



COMPETITION COMMISSION OF INDIA

Case No. 21 of 2025

In Re:

Sarvesh M. Kolumbkar

Informant

And

M/s Nestle India Ltd.
Bicholim Maulinguem,
North Goa, Goa – 403504

Opposite Party

CORAM

Ms. Ravneet Kaur
Chairperson

Mr. Anil Agrawal
Member

Ms. Sweta Kakkad
Member

Mr. Deepak Anurag
Member

Order under Section 26(2) of the Competition Act, 2002

1. The present Information has been filed by Mr. Sarvesh M. Kolumbkar (**‘Informant’**) against M/s Nestle India Ltd. (**‘Opposite Party’/‘OP’**) under Section 19(1)(a) of the Competition Act, 2002 (**‘Act’**) alleging contravention of the provisions of Section 4 of the Act.
2. The Informant has alleged that the OP/Nestle India Bicholim Goa Factory, which is involved *inter alia* in the manufacturing of Maggi Sauce, has been using dirty water extraction pump from an under-construction site for the production of Maggi Sauce.



3. The Informant has also alleged that by putting false labels on the Maggi Sauce bottles, the OP has cheated the Indian consumers and denied their right to clean, healthy and hygienic food.
4. The Informant has submitted that highly objectionable production process adopted by OP in manufacturing of Maggi Sauce violates the provisions of Food Safety and Standards Act, 2006 and Rules and Regulations framed thereunder. However, no legal action has been taken by the Directorate of Food and Drugs Administration, Goa.
5. The Informant alleged that by adopting highly objectionable production process and by sticking false labels on Maggi Sauce bottles, the OP has violated the provisions of Section 4 of the Act.
6. Based on the aforesaid facts and allegations, the Informant has prayed before the Commission to incentivise him, if there is any such provision, for following up this Nestle Maggi Sauce scam from the last 15 years. The Informant has also filed an Interlocutory Application ('IA') bearing IA No. 316 of 2025 dated 01.07.2025 for seeking interim relief under Section 33 of the Act requesting the Commission to scrutinise and investigate this highly objectionable Maggi Sauce scam and the officials involved in it. The Informant has further requested the Commission to bar all the certification bodies from giving further certificates.
7. The Commission considered the matter in its ordinary meeting held on 13.08.2025 and decided to pass an appropriate order in due course.
8. The Commission has perused the Information along with the accompanying documents available on record and notes the primary grievance of the Informant that the OP has been using dirty water extraction pump from an under-construction site for the production of Maggi Sauce and was putting false labels on the Maggi Sauce bottles.



9. The Commission further notes that the Informant has made allegations against the OP under Section 4 of the Act, which deals with the prohibition of abuse of dominant position and has been reproduced herein, for reference.

Abuse of Dominant Position:

1. *No enterprise or group shall abuse its dominant position.*
2. *There shall be an abuse of dominant position [under sub-section (1), if an enterprise or a group],-*
 - (a) *directly or indirectly, imposes unfair or discriminatory—*
 - (i) *condition in purchase or sale of goods or services; or*
 - (ii) *price in purchase or sale (including predatory price) of goods or service.*
 - (b) *limits or restricts—*
 - (i) *production of goods or provision of services or market therefore; or*
 - (ii) *technical or scientific development relating to goods or services to the prejudice of consumers; or*
 - (c) *indulges in practice or practices resulting in denial of market access [in any manner]; or*
 - (d) *makes conclusion of contracts subject to acceptance by other parties of supplementary obligations which, by their nature or according to commercial usage, have no connection with the subject of such contracts; or*
 - (e) *uses its dominant position in one relevant market to enter into, or protect, other relevant market.*

10. With regard to the allegations raised by the Informant under Section 4 of the Act, the Commission notes that the conduct alleged, *supra*, primarily relates to the violation of food, health and safety standards and in itself does not fall within the ambit of the Act, in absence of any other information which necessitates further examination into the allegations.

11. Having perused the allegations and the relief sought by the Informant, the Commission is of the view that there is no competition issue arising out of the present case and thus, directs that the matter be closed forthwith under the provisions of Section 26(2) of the Act. Consequently, no case for grant for interim reliefs as sought under Section 33 of the Act, arises and the same is also rejected. Accordingly, IA No. 316 of 2025 dated 01.07.2025 stands disposed of.



12. The Secretary is directed to communicate to the Informant, accordingly.

**Sd/-
Ravneet Kaur
Chairperson**

**Sd/-
Anil Agrawal
Member**

**Sd/-
Sweta Kakkad
Member**

**Sd/-
Deepak Anurag
Member**

New Delhi

Date: 07.10.2025