



\$~10

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(C) 17176/2022& CM APPL. 17746/2025**

M/S AARTI DRUGS LIMITED

.....Petitioner

Through:

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through:

Mr. Anurag Ojha, SSC with Mr. Dipak Raj, Mr. Shubham Kr., Mr. Vipul Kr. And Ms. Garima Kr., Advocates.
Ms. Avshreya Pratap Singh Rudy, Senior Panel Counsel with Ms. Usha Jamnal, Ms. Harshita Chaturvedi and Mr. Siddhant Nagar, Advocates.

CORAM:

JUSTICE PRATHIBA M. SINGH

JUSTICE RAJNEESH KUMAR GUPTA

ORDER

%

26.03.2025

1. This hearing has been done through hybrid mode.
2. The present petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, *inter alia*, challenging the Office Memorandum dated 15th November, 2022 (hereinafter "*impugned OM*") *vide* which the Central Government has refused to accept the recommendations of the Directorate General of Trade Remedies (hereinafter "*DGTR*") provided *vide* final findings dated 16th August, 2025.
3. The present matter relates to the product viz., Ofloxacin and its intermediates (hereinafter "*subject goods*") imported into India from China PR.
4. The Petitioner being the domestic industry had filed an application before the DGTR for imposition of Anti Dumping Duty (hereinafter "*ADD*").



The investigation was undertaken by the DGTR and final findings were rendered on 22nd December, 2017. The Ministry of Finance on accepting the final findings imposed ADD *vide Notification No. 06/2018-Customs (ADD)* dated 12th March 2018.

5. Thereafter, in terms of the Customs Tariff (Identification, Assessment and Collection of Anti Dumping Duty on Dumped Articles and for Determination of Injury) Rules, 1995, Sunset Review was initiated by DGTR and a public hearing was also held. Interested parties had filed their submissions and the DGTR issued final findings on 16th August, 2022 that there is positive evidence of dumping causing injury and therefore the DGTR recommended imposition of ADD on the import of the subject goods. However, the Central Government *vide* the impugned OM did not accept the recommendation of the DGTR and denied the continuation of imposition of ADD. Hence, the present petition was filed challenging the said OM.

6. The stand of the Petitioner now is that it no longer insists on the imposition of the ADD in respect of the subject goods and, therefore, the Petitioner does not wish to press its challenge in the present petition to the impugned OM.

7. In view of the above position, the petition is disposed of as infructuous binding the Petitioner to its stand that it no longer insists on imposition of ADD in respect of the subject goods.

PRATHIBA M. SINGH, J.

RAJNEESH KUMAR GUPTA, J.

MARCH 26, 2025/nd/Ar.