

Nectar Lifesciences Ltd.



Ref No.: NLL/CS/2026- 663

March 07, 2026

To,

1. National Stock Exchange of India Limited
Listing Department,
Exchange Plaza, Bandra Kurla Complex,
Bandra (E), Mumbai 400 051

Symbol: NECLIFE

2. BSE Limited
Corporate Relationship Department,
P J Towers, Dalal Street,
Mumbai 400 001

Scrip Code: 532649

Sub: Regulation 30 of the Securities and Exchange of Board of India (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2015 ("LODR Regulations") read with Master Circular No. HO/49/14/14(7)2025-CFD-POD2/I/3762/2026 dated January 30, 2026.

Dear Sir/ Madam,

This is with reference to letter no. NLL/CS/2024- 414 dated October 07, 2024, vide which the Company had informed pending Litigation(s) as required under Regulation 30 of the LODR Regulations.

Pursuant to captioned regulations, please find enclosed herewith necessary disclosures in prescribed format for details/ updation of Litigation and/ or orders passed by any regulatory authority or judicial body as per **Annexure- 1**.

Kindly take the same on record.

Thanking you,

Yours faithfully,

For **Nectar Lifesciences Limited**

(Sanjaymohan Singh Rawat)

Company Secretary & Compliance Officer

The Details of Litigation and/ or order passed by regulatory authority or judicial body for or against Nectar Lifesciences Limited (“Company”)

Updation on litigation			
Sr no.	Brief details of litigation and action taken or order passed	Expected Financial Implication	Quantum of claims, if any
1.	Nectar Lifesciences Limited		
	Name of Opposite Party: Sanjay Chemicals India Private Limited. (“Plaintiff”)	Nil	Nil.
	Forum where Pending/ Appeal filed/ Appeal proposed to be filed: Mumbai City Civil Commercial Court (“Court”)		
	Date of receipt of Order: By email on March 07, 2026		
	Nature and details of action(s) taken, initiated or order(s) passed, and details of the violation(s)/contravention(s) committed or alleged to be committed/ Brief details of case: The Hon’ble Court has returned the plaint to the Plaintiff, citing a lack of jurisdiction to hear the matter. The Plaintiff had sought recovery of a ₹ 43,30,914 principal amount, 21% interest, and a ₹ 2,00,000 penalty. The Company successfully argued that the Court lacked jurisdiction and that the claims were time-barred. Consequently, the suit stands disposed of with no liability or action against the Company.		