	0.0000	2.008243	2.153831
HOEC	0	-9.214483	-6.843297	0.0000	0.0000	1.978510	2.159239
INSILCO	0	-11.45563	-6.338228	0.0000	0.0000	2.018908	2.243428
ONGC	0	-10.83853	-5.639721	0.0000	0.0000	2.118705	2.258276
OC&CL	0	-9.464499	-6.992460	0.0000	0.0000	1.982017	2.127061
SETL	0	-10.94821	-7.392502	0.0000	0.0000	2.006865	2.132860
SESAG	0	-8.068709	-5.536470	0.0000	0.0000	2.101723	2.457999
ACC	0	-9.349750	-4.019188	0.0000	0.0000	1.994172	2.322732
AMBUJACL	0	-10.53510	-4.339840	0.0000	0.0000	1.944572	2.215827

Company	Lag	ADF Test-Stat.		Probability		Durbin-Watson Stat.	
Symbol		Rtn.	Vol.	Rtn.	Vol.	Rtn.	Vol.
ACL	0	-11.45685	-8.111356	0.0000	0.0000	1.994442	2.050419
AGIL	0	-9.093432	-8.519631	0.0000	0.0000	1.969102	2.042938
AIGL	0	-9.337435	-5.701543	0.0000	0.0000	2.045400	2.260481
ASCL	0	-9.510235	-3.448599	0.0000	0.0000	2.137951	1.956345
BCL	0	-7.796065	-7.200186	0.0000	0.0000	1.897000	2.161122
BIRLAC	0	-8.879443	-5.557245	0.0000	0.0000	1.998153	2.371298
BGWL	0	-10.02915	-7.375190	0.0000	0.0000	1.989792	2.166149
CUL	0	-9.098912	-7.054698	0,0000	0.0000	2.015560	2.327370
CT&IL	0	-9.623602	-5.742449	0.0000	0.0000	2.008621	2.329239
CDL	0	-8.007234	-5.682833	0.0000	0.0000	1.947538	2.300397
DECCAN	0	-9.620357	-4.015967	0.0000	0.0000	1.998881	2.179360
EIL	0	-9.444891	-8.092158	0.0000	0.0000	2.019709	2.044031
GIL	0	-7.874201	-6.768842	0.0000	0.0000	1.990800	2.231966
GIL	0	-9.139359	-6.191215	0.0000	0.0000	1.989130	1.918430
GNL	0	-9.159345	-7.421442	0.0000	0.0000	1.967703	2.096918
GSCL	0	-10.14396	-7.286636	0.0000	0.0000	1.991672	2.134274
HEGL	0	-7.992937	-7.157751	0.0000	0.0000	1.976768	2.110520
HSIL	0	-9.383703	-8.051902	0.0000	0.0000	1.996121	2.076287
HCIL	0	-9.722578	-6.944267	0.0000	0.0000	1.953573	2.071974
IFGLR	0	-10.52463	-7.389241	0.0000	0.0000	2.004614	2.093683
ICL	0	-9.541778	-4.294953	0.0000	0.0000	1.991528	2.381122
IHPCL	0	-9.775208	1.918430	0.0000	0.0000	2.009690	2.008136
JKLC	0	-9.045533	-5.915379	0.0000	0.0000	2.001954	2.305428
KCL	0	-10.59581	-5.857547	0.0000	0.0000	1.982177	2.018158
KCS&IL	0	-11.56700	-8.993801	0.0000	0.0000	2.031653	2.048587
LORG	0	-11.38895	-8.497902	0.0000	0.0000	1.980591	2.022126
MM&GL	0	-10.99645	-5.065824	0.0000	0.0000	1.991320	2.289144
MCL	0	-9.660446	-6.853305	0.0000	0.0000	2.016134	2.308181
MANGLAMCL	0	-9.667782	-6.024282	0.0000	0.0000	2.015278	1.989433
MCL	0	-9.303939	-9.801949	0.0000	0.0000	2.014349	2.018513
NCLI	0	-10.64388	-5.563298	0.0000	0.0000	1.981119	2.507062

٨

Company	Lag	ADF Test-Stat.		Probability		Durbin-Watson Stat.	
Symbol		Rtn.	Vol.	Rtn.	Vol.	Rtn.	Vol.
OCLI	0	-8.356018	-6.233323	0.0000	0.0000	2.005002	1.954071
OAL	0	-9.781142	-6.132675	0.0000	0.0000	2.024493	2.100288
OC&IL	0	-10.70727	-6.450316	0.0000	0.0000	1.996932	2.170457
OP&IL	0	-10.20304	-6.421143	0.0000	0.0000	1.984307	2.238310
PPL	0	-11.48131	-7,349456	0.0000	0.0000	2.034505	2.101283
PCL	0	-9.182583	-5.303496	0.0000	0.0000	1.978721	2.303571
RCL	0	-10.83007	-8.074909	0.0000	0.0000	2.003759	2.068247
REL	0	-8.359947	-5.671534	0.0000	0.0000	1.968852	2.331440
RAMCOIL	0	-7.905140	-7.366277	0.0000	0.0000	1.957045	1.952549
RCL	0	-10.83007	-5.203600	0.0000	0.0000	2.003759	2.143050
SB&TIL	0	-11.02227	-5.636165	0.0000	0.0000	2.002396	2.146220
SCL	0	-7.366996	-7.304496	0.0000	0.0000	1.979446	2.269233
SGSI	0	-9.109149	-7.289798	0.0000	0.0000	1.949323	2.079504
SCL	0	-8.856908	-5.473364	0.0000	0.0000	1.968317	2.376545
SDCC	0	-9.100250	-5.492270	0.0000	0.0000	2.007905	2.472558
S&CL	0	-9.549756	-8.655252	0.0000	0.0000	1.996716	2.086150
SSGL	0	-10.41959	-4.752311	0.0000	0.0000	2.003483	2.316228
SSIL	0	-11.22632	-6.850915	0.0000	0.0000	1.986778	2.211789
SCL	0	-9.882413	-6.301237	0.0000	0.0000	2.001047	2.145333
SRD&J	0	-9.927884	-8.954844	0.0000	0.0000	1.995375	2.042930
SDL	0	-10.40219	-7.855315	0.0000	0.0000	1.992333	2.115500
SDE	0	-11.86956	-5.810941	0.0000	0.0000	1.994336	2.181817
TITAN	0	-9.516489	-5.168762	0.0000	0.0000	2.058335	2.345693
TRIVENIG	0	-10.33272	-8.620285	0.0000	0.0000	1.998604	2.040044
VGL	0	-7.653748	-8.161838	0.0000	0.0000	1.938681	2.081837
VIL	0	-8.911611	-7.759426	0.0000	0.0000	1.988442	2.070677
VISAKAIL	0	-10.54119	-5.212939	0.0000	0.0000	1.991031	2.201994
ANSALBL	0	-9.714987	-7.784578	0.0000	0.0000	1.996792	2.074998
AH&CL	0	-9.366207	-6.165322	0.0000	0.0000	1.995283	2.396835
AP&IL	0	-8.983197	-5.483748	0.0000	0.0000	2.012365	2.109241
AF&HL	0	-8.346343	-9.174753	0.0000	0.0000	2.022001	2.018665

,

Company	Lag	ADF Test-Stat.		Probability		Durbin-Watson Stat.	
Symbol		Rtn.	Vol.	Rtn.	Vol.	Rtn.	Vol.
DSKD	0	-8.882261	-6.960573	0.0000	0.0000	2.008080	2.222327
HBED	0	-10.10093	-9.577922	0.0000	0.0000	1.991639	2.005354
LH&CL	0	-8.572722	-4.983682	0.0000	0.0000	1.977080	2.140550
PENINSULAL	L 0	-8.171291	-9.066311	0.0000	0.0000	1.935657	2.027548
RDL	0	-9.928792	-6.615177	0.0000	0.0000	1.982340	2.131902
RIL	0	-11.91311	-8.852667	0.0000	0.0000	2.003342	2.133584
UNITECH	0	-6.870917	-4.801105	0.0000	0.0000	2.020356	-4.80110

Sources: Self constructed table

Important Note: These critical values automatic taken by e-view software during testing Stationarity of time series data through e-view software.

The table 1.1 shows, ADF test statistic of all companies of Non-metal industry, Real Estate industry and Mining industry for the period of Jan. 2000 to Dec. 2010. On Lag 0, the ADF test statistic is less than the critical values (-2.586753, -1.943853, -1.614749 at 1%, 5% and 10% significant level, respectively), and p-value is also near to zero. We can conclude to reject Ho. This means the TQ and RTN series do not have a unit root problem and the TQ and RTN series is stationary series. And all the figures in the table for Durbin-Watson statistics is big and is around two that means the stock return and trading volume may not have serial correlation problem. Hence, stock return data series will be stationary. The computed ADF test statistic is smaller than the critical value at 1%, 5% and 10% significance level and the hypothesis is valid.

Table	1.2
-------	-----

ADF Test Statistic of Trading Volume and Stock Return on Industries Level (Jan. 2000 to Dec. 2010) ADF Test-Durbin-Watson Lag Probability **Industries** Name Statistics Statistics **RTN-MINING** 0 0.0000 2.553429 -4.437876 -8.337389 0.0000 2.000189 **RTN-NONMETAL** 0 -5.219812 **RTN-REAL** 0 0.0000 2.178609 **TO-MINING** 0 -3.451439 0.0007 2.751341 **TQ-NONMETAL** 0 -2.984109 0.0032 2.527638 -4.271605 0.0000 2.272656 **TO-REAL** 0

Sources: Self constructed table

The table 1.2 shows brief of ADF test statistic of all three industries for the period of Jan. 2000 to Dec. 2010. The TQ and RTN series has not a unit root problem and the TQ and RTN series is stationary series. And the all values

in the table for Durbin-Watson statistics is big and near to two that mean the stock return and trading volume may not have serial correlation problem. Hence, stock return data series will be stationary the computed ADF test statistic is smaller than the critical value at 1%, 5% and 10% significance level and the hypothesis is valid.

Table 1.3

Nonmetal

 Results of Granger Causality Test of Trading Volume and Stocks Return at Industry Level (Jan. 2000 to Dec. 2010)

 Return Cause Vol.
 Vol. Cause Return
 Bi-directional Causation

 No Causation
 Industries
 F-stat.
 Industries
 F-stat.

Mining

Real est.

.91

.75

Sources: Self constructed table

5.75

The table 1.3 shows the f-statistics are large and probability value is close to 0 in case of three industries these are Non-metal industry, except for H oof mining industry and real estate industry at 1%, 5%, 10% significance level. It implies that the contents mutually granger cause to each other for all three industries group and shows stock return cause traded quantity except for the mining industry and real-estate industry in which we found no causation between return and volume. To look at the causality between pairs of returns, granger causality test was conducted to discover which trading volume exerts stronger influence on the other. It studies the cause and effect relationship between volume and return. We test Null hypothesis for granger non causality that "return do not cause trading volume". Accepting the null hypothesis implies that the return do not lead trading volume and this is consistent with the prediction. A similar hypothesis can test the reverse granger non causality from TO to RTN. Trading volume is said to be granger-caused by return if return help in prediction of trading volume, or equivalently if coefficient on the lagged returns on stocks are statistically significant. Two way causation is the, return cause's volume and volume cause return.

Table 1.4

Result of Pair Wise Granger Causality Tests of Stock Return and Trading Volume at Firm Level (Jan. 2000 to Dec. 2010)								
Return Cause Vol. Vol. Cause Return		Bi-directional Causation		No Causation				
Industries	F-stat.	Industries	F-stat.	Industries	F-stat.	Industries	F-stat.	
PCL	5.42	CTIL	3.03	KCL	3.68(2.58*)	PENINSLA	.13	
SCL	10.94	OAL	5.96	MCL	3.78(3.33*)	RDL	.21	

Return Cause Vol.		Vol. Cause Return		Bi-directional Causation		No Causation	
Industries	F-stat.	Industries	F-stat.	Industries	F-stat.	Industries	F-stat.
VISAKAIL	4.83	REL	4.82	SCL	25.37(5,28*)	UNITECH	.37
ANSALBL	5.22	RÍL	7.04			VIL	1.49
AHCL	6.88	Return ca	use vol.			LHCL	.32
APIL	7.04	Industry	F-stat.			AFHL	.75
DSKD	5.13	GIL	4.87			HBED	.14
CDL	5.13	GNL	2.49			ACL	1.52
DECAN	7.71	GSCL	14.09			GMDC	2.21
EIL	7.52	PPL	7.56			GNRE	.53
GIL	16.15	AIGL	4.11		00000000000000000000000000000000000000	ONGC	1.01
HCIL	6.10	CMRL	19.97			SESAG	.29
IFGLR	5.26	HCIL	6.27		a an	AMBUJAC	.30
IHPCL	54.74	НОЕС	9.00			ACL	1.00
JKCL	7.68	INSLCO	15.03			AGIL	.30
KCSIL	21.53	OCCL	13.86			CUL	1.34
LORG	4.46	SETL	40.38			ICL	2.03
MMGL	7.78	MCL	9.60			RAMCOIL	1.48
MNGLM	4.78	NCIL	10.70			SDCC	1.92
HSIL	3.73	OCLI	11.05			SSGL	.01
HEGL	14.07	OCLI	9.77			SDL	1.21
SCL	4.23	OPIL.	2.53			TITAN	1.39
SSIL	3.84	SGSI	7.20				
SCL	4.01	SCL	6.09				
SRDG	13.69	SBTIL	14.64				
SDE	7.24	VGL	12.93				
TRIVENIG	13.08	RCL	12.31				
RCL	6.03		an na shi ka				

Sources: Self constructed table

The table 1.4 shows, the causality between pairs of returns to discover which trading volume exerts stronger influence on the other granger causality test was conducted. It studies the cause and effect relationship between volume and returns. We test Null hypothesis for granger non causality that "return do not cause trading volume". Accepting the null

RIJBR

,

hypothesis implies that the return do not lead volume. A similar hypothesis can test the reverse granger non causality from TQ to RTN. Two way causation, return cause's volume and volume cause return. The result of granger causality test, F-test at firm level are reported in the table, firms of these industries are Non-metal industry, Real Estate industry and Mining industry (see table 1.4) from Jan. 2002 to Dec. 2010. Out of 81 stock, 51 stocks shows that return cause volume, 4 stocks display that volume cause return, 3 stocks indicate bi-directional causation and the remaining 23 shows no causation at all. As we can see, F-statistics are large and probability values are all close to 0 except for some companies. It shows the variables mutually granger cause each other except some companies whose F-statistics are not large and probability values are not all close to 0.

CONCLUSION

From analysis result and discussions, we can say that the empirical result of granger causality test on three industries level in India, in these industries non-metal industry shows Return cause volume and remaining two industries shows no causation. Hence, we can say that only one industry show causation. It means that the variables trading volume and stock return strongly mutually granger cause each other in this industry, in case of empirical analysis of two selected industries of India. Hence, changes in returns and volume do reflect variable each other on non-metal industry but not in mining and real estate. Therefore, there is no randomness in the behaviour of return and volume changes in this study of non-metal industry in India. But in case of empirical analysis of three industries at firm level, the result shows moderate degree relationship between return and volume of all 81 companies from non-metal, real estate and mining industries.

REFERENCES

- Ahmad K. Masood, Ashraf S. & Ahmed S. (2008), "Causality and Volatility in the Firm Level Stock Returns and Volume in India: Evidence from National Stock Exchange", Finance India, Vol. XXII No. 1 (March), Pp. 99-115.
- 2. Asai M. and Unite A. (2008), "The Relationship between Stock Return Volatility and Trading Volume: The case of the Philippines", Applied Financial Economics, Volume 18, Pp. 1333-1341.
- 3. Ali (2006), "The Return–Volume Relationship for Emerging Marketsanalysis of the Internet Technology Bubble in the United States", China Journal of Finance, pp. 1-10.
- 4. Baklaci&Kasman (2006), "An Empirical Analysis of Trading Volume and Return Volatility Relationship in the Turkish Stock Market", Ege

RIJBR

Academic Review, Ege University Faculty of Economics & Administration Science, Vol 6(2), pp. 115-125.

- 5. Chen C. and Zhou Z. (2001), "Stock Returns, Volatility, and Trading Volume: Evidence from the Chinese Stock Markets," International Journal of Finance of Business, 6(2), 2001 ISSN: 1083-4346. Pp. 1-12.
- Chi-liang C. (2004), "Studies on the long Range Dependence in Stock Return Volatility and Trading Volume", Department of Applied Mathematics, NationalSunYat-senUniversity, Kaohsiung, Tiwan, 804, ROC, July, 2004.pp.1-27.
- Christos F. and Dimitrios V. Vougas (2007), "Trading Volume and Returns Relationship in Greek Stock Index Futures Market: GARCH vs. GMM", International Research Journal of Finance and Economics, ISSN 1450-2887 Issue 12 (2007) © EuroJournals Publishing, Inc. 2007.
- 8. Chuntao Li and Jigang Ding (2003), "The Relationship between Risk, Return and the Change of Volume in Shanghai Stock Exchange", USA-China Business Review (Journal), Inc., USA, 2003, ISSN 1536-9048, Vol. 3, No.6 (Serial No.19).
- Deo M., Srinivasan K. and Devanadhen K. (2008), "The Empirical Relationship Between Stock Returns, Trading Volume and Volatility: Evidence from Selected Asia-Pacific Stock Market", European Journal of Economics, Finance and Administrative Sciences, ISSN 1450-2275, Issue 12.
- 10. Floros and Vougas (2007), "Volume and Returns Relationship in Greek Stock Index futures Market: GARCH vs. GMM", Economic Bulletin, Vol. 29, Issue 2.

126

SAMPLE OF STUDY							
1. Cochin Mineral& Rutile Ltd	CM&RL	Mining					
2. Gujarat Mineral Dev. Co. Ltd	GMDC	11					
3. Gujarat N R E Coke Ltd.	GNRE	11					
4. Himadri Chemical & Ind. Ltd	HC&IL	13					
5. Hindustan Oil Explor. Co Ltd	HOEC	17					
6. Insilco Ltd.	INSILCO	17					
7. Oil & Natural Gas Corpn. Ltd	ONGC	11					
8. Oriental Carbon & Chem. Ltd	OC&CL	11					
9. Selan Exploration Tech. Ltd	SETL	11					
10. Sesa Goa Ltd.	SESAG	11					
11. ACCLtd	ACC	Non-metal					
12. Ambuja Cements Ltd.	AMBUJACL	17					
13. Andhra Cements Ltd.	ACL	17					
14. Aro Granite Inds. Ltd.	AGIL	11					
15. Asahi India Glass Ltd.	AIGL	11					
16. Asian Star Co. Ltd.	ASCL	71					
17. Bell Ceramics Ltd.	BCL	17					
18. Birla Corporation Ltd.	BIRLAC	11					
19. Borosil Glass Works Ltd.	BGWL	۴۴					
20. Carborundum Universal Ltd.	CUL	17					
21. Century Textiles &Inds. Ltd.	CT&IL	23					
22. Classic Diamonds (India) Ltd	CDL	11					
23. Deccan Cements Ltd.	DECCAN	87					
24. Everest Industries Ltd.	EIL	11					
25. Goldiam International Ltd.	GIL	١٢					
26. Graphite India Ltd.	GIL	11					
27. Grindwell Norton Ltd.	GNL	17					
28. Gujarat Sidhee Cement Ltd.	GSCL	11					
29. H E G Ltd.	HEGL	11					
30. H S I L Ltd.	HSIL	11					
31. Heidelberg Cement India Ltd.	HCIL	11					

APPENDIX

×

32. IFGLRefractoriesLtd.	IFGLR	11
33. India Cements Ltd.	ICL	8 3
34. Indian Hume Pipe Co. Ltd.	IHPCL	11
35. J K Lakshmi Cement Ltd.	JKLC	71
36. Kajaria Ceramics Ltd.	KCL	11
37. KakatiyaCeSugar&Ind Ltd	KCS&IL	şş
38. La Opala R G Ltd.	LORG	11
39. MadhavMarble&Granite Ltd	MM&GL	11
40. Madras Cements Ltd.	MCL	21
41. Mangalam Cement Ltd.	MANGALAMCL	11
42. Murudeshwar Ceramics Ltd.	MCL	2 F
43. N C L Industries Ltd.	NCLI	ę †
44. OCL India Ltd.	OCLI	r to construction of the second se
45. Orient Abrasives Ltd.	OAL	11
46. Orient Ceramics &Inds. Ltd.	OC&IL	Ŧţ
47. Orient Paper &Inds. Ltd.	OP&IL	17
48. Parekh Platinum Ltd.	PPL	3.6
49. Prism Cement Ltd.	PCL	71
50. Rain Commodities Ltd.	RCL	71
51. Rajesh Exports Ltd.	REL	89
52. Ramco Industries Ltd.	RAMCOIL	93
53. Regency Ceramics Ltd.	RCL	23
54. S B & T International Ltd.	SB&TIL	11
55. Sagar Cements Ltd.	SCL	ęŧ
56. Saint-Gobain SekuriInd Ltd	SGSI	ŢŤ
57. Shree Cement Ltd.	SCL	44
58. Shree DigvijayCem. Co Ltd	SDCC	ęş
59. Shrenuj& Co. Ltd.	S&CL	**
60. Shyam Star Gems Ltd.	SSGL	13
61. Silver Smith India Ltd.	SSIL	łł
62. Somany Ceramics Ltd.	SCL	łI
63. Su-Raj Diamond&Jewllr Ltd	SRD&J	91
64. Suashish Diamonds Ltd.	SDL	11
RIJBR 128	155	N : 2455-5959

۶.

65. Sunraj Diamond Exports Ltd.	SDE	19
66. Titan Industries Ltd.	TITAN	11
67. Triveni Glass Ltd.	TRIVENIG	11
68. Vaibhav Gems Ltd.	VGL	28
69. Vesuvius India Ltd.	VIL	11
70. Visaka Industries Ltd.	VISAKAIL	11
71. Ansal Buildwell Ltd	ANSALBL	Real estate
72. Ansal Housing & Const. Ltd	AH&CL	11
73. Ansal Properties &Infrast Ltd	AP&IL	11
74. ArihantFound.&Housing Ltd	AF&HL	11
75. D S Kulkarni Developers Ltd.	DSKD	11
76. H B Estate Developers Ltd.	HBED	11
77. Lok Housing& Construct Ltd	LH&CL	11
78. Peninsula Land Ltd.	PENINSULALL	11
79. Radhe Developers (India) Ltd	RDL	19
80. Rajeswari Infrastructure Ltd.	RIL	99
81. Unitech Ltd.	UNITECH	99

.

×

129