

SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			<u>UKHC010111072026</u> <u>WPMS/1969/2026</u> M/s Sai Medicose --Petitioner Versus State Of Uttarakhand --Respondent <u>Hon'ble Manoj Kumar Tiwari, J.</u> Mr. Jitendra Chaudhary, Advocate with Mr. Madhur Pabra, Advocate for the petitioner. Mr. Yogesh Pande, Deputy Advocate General assisted by Mr. Ghanshyam Joshi, Additional CSC, for the State. Mr. Sandeep Kothari, Advocate for the respondent. 2. By means of this writ petition, petitioner has sought the following reliefs: “i. Issue writ, order or direction in nature of mandamus, or any other appropriate writ, directing the Respondent no. 2 to decide the representation of the petitioner dated 18.03.2026 (Annexure No. 2, Page No.18-21) in accordance with law, within such time frame as the Hon'ble Court deems fit, and/or ii. Issue writ, order or direction in nature of mandamus, or any other appropriate writ, Directing the Respondent no. 2 to form a committee and initiate an Independent departmental Inquiry in the light of Order dated 16.12.2025 (Annexure No.3, Page No.224) passed by the Respondent no. 1.” 3. According to petitioner, Secretary, Department of Medical Health and Family Welfare, while deciding the appeal filed by

		petitioner as per provisions of Drugs and Cosmetics Rules, directed for holding departmental inquiry against the Drug Licensing Authority. 4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that since directions issued by the Appellate Authority is not being carried out, therefore, petitioner be permitted to make representation to the Competent Authority. 5. Per contra, learned State Counsel submits that subsequent to order passed by Appellate Authority on 16.12.2025, drug licence issued to petitioner was again cancelled on 05.03.2026; petitioner, thereafter, again filed an appeal which was dismissed on 24.04.2026. Thus it is contended that order passed by the Appellate Authority in earlier round of litigation is now inoperative. 6. This Court do not find any reason to issue direction as prayed for. 7. Since the Appellate Authority in another round of litigation has dismissed the appeal, therefore direction issued in earlier appeal filed by petitioner is eclipsed. 8. Writ petition is, accordingly, dismissed. (Manoj Kumar Tiwari, J.) 25.08.2026
--	--	---

--	--	--	--