General information about company

Scrip code	533212	
NSE Symbol	NOTLISTED	
MSEI Symbol	BSE	
ISIN	INE265D01015	
Name of the entity	GKB Ophthalmics Limited	
Date of start of financial year	01-04-2026	
Date of end of financial year	31-03-2027	
Reporting Quarter Type	Quarterly	
Date of Quarter Ending	30-06-2026	
Type of company	Equity	
Whether Annexure I (Part A) of the SEBI Circular dated December 31, 2024 related to Compliance Report on Corporate Governance is applicable to the entity?	No	Regulation 15(2) of SEBI (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2015 (Listing Regulations) and the Compliances with the Corporate Governance provisions as specified in Regulations 17 to 27 and clause (b) to (i) and (t) of sub regulation (2) of Regulation 46 and Para C, D and E of Schedule V shall not apply to our Company, w.e.f. April 01, 2026, as the Paid up Equity Share Capital and Net Worth are not exceeding Rupees Ten Crores and Rupees Twenty Five Crores respectively, as on the last days of the previous three consecutive financial years i.e. March 31, 2024, March 31, 2025 and March 31, 2026. Accordingly, the requirement to submit Compliance Report on Corporate Governance for the Quarter ended June 30, 2026 as required under Regulation 27(2) of the Listing Regulations is not applicable to the Company. The Company has filed with BSE Ltd., the Certificate of Non Applicability pursuant to Regulation 15(2) of Listing Regulations, vide letter dated July 04, 2026 , Acknowledgement no. 04072026886084.
Whether Annexure I (Part B) of the SEBI Circular dated December 31, 2024 related to Investor Grievance Redressal Report is Applicable to the entity?	Yes	
Whether Annexure I (Part C) of the SEBI Circular dated December 31, 2024 related to Disclosure of Acquisition of Shares or Voting Rights in Unlisted Companies is Applicable to the entity?	No	The Company has not aquired any shares during the reporting quarter
Whether Annexure I (Part D) of the SEBI Circular dated December 31, 2024 related to Disclosure of Imposition of Fine or Penalty is Applicable to the entity?	No	No fines and penalties have been imposed on the Company for the quarter ended June 30, 2026.

Whether Annexure I (Part E) of the SEBI Circular dated December 31, 2024 related to Disclosure of Updates to Ongoing Tax Litigations or Disputes is Applicable to the entity?	Yes
Is SCORE ID Available ?	Yes
SCORE Registration ID	g00316
Reason For No SCORE ID	
Type of Submission	Original
Remarks (website dissemination)	
Remarks for Exchange (not for Website Dissemination)	

Investor Grievance Details	
No. of investor complaints pending at the beginning of Quarter	0
No. of investor complaints received during the Quarter	0
No. of investor complaints disposed off during the Quarter	0
No. of investor complaints those remaining unresolved at the end of the Quarter	0

Disclosure of Updates to Ongoing Tax Litigations or Disputes The updates on tax litigations or disputes in terms of sub-para 8 of para B of Part A of Schedule III read with corresponding provisions of Annexure 18 of the Master Circular are given below:				
Any Other Information for Disclosure of Updates to Ongoing Tax Litigations or Disputes				
Sr. No.	Name of the opposing party	Date of initiation of the litigation / dispute	Status of the litigation / dispute as per last disclosure	Current status of the litigation / dispute
1	Assistant commissioner of Commercial Tax	20-03-2012	Export sales considered as local taxable sales due to non-availability of documents	In FY 2011-12, the DRI authorities had seized the documents of the entity and during the same year VAT audit was conducted for FY 2008-09, by the sales tax department. During year 2008-09 there was export sales for which the sales tax commissioner asked for the original documents. Since the documents were seized by DRI, the entity was not able to produce the same to Sales Tax Commissioner. Thus, the sales tax commissioner has raised demand, by considering the export sales as Interstate sales and levied CST on the same. Mapusa Ward (CTO, ACCT) had raised the order against which the company has filed an Appeal to Appellate Authority (Panjim), who has forwarded the case to Mapusa Ward for Re-assessment and Mapusa Ward has not yet given the notice to the Company regarding the re-assessment. The Company is awaiting for the response from Mapusa Ward. Further, there were no updates on this case during the quarter.
2	Customs, Excise and Service Tax Applellate Tribunal (CESTAT)	12-04-2016	Concessional Duty on DTA Sales not allowed (including interest and penalty). (Gross of deposit of Rs.44 Lakhs)	The Company was subjected to a Customs, Excise, and Service Tax (DRI) investigation concerning alleged misclassification of goods, excess Domestic Tariff Area (DTA) sales and failure to fully meet conditions of the Foreign Trade Policy (FTP). The Order-in-Original (No. GOA-EXCUS-000-COM-022-15-16 dated 12.04.2016) passed by the Commissioner of Central Excise and Service Tax, Goa, imposed duty, interest, and penalties on the company. The Company appealed this order before CESTAT (Customs, Excise & Service Tax Appellate Tribunal) . In this matter an Order-in-Original was issued by the Commissioner of Customs, Goa imposing a total differential duty of Rs. 2,66,66,750/-and the balance Rs. 3,11,76,395/- was dropped. The Company has made an appeal to CESTAT authorities wherein the Company has sufficient grounds to further reduce this liability.The Company also filed a refund claim of Rs.23,38,236/-being the balance pre-deposit dated 27.06.2016 paid at the time of filing appeal before Hon'ble CESTAT under Section 35F of the Central Excise Act, 1944. The Custom Department sanctioned the refund of Rs. 36,55,832/- (pre-deposit of Rs.23,38,236/- and interest of Rs.13,17,596/- which was received by the Company.
3	Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeals)	25-03-2016	Nil	There was dividend income in AY 13-14 and 14-15. The department is contesting that the amount invested is out of borrowed funds and the interest expense on borrowed funds, which the entity has claimed as deduction, is partly disallowed by the department. However, the entity is contesting that the investment in subsidiary is made out of the shareholders fund and not from the borrowed funds. Currently the matter is under appeal with CIT(A) (Commissioner Appeals)-Further during the FY 22-23 entity received the order partly in favour of GKB Ophthalnmics limited by which demand has been reduced to 12.71 lakhs from 19.48 lakhs for AY 14-15, to which the Company has further filed an appeal.
4	Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeals)	07-04-2016	Mainly due to additions u/s. 14A made in scrutiny assessment	There was dividend income in AY 13-14 and 14-15. The department is contesting that the amount invested is out of borrowed funds and the interest expense on borrowed funds, which the entity has claimed as deduction, is partly disallowed by the department. However, the entity is contesting that the investment in subsidiary is made out of the shareholders fund and not from the borrowed funds. Currently the matter is under appeal with CIT(A) (Commissioner Appeals)-Further during the FY 22-23 entity received the order partly in favour of GKB Ophthalnmics limited by which demand has been reduced to 12.71 lakhs from 19.48 lakhs for AY 14-15 to which the Company has further filed an appeal.

5	Additional Commisioner of Commercial Tax, Panaji	31-05-2017	Entry tax levied on purchases claimed as exempted (Gross of deposit of Rs.5 Lakhs)	Company is EOU unit, hence exempted for paying Entry tax on Imports. The commissioner had refused the entity's claim for the exemption. Mapusa Ward (CTO, ACCT) had raised the order against which the company had previously filed an Appeal to Appellate Authority (Panjim), who has forwarded the case to Mapusa Ward for Re-assessment and Mapusa Ward has not yet given the notice to GKB regarding the re-assessment. GKB is awaiting for the response from Mapusa Ward. As per the legal opinion, it was confirmed to us that the said liability should be set aside in appeal.No further hearing has taken place.
6	Securities and Exchange Board of India	29-07-2022	Violation of section clause 35 of the erstwhile equity Listing agreement (effective till 30-Nov-2015) and Regulation 31(1) of the SEBI LODR 2015	As per the order, the Company was filing wrong information in quarterly shareholding pattern, which has led to violation of Section clause 35 of the erstwhile equity Listing agreement (effective till 30-Nov-2015) and Regulation 31(1) of the SEBI LODR 2015. However there is condition in the order that the order will be applicable based on the hearing of SEBI vs Suzlon Energy Ltd, which is pending before Hon'ble Supreme Court Hence from the order it is evident that it is a conditional order based on the judgement of hearing of SEBI vs Suzlon Energy Ltd .
7	The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeals)	20-09-2022	Wrong additions made to income	Appeal filed was towards Notice under Section 250. Department had wrongly added Dividend twice, raising a tax liability. An amount of Rs. 1,98,35,796/- was credited to P and L account and again department added back in the total income. And there were another 2 matters i.e allowance claimed by entity towards Superannuation and leave encashment provision, which the department has added back amounting to Rs. 5.49 lakhs. The Company is awaiting a response from the authorities.
8	Development Commissioner - Seepz Special Economic Zone	12-02-2015	Contravention of Foreign Trade Policy & Procedure , DTA Sale made during the year 2007-08 to 2013-14 without permission from Development Commissioner , SEEPZ SEZ and the Positive NFE not achieved	The Development Commissioner had in its Order dated January 07, 2016 stated that the Company had Unauthorised DTA sales without entitlement in contravention to the provisions of Foreign Trade Policy & Procedure hence liable for the penal action under Section 11 (2) of the Foreign Trade (Development and Regulation) Act 1992 and imposed a penalty of Rs. 10,00,000/- In this matter, the Company has received a show cause notice wherein the authorities have levied a penalty from earlier Rs. 10,00,000/- to Rs.17,00,000/- for failure to achieve positive NFE for the year 2016-17 to 2018-19. The Company has filed its reply to the authorities with the necessary supporting documents to reduce this liability.
9	Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court	25-05-2021	Charter of Demands raised by the Workers' Union on wage settlement	A Case no. 32/09 was filed for adjudication of Charter of Demands in the year 2009, by the Workmen of GKB Ophthalmics Limited represented by Goa Trade & Commercial Workers' Union against the Company , wherein an Award was passed by the Industrial Tribunal Panjim-Goa dated 25/05/2021. The said Award was challenged by the Company vide writ petition no. WP/358/2021 filed in the Hon'ble High Court of Bombay at Goa. Further based on the legal opinion, the Company has a good case in succeeding as the material facts were ignored while passing the Award. The case is being argued by our Senior Counsel to set aside the Award as it is strongly believed that grounds such as Industry cum Region formula, the financial position of the Company, comparable industries, etc., were not considered by the learned Industrial Tribunal while passing the said Award. Simultaneously, the said matter was also pending before the office of Labour Commissioner for execution of the Award. Accordingly, the Company has received the Order on September 12, 2025 wherein the Labour Commissioner has ordered the recovery of Rs. 8,82,00,856/- from the Company with respect to the said award. However, the Company is not admitting the liability and the Company is in the process of challenging the Labour Commissioner's Order before the Hon'ble High Court, seeking appropriate reliefs in this regard once the recovery certificate is issued by the concerned authority. In continuation to the above, the Company has now received a "Notice of Demand" on July 13, 2026 from the Office of the Mamlatdar of Bardez Taluka, Mapusa, Goa for recovery of Rs. 8,82,00,856/- within a period of 10 days from the date of service of the Notice i.e., July 13, 2026. The Company in consultation with its legal counsel will be challenging this Order before the Hon'ble High Court of Bombay by filing a writ petition seeking appropriate relief.