



1 April 2026

Corporate Relationship Department  
**BSE Limited**  
Phiroze Jeejeebhoy Towers,  
Dalal Street, Mumbai – 400 001

**National Stock Exchange of India Limited**  
Exchange Plaza, Plot No. C-1,  
Block G, Bandra – Kurla Complex,  
Bandra (East), Mumbai – 400 051

**Scrip Code: 543981**

**Symbol: RRKABEL**

**Sub: Disclosure under Regulation 30 of SEBI (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2015 as amended (“SEBI Listing Regulations”).**

Dear Sir / Madam,

Pursuant to Regulation 30 of the SEBI Listing Regulations, we hereby inform you that the Principal Commissioner/Commissioner, CGST & CE, Vadodara-I Commissionerate has filed appeals against the Order-In-Appeal No. VAD-CGST-001-APP-COMMR-231-2024-25 and Order-In-Appeal No. VAD-CGST-001-APP-COMMR-230-2024-25 that were issued on 26 September 2024 in favour of the Company.

The details as required to be provided under sub-para 8 of Para B of Part A of Schedule III to the SEBI Listing Regulations, read with SEBI Master Circular SEBI/HO/CFD/PoD2/CIR/P/0155 dated 11 November 2024, are enclosed as **Annexure-1** to this letter.

This intimation is also being uploaded on the Company’s website at [www.rrkabel.com](http://www.rrkabel.com)

We request you to take the above information on record.

Yours faithfully,

**For R R Kabel Limited**

**Anup Vaibhav C. Khanna**  
**Company Secretary and Compliance Officer**  
**M. No. – F6786**

Encl.: as above

Sr. No.	Particulars	Details
1	Brief details of litigation or dispute:	
	Name of the opposing party	The Principal Commissioner/Commissioner, CGST & CE, Vadodara-I Commissionerate.
	Court/Tribunal	Before the Goods and Services Tax Appellate Tribunal (GSTAT)
	Brief details of dispute/litigation	<p>The matter pertains to a refund dispute wherein the Department alleged erroneous refund under Section 73(1) of the CGST Act, 2017 along with interest under Section 50 and penalty under Sections 73(9) and 122, by invoking Rule 89(4B) read with Notification No. 79/2017-Cus. The Company maintained that the refund was correctly claimed under Section 54(3) read with Rule 89(4), as no benefit of the said notification was availed. The appellate authority, vide orders dated 26 September 2024, accepted the Company's position and dropped the demand.</p> <p>Subsequently, the Department has now filed appeals challenging the said orders, contending that the refunds aggregating to ₹36,90,78,517/- (₹5,16,77,444/- for October 2018 to November 2018 and ₹31,74,01,073/- for April 2019 to September 2021) were incorrectly allowed under Rule 89(4) instead of Rule 89(4B).</p>
2	Expected financial implications, if any, due to compensation, penalty etc.:	The Company does not expect any material financial implications on account of the above Appeals.
3	Quantum of claims, if any:	Appeals have been filed by the Department against grant of refund for the period October 2018 to November 2018, amounting to ₹5,16,77,444/- and for the period April 2019 to September 2021, amounting to ₹31,74,01,073/-, along with applicable penalties of ₹51,67,744/- and ₹3,17,40,107/-, respectively, for the above-mentioned period.