



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

**CWP No.30616 of 2025
Date of Decision: 04.11.2025**

Saatvik Solar Industries Private Limited

.....Petitioner.

Versus

Union of India and others

.....Respondents.

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE LISA GILL
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA**

Present:- Mr. Rishabh Jain, Advocate and
Mr. Shubham Jain, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Naman Jain, Senior Standing Counsel
for respondents No.1, 5 and 6.

Mr. Sunish Bindlish, Senior Advocate with
Ms. Sidhi Bansal, Advocate,
Ms. Ridhi Bansal, Advocate and
Mr. Parth Sharma, Advocate
for respondents No.2 to 4.

LISA GILL, J.(Oral)

1. Prayer in this writ petition is for “quashing investigation initiated by respondent-authorities vide search conducted on 23.07.2025 and all subsequent proceedings including summons dated 07.10.2025 (Annexure P-22)” statedly illegal and arbitrary.

2. It is submitted that respondent-authorities have initiated proceedings in an attempt to recover Anti-Dumping Duty on imported



EPE, i.e Ethylene Propylene Elastomer Films, which are not covered under any Anti-Dumping Notification. This action is causing irreparable harm to petitioner's legitimate business operations in the renewable energy sector. It is further pointed that question of whether EPE is exigible to tax is now under consideration of Directorate General of Trade Remedies (DGTR). Therefore, in any case, respondent-authorities are not entitled to levy Anti-Dumping Duty on imported EPE Films, at this stage. Consequently, proceedings initiated as above should be aborted and writ petition allowed as prayed for.

3. Learned Senior counsel for respondents No.2 to 4, on instructions from Mr. Prasad Krishnan K, Assistant Director, DRI, Zonal Unit, Cochin, informs that as of now, investigation is being carried out as to whether petitioner has not deposited Anti-Dumping Duty on EVA, i.e Ethylene Vinyl Acetate which is admittedly leviable as per notification dated 14.03.2024. It is being investigated as to whether the material in question is EVA or EPE. Learned counsel, on specific instructions, submits that insofar as the question of Anti-Dumping Duty on EPE is concerned, no action shall be taken by the Department till matter is finally decided by DGTR in respect to exigibility of this Duty on EPE. In the meantime, it would be found out as to whether the material of petitioner is EPE or EVA.

4. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances as above and specific stand of respondents, we do not find any ground whatsoever to cause interference, at this stage, to scuttle the investigation initiated by respondent-authorities.



5. It has been brought to our notice that samples have also been sent for analysis report and petitioner has been asked to come forward to submit the relevant documents which are in its possession. Though learned counsel for petitioner submits that necessary documents have been submitted, learned counsel for respondents responds that relevant documents qua composition of sheets in question have not yet been submitted.

6. Learned counsel for petitioner submits that pursuant to last summons which were issued, the documents, as had been sought from petitioner, have been submitted and in case any further documents are required, petitioner would come forward to provide the same as may be sought by respondent-authorities.

7. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances as above, we do not find any ground whatsoever to quash the investigation initiated by respondent-authorities, at this stage. They are very well within their rights to carry on investigation in the matter which, it is informed, has been initiated on account of specific intelligence reports.

8. Writ petition is disposed of accordingly.

(LISA GILL)
JUDGE

(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)
JUDGE

November 04, 2025
Yag Dutt

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes
Whether Reportable: Yes