JUDGMENT SHEET
IN THE ISLAMABAD HIGH COURT, ISLAMABAD
JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT

W.P.No.1586 of 2020
M/s Bio Leads (Pvt.) Limited and others
Versus
Federation of Pakistan through Secretary, Ministry of Law and Justice and others

Dates of Hearing:	19.02.2021, 11.03.2021, 24.03.2021, 05.05.2021, 02.06.2021, 04.06.2021, 18.06.2021 & 01.07.2021
Petitioners by:	Rana Abid Nazir Khan, Raja Bilal Mustafa, Ms. Nadia Asghar, Rana Mehboob Ahmad, Ch. Shahid Mehmood, Advocates in W.P.Nos.1586, 1670, 1863, 2162, 2357, 2569, 2970 and 3961 of 2020, 310, 580, 634, 674, 772, 836, 899, 1006, 1317, 1400, 1569, 1841, 1951, 1952, 2134 and 2337 of 2021 M/s Haroon Duggal, Subhe Nasib, Advocates in W.P.Nos.2767, 3350, 3351, 3460 and 3593 of 2018 Syed Zameer Hussain Shah, Advocate in W.P.Nos.1722 and 2156 of 2020 Mr. Sikandar Naeem Qazi, Advocate in W.P.No.1764/2020 Khawaja Manzoor Ahmad, Advocate in W.P.Nos.1843/2020 and 1007/2021 Raja Mumtaz Ali, Advocate in W.P.Nos.3047/2020 and 1007/2021 Sardar Haseeb Ahmed, Advocate in W.P.No.1956/2021 Syed Iftikhar Gillani, and Barrister M. Saad Butter, Advocates in W.P.No.4736/2018 Mr. Zia-ur-Rehman, Advocate in W.P.Nos.2148 and 2198 of 2020 Mr. Muhammad Umar Khan Verdaq, Advocate in W.P.No.2258/2020 M/s Afzal Awan and Nazma Parveen, Advocates in Crl.Org.No.88/2021 in W.P.No.310/2021 Mr. Nasrum Minallah, Advocate in W.P.No.1349/2021 Mr. Atta Ullah Hakim Kundi, Advocate in W.P.No.1431/2021 Qazi Isaac Ali, Advocate in W.P.No.1650/2021 Raza Ali Shah, Advocate in W.P.No.3582/2020 Ch. Muhammad Tariq Ali Goheer, Advocate in W.P.No.4490/2018

UNCERTIFIED COPY

Respondents by: Mr. Arshid Mehmood Kiani, learned Deputy Attorney-General
Barrister Ahmed Pervaiz, Barrister Ehsan Ali Qazi, Sifat Ullah, Advocates and Hafiz Bilal Bin Akbar, Assistant Director (Legal), DRAP
Mr. Binyamin Abbasi, Advocate for MCC in W.P.Nos.1670, 1722, 1843, 1863, 2148, 2156, 2357, 2970, 3047 of 2020, 310, 580, 634, 836, 1349 and 1431 of 2021
Dr. Farhat Zafar, Advocate for MCC Customs Appraisement (East), MCC Port Qasim Karachi and MCC Islamabad in W.P.Nos.2569 and 2970 of 2020, 310, 580, 634, 674, 772, 899, 1006, 1349 and 1431 of 2021
Mr. Sajid Mahmood Baig, Advocate for respondent No.6 in W.P.No.2198/2020
Ch. Muhammad Nawaz, Advocate for CC Appraisement (West) Karachi in W.P.No.674 of 2021
Ch. Muhammad Zafar Iqbal, Advocate in W.P.Nos.2198 of 2020, 634, 772 and 899 of 2021
Mr. Arshad Mehmood, Advocate in W.P.No.2148/2020
Mrs. Naziran Malik, Advocate for Customs in W.P.No.1764/2020
Mr. Irshad Ahmad Zada Mohammadzai, Advocate for respondent No.4 in W.P.No.2258/2020

MIANGUL HASSAN AURANGZEB, J:- Through this judgment, I propose to decide writ petitions listed in **Schedule-A** hereto.

2. The petitioners have assailed the *vires* of the Medical Devices Rules, 2017 (**"the MD Rules"**) made by the Drug Regulatory Authority of Pakistan (**"DRAP"**) in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 23 of the Drug Regulatory Authority of Pakistan Act, 2012 (**"the DRAP Act"**). These Rules have been made with the approval of the Federal Government.

3. The petitioners are engaged in the business of import and sale of diagnostic medical devices, and are aggrieved by the inclusion of In-Vitro Diagnostic Medical Devices (**"IVD medical devices"**) in the regulatory domain of DRAP pursuant to the provisions of the MD Rules.

4. Rana Abid Nazir Khan, Advocate Supreme Court of Pakistan, learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that all the petitioners are

UNCERTIFIED COPY

importers of medical devices (as defined in paragraph 3 of Schedule-I to the DRAP Act) and IVD medical devices (as defined in Rule 2(xlii) of the MD Rules); that the definition of medical devices does not include IVD medical devices; that the Global Harmonization Task Force (**"GHTF"**) guidelines also define medical devices separately from IVD medical devices; that the said guidelines define an IVD medical device to mean a medical device, whether used alone or in combination, intended by the manufacturer for in-vitro examination of specimens derived from the human body solely or principally to provide information for diagnostic, monitoring or compatibility purposes; that an IVD medical device cannot be termed as a therapeutic good, and therefore its import and sale cannot be regulated or dealt with either under the provisions of the DRAP Act or the MD Rules; that Rule 14 of the said Rules provides the procedure for enlistment and registration of medical devices but not IVD medical devices; and that IVD medical devices imported by the petitioners are not being released by the customs authorities on the grounds that neither are they enlisted and registered nor have their importers been issued drug sale licences.

5. Furthermore, it was submitted that IVD medical devices imported and sold by the petitioners have nothing to do with the cure and treatment of diseases, and are not therapeutic goods; that IVD medical devices are used for examination and diagnosis of samples outside the living organism, and therefore have nothing to do with the cure and treatment of diseases; that it was obligatory upon the Medical Devices Board (**"MDB"**) to have classified the medical devices in accordance with the GHTF and International Medical Device Regulators Forum (**"IMDRF"**) guidelines, which define medical devices separately from IVD medical devices; that the inclusion of an IVD medical device in medical devices by the M.D.B. is in collusion with large companies which want to weed out the petitioners from the competitive arena; that the list of medical devices given in Schedule-A to the MD Rules are all IVD medical devices since they do not come in direct contact with patients; and that none of the devices listed in Schedule-A can be termed as IVD medical devices.

6. Syed Iftikhar Gillani, Senior Advocate Supreme Court of Pakistan, learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the DRAP Act

UNCERTIFIED COPY

pertains to *"inter-provincial trade and commerce of therapeutic goods"* and does not apply to IVD medical devices which do not fall within the ambit of therapeutics; that the MD Rules do not apply to IVD medical devices as the said Rules stem from the DRAP Act, which was enacted solely for the regulation of *"therapeutic goods;"* that therapeutic goods and IVD medical devices are completely distinct products; that "therapeutics" has been defined as a branch of medicine that deals with treatment and cure of diseases whereas IVD medical devices pertain to those medical devices that are intended for the in-vitro (i.e. outside of the body of a living organism) examination of the human body for the purposes of diagnostic monitoring or compatibility; that the inclusion of IVD medical devices within the ambit of therapeutic goods goes against the GHTF and the IMDRF guidelines, both of which are being relied upon for the classification and grouping of medical devices under Rule 11 of the MD Rules; that the petitioners are opposed to the inclusion of IVD medical devices among therapeutics goods; that the inclusion of IVD medical devices among therapeutic goods is the result of collusion between DRAP and big pharmaceutical companies in order to protect their monopoly and give them a free hand to charge exorbitant prices from people; and that inclusion of IVD medical devices among therapeutic goods also places an unnecessary financial burden on the petitioners since they have to hire Class-A pharmacists, and possess a 600 sq. yard refrigeration unit which can be inspected by a Drug Inspector.

7. Barrister Haroon Duggal, Advocate Supreme Court of Pakistan submitted that prior to the abolition of the Concurrent Legislative List through the Constitution (Eighteenth Amendment) Act, 2010 ("18th Amendment") the subject of Drugs and Medicines was at Entry No.20 of the said list; that due to the abolition of Concurrent Legislative List through the 18th Amendment, the said subject did not fall within the legislative domain of the Parliament; that by virtue of Section 270 AA (6) of the Constitution, the Drugs Act, 1976 continued to remain in force until altered, repealed or amended by the Competent Authority, i.e. the Provincial Legislature; that under Article 144 of the Constitution, the Provincial Assembly of Punjab passed resolution dated 15.02.2012 to the effect that the Parliament may by law regulate matters relating to

UNCERTIFIED COPY

drugs and medicines; that the other Provincial Assemblies have also passed similar resolutions; that thereafter the Parliament, on 13.11.2012, enacted the DRAP Act; that Article 144 also empowers the Provincial Assembly to amend or to repeal the law enacted by Parliament pursuant to Article 144 of the Constitution; that after the enactment of the DRAP Act by the Parliament, the Provincial Assembly of Punjab has amended the Drugs Act, 1976 from time to time; that after such amendments, the authority given by the Provincial Assemblies to the Parliament to make law for the regulation of matters relating to drugs and medicines stood rescinded; that after the amendments made by the Provincial Assembly of Punjab in the Drugs Act, 1976, DRAP could not make the MD Rules in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 23 of the DRAP Act; and that such rules could not be made applicable to the Province of Punjab.

8. Furthermore, it was submitted that medical devices do not come within the meaning of "drugs"; that the MD Rules are manifestly arbitrary, unworkable and provide impossible deadlines which are contrary to the international best practices; and that the procedure prescribed in the MD Rules for the registration and renewal of medical devices are cumbersome.

9. The learned counsel for the petitioners prayed for the writ petitions to be allowed. The other counsel for the petitioners adopted the aforementioned arguments. Mr. Muhammad Umar Khan Vardag, Advocate, however, submitted that the petitioner whom he represents imports hearing aids, which do not come within the meaning of medical devices.

10. On the other hand, Barrister Ahmed Pervaiz learned counsel for DRAP submitted that the questions as to whether medical devices fall within the meaning of drugs and medicines, and the competence of the Parliament to legislate on the subject of drugs and medicines (which include medical devices) pursuant to the resolutions passed by the Provincial Assemblies under Article 144 of the Constitution has been exhaustively dealt with and decided by the Hon'ble High Court of Sindh in the judgment reported as Azfar Laboratories (Pvt.) Ltd. Vs. Federation of Pakistan (PLD 2018 Sindh 448) (**"Azfar Laboratories' case"**) and by the Hon'ble Lahore High Court in the judgment reported

UNCERTIFIED COPY

as Dawakhana Hakeem Ajmal Khan (Pvt.) Ltd. Vs. Federation of Pakistan (PLD 2020 Lahore 899) ("Dawakhana Hakeem's case") as well as in the judgment dated 22.10.2020 passed in Writ Petition No.20263/2020 titled "Johnson and Johnson Pakistan (Pvt.) Ltd. Vs. Federation of Pakistan etc."

11. Furthermore, it was submitted that medial devices have always been regulated as "drugs" under the Drugs Act, 1976 and were included in the definition of drugs either specifically or through the authority given to the Federal Government under the said Act; that not only does the definition of "drugs" in the said Act include medical devices but also allows the Federal Government to declare substances or devices as drugs; that it is not the petitioners' case that previously medical devices had not been regulated as drugs; that in the case reported as *PLD 1992 SC 455*, the Hon'ble Supreme Court held *inter alia* that the definition of drug in the Drugs Act, 1976 is wide and covers any matter, material or stuff manufactured and sold for the treatment, mitigation, prevention, or diagnosis of disease in human beings or animals; that the petitioners have not challenged any specific provision of the MD Rules; that the petitioners do not want the trade in IVD medical devices to be regulated by DRAP; that paragraph 3 of Schedule-I to the DRAP Act includes a device used for diagnosis, monitoring and treatment of disease to be a medical device; that IVD medical devices are critical for diagnosis and there can be no monitoring or treatment without diagnosis; that the GHTF and IMDRF guidelines also define IVD medical devices as medical devices; and that the mere fact that the compliance with the MD Rules would be inconvenient to the petitioners is not a valid ground to strike down *vires* of the said rules. Learned counsel for DRAP prayed for the writ petitions to be dismissed.

12. I have heard the contentions of the learned counsel for the contesting parties and have perused the record with their able assistance.

13. I propose in the first instance to decide the question as to whether the authority to legislate on the subject of drugs and medicines could be exercised by the Parliament pursuant to the resolutions passed by the provincial assemblies under Article 144 of the Constitution.

UNCERTIFIED COPY

14. The scope and extent of the legislative power exercised by the Parliament under Article 144 of the Constitution has been discussed in detail by the Hon'ble High Court of Sindh in Azfar Laboratories' case (*supra*). After doing so and referring to the resolutions passed by the provincial assemblies authorizing the Parliament to legislate on the subject of drugs and medicines and the establishment of a regulatory authority, the Hon'ble High Court of Sindh dismissed the challenge to the constitutionality of the DRAP Act. I have gone through the said judgment with great interest and keenness and have been given no reason to take a different view.

15. Furthermore, challenge had also been made to the legislative competence of the Parliament to enact the DRAP Act before the Hon'ble Lahore High Court. In particular, it was asserted before the Hon'ble Lahore High Court that the Parliament could not legislate on the subject of medical devices as they did not come within the meaning of drugs and medicines. The Hon'ble Lahore High Court in the Dawakhana Hakeem's case (*supra*) and Johnson and Johnson's case (*supra*) upheld the constitutionality of the DRAP Act and/or the legislative competence of the Parliament to enact the said Act, and also the Parliament's competence to legislate on the subject of medical devices which were held to come within the meaning of drugs and medicines.

16. In some of the writ petitions, the *vires* of the DRAP Act have been challenged. It would be tedious and verbose to detail the reasoning of the Hon'ble High Court of Sindh as well as of the Hon'ble Lahore High Court in the said judgments. Suffice it to say that I am not inclined to take a different view from the law laid down in the said judgments, the petitioners' challenge to the constitutionality of the DRAP Act as well as their assertion that the subject of medical devices could not have been legislated upon by the Parliament is decided in terms of the law laid down in the said judgments.

17. Indeed, the Provincial legislature has the legislative competence to amend or repeal the DRAP Act to the extent to which it applies to the Province. This is explicitly provided in Article 144 of the Constitution. As regards the applicability of the DRAP Act to the Islamabad Capital Territory, Article 142(d) of the Constitution provides that the Parliament shall have exclusive powers to make laws with respect to all matters

UNCERTIFIED COPY

pertaining to such areas in the Federation as are not included in any Province. The Islamabad Capital Territory is indeed an area in Federation not included in any Province and therefore the Parliament has the exclusive powers to make laws with respect to all matters, including the regulation of drugs and medicines for such area. Insofar as the applicability of the DRAP Act to the Islamabad Capital Territory is concerned, it is only the Parliament that can amend or repeal the said Act.

18. The Provincial Assembly of the Punjab may have amended the provisions of the Drugs Act, 1976 but this by itself would not operate as a repeal of the DRAP Act to the extent of its applicability to the Province of Punjab. Article 144 of the Constitution also permits the Provincial Assemblies to amend the law enacted by the Parliament pursuant to the said Article. Since none of the Provincial Assemblies have repealed the provision in the D.R.A.P Act empowering D.R.A.P to make rules, therefore, the MD Rules made by DRAP in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 23 of the DRAP Act cannot be declared ultra *vires* simply on the ground that a Provincial Assembly has amended the Drugs Act, 1976. It is an admitted position that none of the Provinces have questioned the *vires* of either the DRAP Act or the MD Rules. If it is assumed that the MD Rules to the extent of bringing IVD medical devices within the regulatory domain of DRAP was beyond the authority given by the Provincial Assemblies to the Parliament to legislate on the subject of drugs and medicines, it is not understandable as to why the Provinces have not questioned the *vires* of the MD Rules to the said extent. This silence by the Provinces would endorse the view that the MD Rules are in conformity with the DRAP Act, which was enacted pursuant to the authority given by the Provinces to the Parliament under Article 144 of the Constitution.

19. The DRAP Act was enacted on 13.11.2012. As per the preamble of the said Act, one of the objectives of the said Act is to regulate the manufacture, import, export, storage, distribution and sale of therapeutic goods. The said Act defines "therapeutic goods" to include drugs or alternative medicine or medical devices or biological or other related products as may be notified by DRAP whereas the term "medical devices" has been defined to mean medical devices as

UNCERTIFIED COPY

specified in Schedule-I. Paragraph 3 of Schedule-I to the said Act provides that the medical devices include (a) instruments, medical equipment, implants, disposables and software, used mainly for the purpose of diagnosis, monitoring and treatment of disease; or (b) any other item which the Federal Government may, by notification in the official Gazette, declare as medical device.

20. Rule 2(xlii) defines an "in-vitro diagnostic (IVD) medical device" as follows:-

> ***"in-vitro diagnostic (IVD) medical device means a medical device, whether used alone or in combination, intended by the manufacturer for the in-vitro examination of specimens derived from the human or animal body solely or principally to provide information for diagnostic, monitoring or compatibility purposes including reagents, calibrators, control materials, specimen receptacles, software and related instruments or apparatus or other articles and are used, for example, for the test purposes of diagnosis, aid to diagnosis, screening, monitoring, predisposition, prognosis, prediction and determination of physiological status."***

21. Rule 52 of the MD Rules exempts certain medical devices from the operation of the said Rules for the period specified in the said Rule. The said Rule also provides that all life saving and life sustaining medical devices specified in Schedule-D to the said Rules required to be registered shall be deemed to have been registered under the said Rules till the validity of their exemption period specified in the said Rule subject to the conditions specified therein.

22. Chapter-IV of the MD Rules deals with the subject of "enlistment and registration of medical devices." Rule 12(1) in this Chapter provides that the MDB shall enlist and register medical devices which include any instrument, apparatus, implement, machine, appliance, implant, reagent for in-vitro use, software, material or other similar or related article, intended by the manufacturer to be used, alone or in combination, for human beings or animals for one or more of the specific medical purposes listed in the said Rule. The petitioners are aggrieved by the requirement for the MDB to enlist and register medical devices including the ones for in-vitro use, and the devices which provide information by means of in-vitro examination of specimens derived from a human body.

23. The "Medical Devices Board" has been defined in the MD Rules to mean a body responsible for enlistment or registration of medical

UNCERTIFIED COPY

devices, licensing of establishments and issuance of permits for export and import of medical devices and for matters ancillary thereto. Chapter-III of the said Rules, which deals with the subject of "classification and grouping of medical devices," provides that for the purposes of registration and enlistment, the method of classification and grouping of medical devices shall be in accordance with Schedules-A and B to the said Rules, which the MDB may amend from time to time as per the GHTF or the IMDRF guidelines. The said Chapter also provides that in case of any dispute or uncertainty or combination product over classification of a medical device, the establishment may request the MDB to decide the dispute and the MDB shall take a decision in writing on the dispute.

24. The provision in the MD Rules which, according to the petitioners, most adversely impacts them is Rule 21 which provides that a medical device may be imported subject to the condition that the importer shall possess valid medical device establishment licence and medical device enlistment or registration and have premises under his possession for proper storage to preserve its properties. The power to issue licences is with the MDB. Rule 3 of the said Rules provides that the MDB shall issue (a) licence to manufacture medical devices, and (b) licence to import medical devices.

25. Chapter-IV of the said Rules provides for the classes of medical devices to be enlisted and registered, and the procedure for their enlistment and registration, IVD medical devices can fall in any of these categories depending on the hazard that it prevents. Section 4(d) of the DRAP Act makes the Director, Medical Devices and Medicated Cosmetics to be Incharge of the Division of medical devices and medicated cosmetics, which is responsible for the assessment, enlistment or registration of medical devices and medicated cosmetics, etc. Section 7(c) of the said Act empowers DRAP to issue guidelines and monitor the enforcement of *inter alia* the registration of therapeutic goods.

26. As regards the contention of the learned counsel for the petitioners that medical devices do not come within the meaning of drugs and medicines, the same has been authoritatively determined by the Hon'ble Lahore High Court vide judgment dated 22.10.2020 passed

UNCERTIFIED COPY

in W.P.No.20263/2020. In paragraphs 13 to 16 of the said judgment, the Hon'ble Lahore High Court, after making reference to the relevant provision of the Drugs Act, 1976, and in particular to the definition of "Drugs" in Section 3(g)(i) to (viii) of the said Act as well as the World Health Organization Global Model Regulatory Framework for Medical Devices, held that the term "drugs and medicines" used in the resolution passed by the Provincial Assembly of Punjab would include medical devices, and consequently DRAP could regulate medical devices. The said judgment has till date not been suspended or set-aside. Therefore, the authority of DRAP to regulate medical devices has been judicially endorsed.

27. The question that remains to be considered is whether IVD medical devices are specie altogether different from medical devices and beyond the regulatory domain of DRAP. Now, the definition of "therapeutic goods" in Section 2(xxxvi) of the said Act includes medical devices. Paragraph 3 of Schedule-I to the said Act provides that the medical devices include (a) instruments, medical equipment, implants disposables and software, used mainly for the purpose of diagnosis, monitoring and treatment of disease; or (b) any other item which the Federal Government may, by notification in the official Gazette, declare as medical device. I am of the view that the meaning given to medical devices in paragraph 3 of Schedule-I of the DRAP Act would include an IVD medical device as defined in the MD Rules. The "final document" issued by the GHTF also describes an IVD medical device as a medical device, whether used alone or in combination, intended by the manufacturer for in-vitro examination of specimens derived from the human body solely or principally to provide information for diagnostic, monitoring or compatibility purposes. As long as a medical device is intended to be used for diagnostic monitoring or treatment of disease whether through in-vitro examination or otherwise it would be subject to regulatory oversight of DRAP. The mere fact that any equipment or machine is intended to be used as an aid in diagnosis through in-vitro examination would not take such equipment or machine out of the meaning of a medical device or beyond the regulatory domain of DRAP.

28. Rule 4(2) of the MD Rules require an application for *inter alia* the import of medical devices to be made to the MDB on the format set out

UNCERTIFIED COPY

in Form 2, which has been made a part of the said rules. The said form requires an applicant for the import of medical devices to produce a drug sale licence issued by the Provincial Government. This Court had granted interim relief to the petitioners to the effect that the requirement of furnishing a drug sale licence shall not be an obstacle for a licence to import medical devices to the petitioners. During the pendency of the petitions, the Ministry of National Health Service, Regulations and Coordination has issued notification dated 04.06.2021 whereby the requirement of furnishing a drug sale licence has been done away with by omitting serial number (viii) in column (2) of Form-2. Therefore, the petitioners' grievance to the extent of requiring them to furnish drug sale licences as part of their application for the issuance of licences to import medical devices have been rendered infructuous.

29. It is well settled that the *vires* of the MD Rules framed in exercise of the powers conferred by statute can be challenged on the touchstone of violation of the statute under which they are framed or the provisions of the Constitution. It is also well-settled that rules shall always be consistent with the statute and no rule shall militate or render the provisions of a statute ineffective. The test is whether the provisions of the statute and that of rules can stand together. The main object of the Rules is to implement the provisions of the statute. Rules cannot enlarge the scope of an Act under which the same have been framed. Rules and regulations are subordinate and delegated legislation deriving authority and legal cover from the provisions of the statute. The authority of the executive to make rules and regulations in order to effectuate the policy and intention of the legislature must be exercised within the limits of mandate given to the rule-making authority and the rules framed under the enactment must be consistent with the provisions of the said enactment. In case of conflict between the statute and the rules, the rules must give way to the provisions of the statute. Rules should not be repugnant to the enactment under which they are made since they have the same force as the provisions of the statute under which they are framed. Rules being subordinate legislation can neither override nor over-reach a provision of the substantive statute but if the rules explain the latter and provide aid to facilitate its understanding, it shall, be quite legitimate to read and refer to them,

UNCERTIFIED COPY

especially when they, on all counts, conform to and are subordinate to the substantive statute. In suo moto case No.13 of 2009 (PLD 2011 SC 619), the Hon'ble Supreme Court held as follows:-

> ***"[A] rule making body cannot frame rules in conflict with, or in derogation of, the substantive provisions of the law or statute, under which the rules are framed. Rules cannot go beyond the scope of the Act. Thus, we are inclined to hold that no rule can be made which is inconsistent with the parent statute, whereas, no regulation can be made inconsistent with the parent statute or the rules made thereunder and the provisions of these rules or regulations, as the case may be, to the extent of their inconsistency with the parent statute or the rules shall be inoperative."***

30. The learned counsel for the petitioners have not pointed out any provision in the MD Rules which are in derogation of the DRAP Act. I have already observed herein above that the authority of DRAP to regulate the import of IVD medical devices is in conformity with the meaning given to medical devices in paragraph 3 of Schedule-I to the DRAP Act. It is not disputed that most of the petitioners have got themselves enlisted and so have the medical devices imported by them.

31. In view of the above, I do not find any merit in these petitions which are dismissed with no order as to costs.

(MIANGUL HASSAN AURANGZEB)
JUDGE

ANNOUNCED IN AN OPEN COURT ON 31/08/2021

(JUDGE)

Qamar Khan

UNCERTIFIED COPY

SCHEDULE-A

Sr. No.	Case No.	Title	Dates of Hearing
1.	W.P. No.1586/2020	M/s Bio Leads (Pvt.) Ltd., etc. Vs. Federation of Pakistan, etc.	19.02.2021, 11.03.2021, 24.03.2021, 05.05.2021 and 02.06.2021
2.	W.P. No.2767/2018	M/s Total Tech. (Pvt.) Ltd. Vs. Federation of Pakistan, etc.	-do-
3.	W.P. No.3350/2018	Naveed Felix Vs. Federation of Pakistan, etc.	-do-
4.	W.P. No.3351/2018	M/s Euronano Diagnostics (Pvt.) Ltd. Vs. Federation of Pakistan, etc.	-do-
5.	W.P. No.3460/2018	M/s Pakistan Microbiological Associates, etc. Vs. Federation of Pakistan, etc.	-do-
6.	W.P. No.3593/2018	M/s Keyyani Medical Solutions Vs. Federation of Pakistan, etc.	-do-
7.	W.P. No.4490/2018	M/s DWP Technologies Vs. Federation of Pakistan, etc.	-do-
8.	W.P. No.4736/2018	M/s Gulf Marketing International, etc.	-do-
9.	W.P. No.1670/2020	M/s AGBL Pakistan (Pvt.) Ltd. Vs. Federation of Pakistan, etc.	-do-
10.	W.P. No.1722/2020	M/s Reaction Scientific (Pvt.) Ltd. Vs. Federation of Pakistan, etc.	-do-
11.	W.P. No.1764/2020	Wali Med Vs. Federation of Pakistan, etc.	-do-
12.	W.P. No.1843/2020	M/s Cares Worth Pakistan Ltd. Vs. Federation of Pakistan, etc.	-do-
13.	W.P. No.1863/2020	M/s Al Qazi Marketing Group, etc. Vs. Federation of Pakistan, etc.	-do-
14.	W.P. No.2148/2020	Irshad Sharif Vs. Federation of Pakistan, etc.	-do-
15.	W.P. No.2156/2020	M/s Arrow Tech Medical Systems, etc. Vs. Federation of Pakistan, etc.	-do-
16.	W.P. No.2162/2020	M/s Nycotech Incorporation, etc. Vs. Federation of Pakistan, etc.	-do-
17.	W.P. No.2198/2020	Dr. Niranjan Kumar Vs. Federation of Pakistan, etc.	-do-
18.	W.P. No.2258/2020	Hearing Care Services, etc. Vs. Federation of Pakistan, etc.	-do-
19.	W.P. No.2357/2020	M/s Asia Pacific Technologies Vs. Federation of Pakistan, etc.	-do-
20.	W.P. No.2569/2020	M/s JK Traders, etc. Vs. Federation of Pakistan, etc.	-do-
21.	W.P. No.2970/2020	M/s Sky Ltd., etc. Vs. Federation of Pakistan, etc.	-do-
22.	W.P. No.3047/2020	M/s Raffay Associates Vs. Federation of Pakistan, etc.	-do-
23.	W.P. No.3582/2020	United Systems Corporation, etc. Vs. Federation of Pakistan, etc.	-do-

UNCERTIFIED COPY

24.	W.P. No.3961/2020	M/s Tokyo Medical Company, etc. Vs. Federation of Pakistan, etc.	-do-
25.	W.P. No.310/2021	M/s Amarat Medical Tech., etc. Vs. Federation of Pakistan, etc.	-do-
26.	W.P. No.580/2021	M/s Alisco Agencies, etc. Vs. Federation of Pakistan, etc.	-do-
27.	W.P. No.634/2021	M/s Abdullah Traders Vs. Federation of Pakistan, etc.	-do-
28.	W.P. No.674/2021	M/s Doctor's Enterprises, etc. Vs. Federation of Pakistan, etc.	-do-
29.	W.P. No.772/2021	M/s Science Tec Vs. Federation of Pakistan, etc.	11.03.2021, 24.03.2021, 05.05.2021, 02.06.2021, 04.06.2021, 18.06.2021 and 01.07.2021
30.	W.P. No.836/2021	M/s Scientific House Vs. Federation of Pakistan, etc.	24.03.2021, 05.05.2021, 02.06.2021, 04.06.2021, 18.06.2021 and 01.07.2021
31.	W.P. No.899/2021	M/s Medvision International, etc. Vs. Federation of Pakistan, etc.	-do-
32.	W.P. No.1006/2021	M/s SAF Traders Vs. Federation of Pakistan, etc.	-do-
33.	W.P. No.1007/2021	M/s Pro Carewell Vs. Federation of Pakistan, etc.	-do-
34.	W.P. No.1317/2021	M/s Medical Ray X Vs. Federation of Pakistan, etc.	05.05.2021, 02.06.2021, 04.06.2021, 18.06.2021 and 01.07.2021
35.	W.P. No.1349/2021	M/s Medilab Services Vs. Federation of Pakistan, etc.	-do-
36.	W.P. No.1400/2021	M/s A.Z Enterprises, etc. Vs. Federation of Pakistan, etc.	-do-
37.	W.P. No.1431/2021	Laiba International, etc. Vs. Pakistan, etc.	-do-
38.	W.P. No.1569/2021	M/s Saim International, etc. Vs. Federation of Pakistan, etc.	-do-
39.	W.P. No.1650/2021	M/s Orbit Diagnostics Vs. Federation of Pakistan, etc.	-do-
40.	W.P. No.1841/2021	M/s FW Logistics & Trading Vs. Federation of Pakistan, etc.	-do-
41.	Crl. Org. No.88/2021	M/s M.J Medical Suppliers (Pvt.) Ltd. Vs. ArshadJawad, etc.	-do-
42.	W.P. No.1951/2021	M/s Medi Rays, etc. Vs. Federation of Pakistan, etc.	04.06.2021
43.	W.P. No.1952/2021	M/s Pakistan Medical Diagnostics Devices Association Vs. Federation of Pakistan, etc.	-do-
44.	W.P.	VaryBiz Vs. Federation of	-do-

UNCERTIFIED COPY

	No.1956/2021	**Pakistan, etc.**	
45.	**W.P. No.2134/2021**	**M/s Power Zone, etc. Vs. Federation of Pakistan, etc.**	**18.06.2021**
46.	**W.P. No.2337/2021**	**M/s Multi Trade International Corp, etc. Vs. Federation of Pakistan, etc.**	**01.07.2021**

UNCERTIFIED COPY