

CENTRAL CONSUMER PROTECTION AUTHORITY

Room No 365, Krishi Bhawan, New Delhi - 110001

F.No. CCPA/5/2026-CCPA [E-38889]

In the matter of: Amazon Seller Services Pvt. Ltd. Misleading Advertisement and Unfair Trade Practice through Sale of Agro-Chemical Product, namely "Cyclosinone Herbicide".

CORAM:

Smt. Nidhi Khare, Chief Commissioner, CCPA

Shri Anupam Mishra, Commissioner, CCPA

Appearance of Ld. Legal Counsels on behalf of Amazon Seller Services Pvt. Ltd.

Shri Saikrishna Rajagopal

Shri Vivek Ayyagiri

Shri Manas Raghuvanshi

Shri. Sushain Sobti and

Ku. Brinda Nagaraja

Date: 16.09.2026

ORDER

1. The Central Consumer Protection Authority (hereinafter referred to as CCPA) has been established under section 10 of the Consumer Protection Act 2019 to regulate matters relating to violation of rights of consumer, unfair trade practices, false and misleading advertisement which are prejudicial to the interest of public and consumers and to promote, protect and enforce the rights of consumer as a class.

2. The CCPA, in exercise of its statutory mandate under Section 18(1) of the Consumer Protection Act, 2019 (hereinafter referred to as Act), is entrusted with the function of preventing unfair trade practices and ensuring that no false or misleading advertisement is made in respect of any goods or services, and further to ensure that no advertisement of goods or services is issued in contravention of the provisions of the said Act or the rules and regulations framed thereunder.

3. It came to the notice of the CCPA vide letter dated 18.02.2026 received from the Department of Agriculture and Farmer Welfare (Plant Protection Division), Ministry of Agriculture and Farmers Welfare, Government of India, wherein it had forwarded a complaint dated 22.01.2026 submitted by the Crop Care Federation of India (CCFI) regarding the sale and advertisement of an unregistered herbicide, namely "Cyclosinone Herbicide" through e-commerce platforms and digital media platforms.

3.1. The aforesaid letter further stated that the unregistered herbicide, namely "Cyclosinone Herbicide" (impugned product hereinafter referred to as unregistered herbicide) is not included in the Schedule of Insecticides Act, 1968. Additionally, the letter stated that only those pesticides (insecticides, fungicides, herbicides, and rodenticide) which are duly registered with Central Insecticides Board and Registration Committee (CIB&RC) under the Insecticides Act, 1968 for the use in the country are allowed to be sold in the domestic market through authorized license holder only. Thus, the sale of such unregistered and illegally imported pesticides, pose serious risk to farmers, consumers and the environment.

4. Inter-alia, the complaint of Crop Care Federation of India (CCFI) further alleged that:

4.1. The sale of unregistered herbicide Cyclosinone was available for sale though e-commerce platforms such as Amazon Seller Services Pvt. Ltd. (hereinafter referred to as Opposite Party)

4.2. The retail package carries no information whatsoever about the product whether in compliance with the Rules of Insecticides Act, 1968.

4.3. The label claimed product as low-toxicity which is a self-certified claim. The e-commerce platform sell this pesticide as an eco-friendly pesticide.

4.4. That there is no herbicide / chemical registered officially anywhere in the world under the nomenclature "Cyclosinone".

5. Accordingly, on the basis of contents of the aforesaid Letter, the CCPA took cognizance of the matter and initiated a preliminary inquiry. CCPA examined various e-commerce platforms including that of the e-commerce platform of the Opposite Party and, upon such analysis, found prima facie that the Opposite Party was advertising, listing, offering for sale, and selling the unregistered impugned product under the brand name "Cyclosinone Herbicide." The findings of the Preliminary Inquiry Report are:

5.1. The objective of the Insecticides Act, 1968 is to regulate the import, manufacture, sale, transport, distribution and use of insecticides with a view to prevent risk to human beings or animals, and for matters connected therewith.

Accordingly Section 13 (1) of the Insecticides Act, 1968 stipulates that:

Any person desiring to manufacture or to sell, stock or exhibit for sale or distribute any insecticide [or to undertake commercial pest control operations with the use of any insecticide], may make an application to the licensing officer for the grant of a license.

Moreover, Section 17 (1) states that:

No person shall, himself or by any person on his behalf, import or manufacture:

- (a) any misbranded insecticide;*
- (b) any insecticide the sale, distribution or use of which is for the time being prohibited under section 27..*

5.2. The Insecticides (Second Amendment) Rules, 2022 published vide notification number G.S.R. 670 (E), came into effect from the 24.11.2022, clearly stipulates under Rule 10(E) for Sale of Insecticides through e-commerce entity that:

A licensee, during the currency of license, may undertake sale of any insecticide through e-commerce entity for supply of insecticides to the door step of the farmers and the licensee shall comply with the provisions of the Act and the rules made there under for the time being in force:

Provided that the operators of e-commerce entity before engaging the licensee for sale of insecticide through online portal, shall verify the validity of the licence issued by the concerned Licensing Officer of the State.

Provided further that the operators of e-commerce entity and licensee shall comply with the provisions of the Consumer Protection (E-commerce) Rules, 2020 notified in the Gazette of India vide G.S.R No. 462(E) dated 23rd July, 2020 and further subsequent amendments (if any)."

5.3. Rule 5 (2) of Consumer Protection (E-Commerce) Rules 2020 stipulates liabilities of marketplace e-commerce platforms that:

Every marketplace e-commerce entity shall require sellers through an undertaking to ensure that descriptions, images, and other content pertaining to goods or services on their platform is accurate and corresponds directly with the appearance, nature, quality, purpose and other general features of such good or service.

5.4. It was observed that the label of the unregistered impugned product claimed 5% formulation granules whereas the Opposite Party claimed Granular Weed Killer with 10% Active Ingredient Low Toxicity Formula for Lawn, Garden & Farm Use Fast-Acting, Eco-Safe Weed Terminator.

5.5. The Opposite Party further claimed effective cyclosinone formula powered by an advanced, low-toxicity ingredient that targets and destroys weeds from the root up. **(Annexure: A)**

- i. Fast-Acting Results Experience visible weed reduction in as little as 24–72 hours.

- ii. Kills to the Root, Prevents Regrowth Granules penetrate deep into the soil to stop weeds at their source, ensuring long-lasting protection.
- iii. Eco-Safe & Garden-Friendly Formulated to be gentle on soil and nearby plants, while remaining tough on invasive weeds.
- iv. Easy-to-Use Granular Format Convenient dust-free granules for mess-free spreading with even coverage.
- v. Versatile Application Perfect for use in lawns, vegetable gardens, pathways, agricultural fields, and more.

From the perusal of the Preliminary Inquiry Report it was clear that the said unregistered impugned product was being offered for sale without disclosing active ingredient, its precise chemical identity, any verifiable license number with its validity and mandatory disclosures regarding it hazardous or the basis of above claims such as "*eco-safe & garden-friendly, low toxicity*" etc. and if any Principal Authorization Certificate is obtained for sale or not. Thus, it appeared that the misleading claims made by the Opposite Party could deceive consumers into believing that the impugned product is in compliance with the laws made for the time being in force, however, which was not the case.

6. Considering the above findings of the preliminary inquiry report, a Notice dated 20.03.2026 was issued to the Opposite Party to submit response within 15 days along with necessary supporting documents regarding whether the Opposite Party has verified the statutory compliance of the said product with respect to disclosure of the active ingredient and its precise chemical identity in the advertisements and product listings, as required under applicable laws and regulatory standards. Whether the Opposite Party has any mechanism in place to scrutinize and prevent listing, advertisement and sale of impugned product in the absence of statutory compliance without ensuring the seller's requisite license / authorization. Further, whether the requisite due diligence under the Consumer Protection Act, 2019 and the Consumer Protection (E-Commerce) Rules, 2020 were duly undertaken and implemented.

7. In response to the above Notice, the Opposite Party vide email dated 25.04.2026 submitted that:

7.1. The Opposite Party owns, manages, and operates the Online Marketplace, which enables independent third-party sellers to list and sell products directly to customers. Our Client does not manufacture, procure, list, price, sell, or offer for sale any of the products made available on the Online Marketplace, including the Impugned Product. The responsibility to comply with applicable law rests solely with the concerned third-party sellers, who alone determine the manner of listing, the product descriptions, the declarations, claims made, and the sale products.

7.2. The Opposite Party neither initiates the transmission of the information contained in third-party listings, nor selects the receiver of such transmission, nor selects or modifies such information.

- 7.3.** The Amazon Services Business Solutions Agreement (“BSA”), entered into between Our Client and third-party sellers in compliance with Rule 6(4)(a) read with Rule 5(2) of the E-Commerce Rules, contractually requires such sellers to ensure that the products listed by them on the Online Marketplace comply with applicable laws and that the information provided in relation thereto is true, complete, and accurate.
- 7.4.** The Opposite Party has in place reasonable mechanisms to expeditiously remove or disable access to third-party content upon receipt of “actual knowledge” in accordance with law. In the present case, immediately upon receipt of the Notice, the Impugned Listing was expeditiously taken down.
- 7.5.** The Impugned Product also does not appear in the publicly available list of pesticides that are banned, or whose registration has been refused or restricted, as published as of March 31, 2024, nor does it appear to be specified in the Schedule to the Pesticides (Prohibition) Order, 2018.
- 7.6.** Apart from taking down the impugned listing, the Opposite Party has initiated appropriate action against the sellers in breach of their contractual obligations corresponding to the Impugned Listing, in accordance with the terms of the BSA and the allied policies.
- 7.7.** The particulars of the sellers corresponding to the Impugned Listing, are set out below:

(i)	Name	Vilas Jayshukhbhai Maniya/Trident Enterprise® - What You See Is What You Get
(ii)	Address	Vilasben Jaysukhbhai Maniya, A/60, Sukh-Amarut Shopping Center, Near Umra Chokdi, Umra, Olpad, Surat, Gujarat – 394130
(iii)	Email Address	
(iv)	Mobile Number	

(i)	Name	Rangholiya Arunaben Sanjaybhai/etrade onnline
(ii)	Address	Rangholiya Arunaben Sanjaybhai, G/403, Vaibhav Laxmi Recy., Near Talav Mota Varachha, Surat, Gujarat – 394101
(iii)	Email Address	
(iv)	Mobile Number	

- 7.8.** Commenced an audit to identify and suppress any listings of the impugned product that may be available on the Online Marketplace. Further, with a view to safeguarding consumer interests and maintaining a safe, trustworthy, and reliable online marketplace, Opposite Party has implemented additional measures to identify and take down any future listings of the Impugned Product, including evasive listings thereof.

7.9. In *Shreya Singhal v. Union of India* [(2015) 5 SCC 1], the Hon'ble Supreme Court read down Section 79(3)(b) of the IT Act to hold that such "actual knowledge" must be through the medium of a court order or upon notification by the appropriate Government or its agency.

8. The reply submitted by the Opposite Party was examined by the CCPA and based on it CCPA was satisfied that there exists a prima-facie case of violation of consumer rights, misleading advertisement and unfair trade practice which lead to the necessity of further scrutiny.

9. Thereafter, CCPA, vide letter dated 14.05.2026 forwarded the matter to DG (Investigation) for detailed investigation.

10. The Investigation report dated 22.07.2026 was received from DG (Investigation) wherein the following were submitted:

10.1. It was observed that the Opposite Party continued to host and facilitate the sale of impugned product on its platform up to March 2026 without ensuring compliance with mandatory regulatory safeguards applicable to the sale of such regulated substance. The impugned listings neither disclose its active ingredient, nor its precise chemical identity, any verifiable license number with its validity and mandatory disclosures regarding it hazardous or the basis of above claims and if any Principal Authorization Certificate is obtained or not.

10.2. The omission to disclose aforesaid material information specifically regarding statutory licensing requirements, its active ingredient and its precise chemical identity deprive consumers of essential information required to make informed purchasing decisions and exposes them to legal and safety risks.

10.3. The Opposite Party has subsequently removed the impugned listings from its platform and also implemented additional measures to identify and take down any future listings of the impugned product. However, this does not absolve it of its liability for the period during which the product was available for sale.

10.4. During the investigation, comments were sought from the "Department of Agriculture & Farmers Welfare, Plant Protection Division, Ministry of Agriculture & Farmers Welfare" regarding the legal status of the impugned product marketed as "Cyclosinone Herbicide." The Department, inter alia, vide letter dated 02.06.2026 stated as follows:=-

- i. Insecticides/pesticides are inherently toxic in nature as they are designed to develop to kill or combat the insects, diseases and weeds hence its import, manufacture, sale, transport, distribution and use are regulated under the insecticide acts, 1968 and Insecticides Rules 1971 with a view to prevent risk to human being or animals and matters connected therewith.

- ii. There is no chemical as "Cyclosinone" included in the Schedule to the Insecticides Act, 1968. However, the product "Cyclosinone" claimed to be "Herbicide" is being sold through e-portals without disclosing chemical name of its active ingredient and composition.
- iii. The statement of the Opposite Party that "Cyclosinone" does not exist as a registered compound is legally untenable. The product "Cyclosinone" is being actively marketed and sold via its platform with explicit claims of being an "Herbicide" falls squarely within this functional clarification. Hence, it is currently being marketed illegally because it bypasses the mandatory safety, bio efficacy, quality and legal checks required under the Insecticides Act, 1968.

10.5. Opposite Party does not undertake any independent verification to ascertain whether sellers are complying with the mandatory legal requirements, such as the need for any licences or other regulatory approvals, wherever applicable. Instead, the company relies primarily upon the information furnished by sellers under the Amazon Services Business Solutions Agreement (BSA). However, sellers may submit false or incomplete declarations in order to list their products. Therefore, relying only on self-declaration is inadequate. It reflects gross negligence and deficiencies in the Opposite Party's seller onboarding procedures, product verification and content moderation mechanisms.

10.6. Opposite Party has derived substantial revenue from the sale of the impugned product mentioned in the SCN, the aggregate sale value of which amounted to INR 96,42,572/-. In these circumstances, the company cannot completely shift entire responsibility onto sellers by solely relying on the "Amazon Services Business Solutions Agreement (BSA)" clause that places liability for non-compliance on the sellers. Permitting regulated products to be listed without adequate scrutiny while simultaneously generating revenue from listing-related services raises serious concerns regarding compliance and accountability. The duty of due diligence cannot be contractually waived.

10.7. The company's reliance on its status as an intermediary is not sufficient to avoid responsibility. As a marketplace e-commerce entity facilitating transactions between buyers and sellers, the company is required to exercise reasonable due diligence and oversight over listings hosted on its platform.

10.8. Henceforth, a case relating to the violation of consumer rights and misleading advertisement under the Consumer Protection Act, 2019 is established.

11. In view of the findings in the DG (Investigation) Report, the CCPA vide letter dated 29.07.2026 shared the investigation report with the Opposite Party to furnish their comments, if any. Thereafter, a hearing was scheduled on 17.08.2026.

12. The Opposite Party vide letter dated 16.08.2026 submitted its following comments on the DG Investigation Report:

- 12.1.** The Opposite Party operates the Online Marketplace that enables independent third-party sellers to list and offer their products directly to consumers. Further, the Opposite Party's role is confined to providing the technological infrastructure through which third party sellers may display the product information, declarations and disclosures in relation to their respective listings.
- 12.2.** On the basis of the statutory provisions, notifications and regulatory materials available in the public domain, the Impugned Product did not appear to fall within the Schedule to the Insecticides Act, did not appear to correspond to any insecticide registered under Section 9(3) and notified by the Ministry of Agriculture and Farmers Welfare ("Ministry"), did not appear in the publicly available lists of pesticides that had been banned, restricted, or whose registration had been refused, and was not included in the Pesticides (Prohibition) Order, 2018.
- 12.3.** The Investigation Report proceeds on the premise that the Impugned Product was a regulated insecticide merely because it was described or marketed by third party sellers as a "herbicide". This overlooks the material distinction between a product that falls within the statutory definition of an "insecticide" under Section 3(e) of the Insecticides Act and a product that is merely described or represented by a seller or manufacturer as an insecticide, pesticide, herbicide or fungicide.
- 12.4.** A representation made by a third party cannot, without verification of the product's composition and statutory classification, substitute the requirements of Section 3(e). Correspondingly, the licensing and verification requirements under Rule 10E of the Insecticides Rules, 1971 ("Insecticides Rules"), apply to the online sale of an "insecticide" governed by the Insecticides Act and cannot be extended to every product merely claimed or marketed by a third party to be an insecticide, pesticide, herbicide or fungicide.
- 12.5.** The approval process includes verification of the validity of the licence furnished by the seller at the time approval for the listing is sought, and no approval is accorded for the listing of an insecticide that is prohibited or banned.
- 12.6.** The Opposite Party identified and took down listings corresponding to 292 Amazon Standard Identification Numbers (ASINs), furnished the particulars of the concerned listings and corresponding third-party sellers to the Investigation Wing, initiated appropriate action against such sellers and implemented measures to identify and remove future and evasive listings.
- 12.7.** The aggregate sales figures in respect of the Impugned ASINs corresponding to the listings of the Impugned Product, for the period commencing January 2024, are that 38,410 orders were placed on the Online Marketplace; 43,634 units of the Impugned Product were sold by the respective sellers; and the aggregate sale value in respect of the said units was INR 96,42,572/-. At no stage did ASSPL represent that the said amount constituted revenue, commission, fees or any other consideration earned or retained by it. The aggregate sale value of

products sold by third-party sellers and the consideration that may be received by Opposite Party for providing online marketplace-related services are factually, legally and financially distinct.

12.8. Courts have recognised that intermediaries, such as Opposite Party, are neither obligated to, nor possessed of the necessary prowess to, suo motu identify potentially unlawful content, verify the genuineness of third-party listings, or police their e-commerce marketplaces as regarded by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi, in *Kent RO Systems Ltd. v. Amit Kotak* [2017 SCC Online Del 7201]:

12.9. The Authority may undoubtedly recommend prospective measures for strengthening consumer protection on e-commerce marketplaces. However, the absence of a particular mechanism cannot retrospectively be treated as a statutory contravention unless the applicable law prescribed that mechanism as a mandatory requirement during the relevant period.

13. During the hearing held on 17.08.2026, Ld. Counsels Shri Saikrishna Rajgopal, Shri Vivek Ayyagiri, Shri Manas Raghuvanshi, Shri. Sushain Sobti and Ku. Brinda Nagraja appeared on behalf of the Opposite Party and submitted the following:

13.1. That the Impugned Product did not fall within the definition of an "insecticide" contemplated under Section 3(e) of the Insecticides Act, 1968, as the said product is not a substance specified in the Schedule to the Insecticides Act. Accordingly, the statutory framework under Section 27 (1) applicable to substances falling within the Schedule of "insecticide" could not, in the absence of the requisite statutory ingredients, be extended to the Impugned Product.

13.2. The architecture and operational framework of the Opposite Party's platform is such that product listings are created and made available by the respective sellers. The Opposite Party does not manufacture the products, nor does it originate the product-specific representations, descriptions, declarations or claims furnished by the sellers in relation to their respective products. The mere hosting or facilitation of such seller-generated listings, therefore, in the absence of a specific statutory duty to independently ascertain information which has not been disclosed, be construed as an independent representation or adoption of the contents of such listings by the Opposite Party.

13.3. The obligation contemplated under Rule 10E of the Insecticides Amendments Rules, 2022 is referable to substances which fall within the statutory framework governing insecticides, including substances specified in the Schedule thereto. In the present case, the Impugned Product did not fall within the said category.

13.4. The Opposite Party has undertaken a comprehensive audit of its platform in relation to the Impugned Product. Pursuant thereto, the listings pertaining to the Impugned Product are being taken down from the platform. Further, pursuant to the Notice issued by the Hon'ble CCPA and the comprehensive audit conducted thereafter, 292 additional listings were identified and removed from the platform.

13.5. The mere availability of a seller-generated listing on the Online Marketplace, in the absence of any independent statutory obligation upon the Opposite Party to ascertain information which was not disclosed by the concerned sellers, cannot by itself constitute a sufficient basis for attributing to the Opposite Party the alleged act of misleading advertisements or unfair trade practices of the respective sellers.

13.6. A request was made during the hearing that if required, the Opposite Party may submit the comments on the DG (Investigation) Report within a period of 7 days which was duly granted to the Opposite Party.

14. The Opposite Party vide letter dated 24.08.2026 submitted its following comments:

14.1. With regard to the Consumer Protection (E-Commerce) Rules 2020, the Opposite Party in terms of Rules 5(2), 5(3)(e), 6(1), 6(4)(c) and 6(5) gives effect to this statutory allocation through its contractual and technological framework, under which third-party sellers directly create their respective listings and enter the product information, declarations and disclosures intended to be displayed to consumers on the Online Marketplace.

14.2. The concerned sellers therefore remain responsible for determining, entering and maintaining the completeness and legality of the information displayed in relation to their products. The Opposite Party could not have been expected, merely on the basis of the description adopted by a third-party seller, independently to determine that the Impugned Product attracted the specialised regulatory framework under the Insecticides Act and thereafter apply the corresponding license-verification requirement under Rule 10E of the Insecticides Rules.

14.3. Section 79 does not require an intermediary to guarantee the perpetual or absolute absence of potentially non-compliant third-party information from its online marketplace. It requires the intermediary to exercise the prescribed due diligence on a "reasonable efforts" basis under Rule 3(1)(b) of the IT Rules and to act expeditiously upon receipt of "actual knowledge" concerning specifically identified unlawful material.

14.4. As of August 2026, the listings corresponding to 580 ASINs of the Impugned Product have been identified and suppressed from the Online Marketplace. This cumulative figure includes the aforesaid 292 ASINs identified and taken down pursuant to the wider audit undertaken in April 2026, while the remaining ASINs were subsequently identified and suppressed pursuant to the additional measures implemented by Our Client in April 2026.

15. The CCPA, after careful consideration of the relevant provisions observes that –

15.1. In terms of Section 3(e) of the Insecticides Act, 1968, the expression "*insecticide*" includes:

- (i) *any substance specified in the Schedule to the Act;*
- (ii) *such other substances, including fungicides and weedicides, as the Central Government may, after consultation with the Central Insecticides Board, by notification in the Official Gazette, include in the Schedule from time to time; and*
- (iii) *any preparation containing one or more of such substances.*

15.2.Section 27(1) of the Insecticides Act, 1968 stipulates for Prohibition of sale, etc., of insecticides for reasons of public safety.—

*(1) If, on receipt of a report under section 26 or otherwise, the Central Government or the State Government is of opinion for reasons to be recorded in writing, that the use of any insecticide specified in ^{3***} clause (e) of section 3 or any specific batch thereof is likely to involve such risk to human beings or animals as to render it expedient or necessary to take immediate action.....*

15.3.Section 18 of the Insecticides Act, 1968 stipulates Prohibition of sale, etc., of certain insecticides:

- (1)No person shall, himself or by any person on his behalf, sell, stock or exhibit for sale, distribute, [transport, use, or cause to be used] by any worker:*
 - (a) any insecticide which is not registered under this Act;*
 - (b) any insecticide, the sale, distribution or use of which is for the time being prohibited under section 27;*
 - (c) any insecticide in contravention of any other provision of this Act or of any rule made thereunder.*
- (2) No person shall, himself or by any person on his behalf, sell, stock or exhibit for sale or distribute [or use for commercial pest control operations] any insecticide except under, and in accordance with the conditions of, a licence issued for such purpose under this Act.*

15.4.The Insecticides (Second Amendment) Rules, 2022 clearly stipulates under Rule 10(E) for Sale of Insecticides through e-commerce entity that:

A licensee, during the currency of license, may undertake sale of any insecticide through e-commerce entity for supply of insecticides to the door step of the farmers and the licensee shall comply with the provisions of the Act and the rules made there under for the time being in force:

Provided that the operators of e-commerce entity before engaging the licensee for sale of insecticide through online portal, shall verify the validity of the licence issued by the concerned Licensing Officer of the State.

Provided further that the operators of e-commerce entity and licensee shall comply with the provisions of the Consumer Protection (E-commerce) Rules, 2020 notified in the Gazette of India vide G.S.R No. 462(E) dated 23rd July, 2020 and further subsequent amendments (if any)

15.5.Section 2(1) of the Consumer protection Act, 2019 defines:

- (1) *"advertisement" means any audio or visual publicity, representation, endorsement or pronouncement made by means of light, sound, smoke, gas, print, electronic media, internet or website and includes any notice, circular, label, wrapper, invoice or such other documents.*

15.6.Section- 2(28) of the Consumer protection Act, 2019 defines "misleading advertisement" in relation to any product or service to mean an advertisement:

- i) falsely describes such product or service; or*
- ii) gives a false guarantee to, or is likely to mislead the consumers as to the nature, substance, quantity or quality of such product or service; or*
- iii) conveys an express or implied representation which, if made by the manufacturer or seller thereof, would constitute an unfair trade practice; or*
- iv) deliberately conceals important information.*

15.7.Section 2 (47) of the Act defines 'unfair trade practice' as to the practice when *for the objective of promoting the use or supply of any service, any person, adopts unfair or deceptive practice inter-alia any statement, whether orally or in writing or by visible representation including by means of electronic record which falsely represents that the goods are of a particular standard, quality, quantity, grade, composition, style or model [(Section 2(47) (b)] or represents that the goods or services have sponsorship, approval, performance, characteristics, accessories, uses or benefits which such goods or services do not have [(Section 2(47) (d)).*

15.8.Inter alia, the Guidelines for Prevention of Misleading Advertisement and Endorsement of Misleading Advertisement, 2022 stipulates under para 12 (d) that an advertisement shall not contain statements or visual presentations which directly, or by implication, or by omission, or by ambiguity, or by exaggeration are likely to mislead consumers about the product advertised, or the advertiser, or about any other product or advertiser.

16.From a bare reading of the above provisions of the Act, it is clear that any advertisement should:

- 16.1. contain truthful & honest representation of facts and shall not falsely describe products,
- 16.2. An advertisement shall be considered to be valid and not misleading, if it does not mislead consumers by exaggerating the accuracy, scientific validity or practical usefulness or capability or performance or service of the goods or product.
- 16.3. The definition of advertisement under the Consumer Protection Act, 2019 is wide and technology-neutral and expressly extends to publicity or representation made through "electronic media, internet or website," without confining the term to conventional print or broadcast media.
- 16.4. Rule 10E of the Insecticides (Second Amendment) Rules, 2022 published vide notification number G.S.R. 670 (E), came into effect from the 24.11.2022 specifically to regulate the online sale of insecticides and requires the e-commerce entity to verify the validity of the licence of the concerned licensee. Where a product is expressly represented and marketed as a herbicide, the platform cannot adopt a wholly passive approach and disclaim responsibility on the ground that the product was not independently identified by it as falling within the Schedule.
17. Based on the available submissions made by the Opposite Party, CCPA noted that:
- 17.1. The Opposite Party's attempt to distance itself from the Impugned Product by describing itself as a mere marketplace intermediary is untenable. Since it owns, manages, and operates the Online Marketplace through which it facilitated listing, hosting, advertising and selling of that unregistered impugned product. The Opposite Party cannot disclaim responsibility for unlawful or misleading products made available to consumers on its platform. The fact that the actual seller is a third party does not, by itself, absolve the platform of its statutory consumer-protection mandate. A platform cannot profit from the transaction while simultaneously disclaiming every corresponding responsibility.
- 17.2. The present proceedings concern the Opposite Party's independent obligations in its capacity as an Online Marketplace, and not obligations attaching to it as a manufacturer. Once the platform facilitates the advertising, listing, offering for sale, and selling the unregistered impugned product represented as a herbicide, the statutory duties applicable to the platform cannot be avoided.
- 17.3. The Opposite Party's reliance on the intermediary liability exemption under Section 79 of the Information Technology Act, 2000, on *Shreya Singhal v. Union of India*, (2015) 5 SCC 1 and on the comparative absence of a provision similar to Rule 10E of the Insecticides Rules, 1971, is misplaced as the judgment in *Shreya Singhal* was rendered in the context of remove or disable access to unlawful content with regard to far-reaching questions relatable primarily to the fundamental right of free speech and expression guaranteed by Article 19(1)(a) of the Constitution of India.

- i. The safe harbour under Section 79 is conditional upon compliance with the due diligence obligations prescribed under Section 79(2), including the general due-diligence obligation under Section 79(2)(c) and Rule 3(1)(b) of the Information Technology (Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code) Rules, 2021, which independently obligates every intermediary to exercise due diligence to ensure that unlawful information, including the listing of goods whose sale is restricted or prohibited under applicable law, is not advertised, listed, offered for sale on its platform.
- ii. The proposition regarding 'actual knowledge' standard in *Shreya Singhal* governs an intermediary's obligation to take down specific content upon notification; it can neither be read as prohibiting all forms of due diligence, compliance measures, or reasonable regulatory obligations upon digital platforms. Nor the judgment created a blanket exemption from obligations imposed by valid legislation enacted to protect consumers and prevent unfair or deceptive commercial practices.
- iii. Inter-alia, it cannot be read as a legislative intention to exempt e-commerce platforms dealing in unregistered substances from the general due-diligence obligations that independently arise under Rule 3(1)(b) of the IT Rules, 2021 and Rules 4(3) and 5 of the Consumer Protection (E-Commerce) Rules, 2020, and other validly notified and gazetted law, such as Insecticides (Second Amendment) Rules, 2022 published vide notification number G.S.R. 670 (E), is presumed to be known to all persons governed by it and the opposite party's own admission, at the hearing, that it undertakes no verification whatsoever of a seller's licence leaving this entirely to the seller and buyer demonstrates that no meaningful due diligence was, in fact, applied to listings of these substances at any stage prior to the Show Cause Notice.

17.4. The reliance placed on *Kent RO Systems Ltd. v. Amit Kotak*, 2017 SCC OnLine Del 7201, is misplaced. The observations relied upon by the Opposite Party were made in the context of intermediary liability for alleged infringement of intellectual property rights and the question whether an intermediary could be required to adjudicate competing claims of infringement before hosting third-party content. The said judgment does not lay down any general principle granting e-commerce platforms immunity from obligations arising under an independent consumer protection statute.

17.5. The issue before the CCPA is not whether an intermediary is required to adjudicate every third-party claim or proactively determine the legality of all content hosted on its platform. Rather, the proceedings concern compliance with the statutory obligations arising under the Consumer Protection Act, 2019 in relation to false or misleading advertisements, unfair trade practices and violations of consumer rights affecting consumers as a class. The proposition that an e-commerce platform cannot be expected to "verify" every third-party listing

also cannot be construed as an absolute exemption from exercising reasonable diligence or complying with specific obligations imposed by law. The nature and extent of such obligations is determined with reference to the applicable statutory framework and the facts of each case. Accordingly, reliance on *Kent RO Systems* as a blanket defence against regulatory scrutiny is untenable and misplaced.

17.6. Additionally, during the hearing dated 17.08.2026, CCPA displayed and read the following relevant provisions of law as mentioned in para 5 and 15 above so as to remove the interpretative ambiguity. Based on which the statutory intent was made clear that, where the prescribed statutory conditions are satisfied with respect to the likelihood of risk arising from the use of any insecticide or any specific batch thereof, the law contemplates the taking of immediate action where such action is considered expedient or necessary and more importantly where the unregistered impugned product did not even disclosed its chemical identity and was unregistered making it illegal to be sold.

17.7. The underlying object of consumer protection legislation is to empower consumers by ensuring access to complete, accurate, and truthful information, thereby enabling them to make informed choices. In furtherance of this objective, with the enactment of the Consumer Protection Act, 2019, the traditional doctrine of *caveat emptor* has undergone a marked transformation, giving rise to the principle of *caveat venditor*.

18. It is imperative to mention that statutory provisions mandate due diligence to be carried out for offering sale of goods and services and violating the same, amounts to misleading advertisement and unfair trade practice. In the present matter after consideration of the submissions made by the Opposite Party and findings recorded in the DG Investigation Report, the CCPA finds that:

18.1. The impugned product was advertised, listed and offered for sale on the Online Marketplace as a "Herbicide", "Weed Killer" and "Eco-Safe" product, without disclosure of its active ingredient, precise chemical identity, requisite regulatory credentials, license particulars, or other material information necessary for consumers to assess its legality, scientific validity, safety and efficacy.

18.2. The claims made in the impugned listings, including "Low Toxicity", "Eco-Safe", "Garden-Friendly", "Fast-Acting", "Kills to the Root" and "Prevents Regrowth", were material claims capable of influencing a consumer's purchasing decision. In the absence of adequate substantiation and disclosure of the composition and regulatory status of the unregistered impugned product, such representations mislead consumers as to the nature, characteristics, safety, quality and efficacy of the product and, therefore, constitute a misleading advertisement within the meaning of Section 2(28) of the Consumer Protection Act, 2019.

- 18.3.** The Ministry of Agriculture and Farmers Welfare has categorically stated that no chemical under the nomenclature "Cyclosinone" is included in the Schedule to the Insecticides Act, 1968. The insecticides / pesticides are inherently toxic in nature as they are designed to combat the insects, diseases and weeds, hence its manufacturing, sale, transport, distribution and use are regulated under the law with a view to prevent risk to human beings and animals. Further, prior to giving registration to any insecticides for use in the country, various attributes are verified in detail relating to its chemistry, toxicity, bio-efficacy, and packaging claims. The unregistered impugned product was being marketed via e-commerce platforms including that of the Opposite party which explicitly claimed being a "Herbicide" and was sold illegally because it bypasses the mandatory safety, bio efficacy, quality, legal checks required under the insecticides Act, 1968.
- 18.4.** The Registration Committee (R.C.) constituted under Section 5 of the Insecticides Act, 1968, clearly states that R.C. registers insecticides after scrutinizing formula, verify claims of efficacy and safety to human beings and animals, specifying the precautions against poisoning and performing any functions incidental to these matters. Therefore, the Opposite Party permitted and facilitated the listing, advertisement, and sale of hazardous substances with misleading claims that are subject to mandatory registration, licensing, verification, and other regulatory requirements. By enabling access to such sensitive and potentially hazardous materials without ensuring adequate regulatory disclosures, authentication, verification, and consumer safeguards, the Opposite Party materially violated Section 2(1) of the Consumer Protection Act, 2019 and facilitated access to regulated substances in circumstances giving rise to grave and foreseeable risks to the safety of consumers as a class.
- 18.5.** The submissions of Opposite party further established that 43,634 units of the impugned product were sold through the Online Marketplace pursuant to 38,410 orders, having an aggregate sale value of ₹96,42,572/-, and that the Opposite Party did not undertake adequate independent verification of the regulatory credentials of the impugned product. The subsequent identification and suppression of 580 ASINs further demonstrates the scale of the listings requiring corrective action and the necessity of CCPA from exercising its statutory jurisdiction under the Consumer Protection Act, 2019.
- 18.6.** The Opposite Party's platform cannot, by any stretch of interpretation, be characterized as being operated "for any public good" or in the nature of a public utility. On the contrary, the platform is operated as a commercial enterprise for the direct and substantial pecuniary benefit of the Opposite Party, which derives revenue from the engagement, participation, listings, and related activities facilitated through the platform. This commercial character is further unequivocally borne out by the information available on the Opposite Party's own website concerning its fee structure. It clearly provides steps for a seller for onboarding on the Opposite Party's platform, gardening category under which the impugned product was listed, various fee structure depending on the value of products and the units sold. **(Annexure: B)**

- 18.7.** The CCPA has clarified that enforcement, licensing, and penal consequences under the Insecticides Act, 1968 and the rules framed thereunder fall within the jurisdiction of the competent statutory authorities, and that the present proceedings do not adjudicate or determine criminal liability under the said enactment. However, the said statutory framework read conjointly and in their proper context with the Consumer Protection Act, 2019 and the rules framed thereunder is directly germane to the present proceedings, as it establishes the Opposite Party has falsely described unregistered impugned product such as *eco-safe & garden-friendly, low toxicity*” etc and while, at the same time, deliberately concealed important information including its active ingredients, chemical identity and registration and license particulars, which squarely falls within the ambit of Section 2(1), Section 2(9), Section 2(28), Section 2(47) of the Consumer Protection Act, 2019, read with Rules 4(3) and 5 of the Consumer Protection (E-Commerce) Rules, 2020.
- 18.8.** The Courts have, in analogous contexts, taken a strict view of the online availability of substances whose sale is subject to licensing or regulatory control, where adequate verification safeguards are absent. The Delhi High Court, in *Dr. Zaheer Ahmed v. Union of India & Ors.*, W.P.(C) 11711/2018, by an interim order dated 12th December, 2018 (Division Bench of Chief Justice Rajendra Menon and Justice V. Kameswar Rao), restrained the sale of drugs online without a valid licence, taking note of the risk posed by unregulated and unverified access to substances requiring licensed sale. While those proceedings concerned pharmaceutical products, the underlying rationale that the mere convenience of online access cannot be permitted to dilute the licensing and verification safeguards that apply to the sale of a regulated substance in the physical marketplace applies with equal, if not greater, force to insecticides substances such as unregistered impugned product, having regard to the graver and more immediate risk to soil, human beings and animals.
- 18.9.** The fact that the Opposite Party operates as a marketplace e-commerce model does not confer upon it any blanket immunity from the obligations expressly cast upon a “marketplace e-commerce entity” under the Consumer Protection (E-Commerce) Rules, 2020 (“E-Commerce Rules”). The very definition of a “marketplace e-commerce entity” under Rule 3(g) contemplates an entity which provides an information technology platform to facilitate transactions between buyers and sellers. The Rules thereafter specifically prescribe independent duties and liabilities of such marketplace entities. The statutory scheme therefore makes a clear distinction between the role of the seller as the person offering the goods for sale and the independent obligations imposed upon the marketplace through which such transaction is facilitated.
- 18.10.** The Opposite Party cannot simultaneously invoke its status as a marketplace e-commerce entity for the purposes of conducting its business and disown the corresponding statutory obligations imposed upon such entities for the protection of consumers. The proceedings before the CCPA, concern the Opposite Party’s

conduct and obligations as an e-commerce entity facilitating the advertisement and sale of the impugned product to consumers, and not any liability arising from its manufacture of the product. The defence of "mere intermediary" cannot be permitted to operate as a jurisdictional shield against an express statutory regime enacted specifically to regulate e-commerce entities and prevent unfair trade practices on digital marketplaces. Therefore, the Opposite Party failed to exercise adequate due diligence and safeguards commensurate with the nature of the unregistered impugned product represented to consumers as an herbicide.

- 18.11.** The Delhi High Court, in *Christian Louboutin SAS v. Nakul Bajaj & Ors.*, 2018 SCC OnLine Del 12215, examining the liability of an e-commerce platform claiming intermediary status, held that an online marketplace ceases to be a passive intermediary and becomes an active participant where it renders services beyond mere hosting including charging of fees, actively promoting sellers' listings and offering verification or authentication services that lend credibility to a seller in the eyes of a buyer and that such active participation disentitles the platform to safe-harbour protection under Section 79 of the Information Technology Act, 2000. This principle applies with full force to the facts of the present case and was accordingly examined in the present matter.
- 18.12.** The submission that the Opposite Party merely displays information entered by sellers and therefore bears no responsibility for such information ignores the express language of the E-Commerce Rules. Rule 5(2) which clearly states that the marketplace to obtain an undertaking from the sellers regarding the accuracy of descriptions, images and other content relating to goods or services displayed on its platform. The statutory architecture is therefore not premised upon the proposition that a marketplace may simply reproduce whatever information is uploaded by a seller and thereafter disclaim all responsibility towards the consumers.
- 18.13.** Reliance placed upon the Business Solution Agreement (BSA) is misplaced. A contractual arrangement between the Opposite Party and third-party sellers cannot dilute, transfer, or contract out of statutory obligations imposed for the protection of consumers. The existence of contractual assurances from sellers merely demonstrates that the Opposite Party was aware of the need for legal compliance, it does not establish that the Opposite Party actually exercised effective diligence to prevent non-compliant unregistered impugned products from being sold to consumers through its platform.
- 18.14.** A contractual arrangement between a marketplace and its sellers cannot override, dilute or contract out of statutory obligations imposed by Parliament or delegated legislation for protection of consumers. The statutory requirement of obtaining a seller undertaking itself demonstrates that the marketplace has a compliance obligation; it is not sufficient for the marketplace to merely assert that responsibility rests contractually upon the seller. Moreover, Rule 4(3) of the E-Commerce Rules expressly provides that no e-commerce entity shall adopt any unfair trade practice, whether in the course of business or otherwise.

- 18.15.** The subsequent takedown, action against sellers, audit, and introduction of additional safeguards are remedial steps, but they do not erase the underlying lapse. The Opposite Party's own decision to commence an audit and implement enhanced detection mechanisms demonstrates that its existing safeguards were not necessarily sufficient to prevent the impugned listing. Post-facto corrective measures may mitigate continuing consumer harm, but cannot be invoked as a defense against statutory accountability. Inter-alia, the opposite party's own submissions establish that it possesses full technical and administrative control over the content hosted on its platform including the ability to review, restrict and remove listings, disable seller accounts and implement keyword-level blocking and it cannot, in the same breath, contend that responsibility for regulatory compliance rests exclusively with third-party sellers.
- 18.16.** The heightened responsibility attaching to any person or entity facilitating access to inherently hazardous substances finds support in the well-settled principle enunciated by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *M.C. Mehta v. Union of India*, (1987) 1 SCC 395 (the Oleum Gas Leak case), where the Court held that an enterprise engaged in a hazardous or inherently dangerous activity owes an absolute and non-delegable duty to the community to ensure that no harm results on account of such activity and that this obligation cannot be diluted merely because the enterprise claims to have exercised reasonable care. While that case arose in the context of tortious liability for industrial hazards, the underlying principle that those who deal in, or facilitate access to, inherently dangerous substances bear a heightened, non-delegable duty of care commensurate with the risk involved is instructive in assessing the standard of due diligence expected of the opposite party in permitting the listing of unregistered impugned product.
- 18.17.** Accordingly, the CCPA holds that the conduct complained of resulted in violation of consumer rights and constituted a misleading advertisement and unfair trade practice within the meaning of the Consumer Protection Act, 2019. Additionally, for the sake of clarity it is emphasized the Rule 10E of the Insecticides (Amendment) Rules, 2022, is itself vocal that the operators of e-commerce entity and licensee shall comply with the provisions of the Consumer Protection (E-commerce) Rules, 2020. It may be emphasized that the regulatory purpose of the Act would be defeated if intervention were permissible only after actual injury had materialised.
- 19.** For the foregoing reasons, CCPA is of the considered view that the legislative object of the CCPA is expressly class-based. Section 18 empowers the Authority to protect, promote and enforce consumer rights "as a class" and to prevent unfair trade practices. The statutory framework therefore does not require the CCPA to await individual instances of physical injury or financial loss before exercising jurisdiction.

- 19.1.** The Opposite Party was required to exercise appropriate due diligence commensurate with the regulatory sensitivity of such product. Rule 6 of the Consumer Protection (E-Commerce) Rules, 2020, read with the applicable regulatory framework governing online sale of insecticides, cannot be construed as permitting an e-commerce entity to discharge its statutory obligations merely by obtaining contractual declarations or self-certifications from third-party sellers.
- 19.2.** The Opposite Party did not undertake adequate independent verification of the requisite regulatory particulars before permitting the impugned listings to remain available to consumers prior to the Notice of CCPA. The subsequent audit and identification of 580 ASINs, removal of the listings upon receipt of notice, initiation of seller action and implementation of enhanced safeguards are acknowledged as corrective measures, however, such post-facto measures cannot retrospectively efface the regulatory lapse or negate the consumer exposure.
- 19.3.** The CCPA is, therefore, satisfied that the scale of consumer exposure, evidenced by 38,410 orders involving 43,634 units with an aggregate sale value of ₹96,42,572/-, coupled with the absence of adequate disclosure and verification of the regulatory status of the impugned product had mislead the consumers as a class. Consumer protection in the digital marketplace necessarily requires that regulated goods are not brought within the reach of consumers through claims which are unsubstantiated or which deliberately conceal material information.
- 19.4.** The Opposite Party's attempt to characterize the proceedings as an effort by the CCPA to become a "sectoral regulator" is therefore a false equivalence. The CCPA is not assuming regulatory jurisdiction over the manufacture, composition or scientific properties of the product. It is examining the conduct of an e-commerce entity insofar as violation of consumer rights, misleading advertisements and unfair trade practices are concerned, i.e, matters which fall squarely within its statutory mandate.
- 19.5.** In particular, the sale of unregistered impugned product, listed, hosted, and advertised by explicitly claiming to being an "Herbicide bypassed the mandatory safety, bio efficacy, quality, legal checks required under the Insecticides Act, 1968. Further, where the applicable regulatory regime requires verification of the validity of the license of a licensee before facilitating online sale, it necessarily contemplates an effective verification mechanism, disclosure of ingredients, precise chemical identity and not a mere paper allocation of responsibility.
- 19.6.** Section 2(9) of the Act protects against the marketing of goods hazardous to life and property and is not confined in its application to household consumer goods. The opposite party cannot absolve itself of responsibility merely on the ground that the impugned listings were uploaded by independent third-party sellers or on the ground that it functions as a mere marketplace ecommerce entity with no knowledge of requirements of extant laws.

19.7. It is a settled principle in consumer protection jurisprudence that representations must be assessed from the perspective of a reasonable consumer of average intelligence, and not through a technical interpretation by the advertiser. The Opposite Party's attempt to conflate inherently subjective taglines with an absolute claim is therefore unsustainable and misleading.

19.8. Accordingly, the CCPA concludes that the impugned claims constitute misleading advertisements and unfair trade practice within the meaning of the Consumer Protection Act, 2019 and with affects consumers as a class. CCPA is of the opinion that it is also necessary to levy a penalty for falsely representing the product.

20. The CCPA is empowered under Section- 21 of the Consumer Protection Act, 2019 to issue directions to the advertiser of false or misleading advertisement to discontinue or modify the advertisement and if necessary, it may, by order, impose a penalty which may extend to ten lakh rupees and for every subsequent contravention may extend to fifty lakh rupees. Further, Section 21 (7) of the above Act prescribes that following may be regarded while determining the penalty against false or misleading advertisement:-

- a. the population and the area impacted or affected by such offence,
- b. the frequency and duration of such offence,
- c. the vulnerability of the class of persons likely to be adversely affected by such offence.
- d. the gross revenue from the sales effected by virtue of such offence

21. In view of the above, the CCPA hereby issues the following directions to the Opposite party:

- i. To discontinue false and misleading advertisement, sale of unregistered agro-chemical products on its platform with immediate effect from its platform.
- ii. The Opposite Party shall further ensure that, it shall conduct self-audit of its platform to prevent listings of products which are in contravention of the law for the time being in force or which are hazardous to life and safety of the consumers.
- iii. The opposite shall pay a penalty of ₹ 10,00,000/ for indulging in misleading advertisement and unfair trade practice.
- iv. The Opposite Party shall submit a compliance report to CCPA on the above directions within 15 days from the date of this Order.

22. The above order and directions are passed in exercise of the powers conferred upon CCPA under section 10, 18, 20, 21 of the Consumer Protection Act 2019.



(Nidhi Khare)
Chief Commissioner



(Anupam Mishra)
Commissioner

Annexure: A

3/20/26, 2:45 PM

Cyclosinone Herbicide Granular Weed Killer

amazon.in Delivering to New Delhi 110002 Update location Industrial & Scientific Search Amazon.in Hello, sign in Account & Lists Returns & Orders

All Fresh MX Player Sell Bestsellers Mobiles Today's Deals Customer Service THE HOUSEMAID Join Prime Lite at ₹67/month*

Industrial and Scientific Best Sellers Lab & Scientific Products Janitorial & Sanitation Supplies Test, Measure & Inspect Tapes, Adhesives & Sealants Occupational Health & Safety

Customers who viewed this item also viewed

Cyclosinone Herbicide Granules | Pack of 2 | 10% Active Formula | Safe Weed

2.6 ★★★★★

₹299.00 (₹1.50/gram(s))

Cyclosinone Herbicide Granular Weed Killer with 10% Active Ingredient Low

2.6 ★★★★★ 85

₹160.00

Erwon® Herbicide, Organic Powerful Liquid Herbicide for Removing Wild Herbs

3.0 ★★★★★ 327

₹385.00

Outdoor Living › Pest Control › Weed Control › Weed Killers



[Click to see full view](#)

Cyclosinone Herbicide Granular Weed Killer with 10% Active Ingredient Low Toxicity Formula for Lawn, Garden & Farm Use Fast-Acting, Eco-Safe Weed Terminator Lawns, Gardens(pack of 2)

Brand: CLEAMIX
3.0 ★★★★★ (6)

-17% ₹249 (₹124.50 / pack)

M.R.P. ₹299

Inclusive of all taxes

Offers

Cashback

Upto ₹7.00 cashback as Amazon Pay Balance when you...

[1 offer >](#)

Partner Offers

Buy 2 or more and get 5% off on Qualifying Items o...

[2 offers >](#)

Bank Offer

Upto ₹1,000.00 discount on sel Credit Cards

[33 offers >](#)

₹249.00 (₹124.50 / pack)

FREE delivery Thursday, 26 March. [Details](#)

Delivering to New Delhi 110002 - [Update location](#)

In stock

Delivered by Amazon

Sold by TRIDENT ENTERPRISE® - What You See is What Yo...

Payment Secure transaction

Quantity: 1

Add to cart

Buy Now

Add to Wish List

Free Delivery

10 days Returnable

Amazon Delivered

Secure transaction

Brand CLEAMIX
Item Form Granule
Active Cyclosinone
Ingredients
Net Quantity 2 Pack

About this item

- Effective Cyclosinone Formula Powered by an advanced, low-toxicity ingredient that targets and destroys weeds from the root up.
- Fast-Acting Results Experience visible weed reduction in as little as 24-72 hours.
- Kills to the Root, Prevents Regrowth Granules penetrate deep into the soil to stop weeds at their source, ensuring long-lasting protection.
- Eco-Safe & Garden-Friendly Formulated to be gentle on soil and nearby plants, while remaining tough on invasive weeds.
- Easy-to-Use Granular Format Convenient dust-free granules for mess-free spreading with even coverage.
- Versatile Application Perfect for use in lawns, vegetable gardens, pathways, agricultural fields, and more.

[Report an issue with this product](#)

amazonbusiness Are you a business? Get GST invoice and bulk discounts

Sponsored

<https://www.amazon.in/Cyclosinone-Herbicide-Ingredient-Fast-Acting-Terminator/dp/B0FNXB9NK4>

1/5

Product information

Technical Details

Brand	CLEAMIX
Model number	CLEAMIX_01

Additional Information

ASIN	B0FNXB9NK4
------	------------

<https://www.amazon.in/Cyclosinone-Herbicide-Ingredient-Fast-Acting-Terminator/dp/B0FNXB9NK4>

2

3/20/26, 2:45 PM

Cyclosinone Herbicide Granular Weed Killer

Product Dimensions	10 x 5 x 5 cm	Customer Reviews	3.0 ★★★★★ (16)
Item model number	CLEAMIX_01		3.0 out of 5 stars
Item Height	5 Centimeters	Best Sellers Rank	#4,392 in Garden & Outdoors (See Top 100 in Garden & Outdoors)
Item Width	5 Centimeters		#16 in Weed Killers
		Date First Available	16 December 2025
		Item Dimensions LxWxH	10 x 5 x 5 Centimeters
		Net Quantity	2 Pack

Feedback

Would you like to [tell us about a lower price?](#) ▼

Product description

🌿 **CLEAMIX Cyclosinone Herbicide Granular Weed Killer – Fast, Safe & Powerful Weed Control for Your Outdoor Spaces** 🌿 Tackle weeds the smart way with CLEAMIX Cyclosinone Herbicide Granular Weed Killer – your go-to solution for fast-acting, eco-conscious weed control. Specially formulated with Cyclosinone, a low-toxicity active ingredient, this herbicide delivers powerful root-level control of stubborn weeds without harming the environment. Whether you're maintaining a lawn, garden, or farmland, CLEAMIX ensures cleaner, greener, and healthier landscapes – the safe way. 🌱

Important information

Safety Information:

Keep it away from children

Directions:

Apply granules evenly over soil or lawn, targeting weed-prone areas. Water lightly to activate. Use on dry vegetation, avoid windy days, keep pets away until absorbed, and repeat only as recommended

Products related to this item Sponsored



Cyclosinone Herbicide Granules - 10% Active Ingredient, Fast-Acting Low-Toxicity Weed Killer
★★★★★ 17
-64% ₹249⁰⁰
(₹249.00 / 100 g)
M.R.P. ₹699⁰⁰



Japanese Formula Soothing Massage Gel for Joint & Muscle Pain Relief - Arnica, Mugwort
★★★★★ 5
-67% ₹199⁰⁰
(₹199.00 / 100 g)
M.R.P. ₹599⁰⁰



Seseno Cyclosinone Herbicide Granules | 5% Active Ingredient | Granular Weed Control
★★★★★ 1,471
-67% ₹299⁰⁰
M.R.P. ₹899⁰⁰



Cyclosinone Herbicide Granular Weed Killer with Active Ingredient Low Toxicity Formula
★★★★★ 3
-59% ₹289⁰⁰
(₹289.00 / 100 g)
M.R.P. ₹899⁰⁰



Cyclosinone Herbicide Granular Weed Killer with Active Ingredient Low Toxicity Formula
★★★★★ 2
#1 Best Seller
-63% ₹299⁰⁰
(₹299.00 / 100 g)
M.R.P. ₹899⁰⁰



TOP NOTCH Repellent Powerful Effective V
★★★★★
-79% ₹2
(₹23.33 / 11)
M.R.P. ₹99⁰⁰

Annexure: B

amazon.in

Start Selling

Check revised fees across all categories

How to sell on Amazon.in?



STEP 1: Register your account
Register on Amazon with GST/PAN details and an active bank account



STEP 2: Choose storage & shipping
Choose storage, packaging, and delivery options



STEP 3: List your products
List your products by providing product and brand details



STEP 4: Complete orders & get paid
Deliver orders to customers on time and get paid within 7 days of delivery

Why become a seller on Amazon.in?

amazon.in

Start ▾ Grow ▾ Pricing ▾ Resources ▾

Start Selling

Lawn and Garden - Other products	0.00% for item price <= 300 10.00% for item price > 300 and <= 15,000 5.00% for item price > 15,000	0.00% for item price <= 1,000 10.00% for item price > 1,000 and <= 15,000 5.00% for item price > 15,000
Luggage - Other products	0.00% for item price <= 300 9.00% for item price > 300 and <= 500 8.00% for item price > 500	0.00% for item price <= 1,000 8.00% for item price > 1,000
Baby - Other Products	0.00% for item price <= 300 6.50% for item price > 300 and <= 500 8.00% for item price > 500 and <= 1,000 7.50% for item price > 1,000	0.00% for item price <= 1,000 7.50% for item price > 1,000
Pet - Other Products	0.00% for item price <= 300 10.50% for item price > 300 and <= 500 12.00% for item price > 500	0.00% for item price <= 1,000 12.00% for item price > 1,000
Apparel - Other Products	0.00% for item price <= 300 1.50% for item price > 300 and <= 500 11.00% for item price > 500 and <= 1,000 19.00% for item price > 1,000	0.00% for item price <= 1,000 19.00% for item price > 1,000
Home - other products	0.00% for item price <= 300 5.00% for item price > 300 and <= 500	0.00% for item price <= 1,000 18.00% for item price > 1,000

Fee Changes

25

Referral Fees

What does this fee mean?

It is the fee that the sellers are charged to get the benefits of being part of Amazon.in. It applies to each item sold and is calculated as a percentage of the total selling price. The percentage varies by product category. Referral fee has been revised for some fee categories, refer below table for new rate cards.

Referral fee has been revised for the following fee categories: Automotive - Tyres & Rims, Fans, and Robotic Vacuums, effective 10th June 2026. For detailed fees, please refer to the table below.

Changes in existing fee categories

Category	Current Referral Fee	New Referral Fee (Effective 16th March)
Automotive, Car & Accessories		+

[Seller Login](#)

Closing Fees

What does this fee mean?

You pay a fixed closing fee based on the item price that is paid by the buyer (including any shipping or gift-wrap charges charged by the seller).

Over the past months, logistics costs have increased, driving up operating costs across the industry. With these costs remaining elevated, we are updating closing fees for sellers in India, effective September 7, 2026.

For products priced up to ₹500, closing fees will increase by ₹1.

For products priced above ₹500, closing fees will increase by ₹3.

These changes will apply across the Fulfillment Center (FC), Easy Ship, and Seller Flex channels. To view the updated fee rates, please refer to the table below.

[Seller Login](#)



Start ▾

Grow ▾

Pricing ▾

Resources ▾

Start Selling

Closing fees

Fulfilment center (excluding Seller Flex)

Closing Fee for Fulfilment center (excluding Seller Flex)						
Item price including shipping charges (₹)	Current Fee			Effective September 7th, 2026		
	Standard Fee	Select Fee categories (Group)	Select Fee categories (Group)	Standard Fee	Select Fee categories (Group)	Select Fee categories (Group)
₹0-₹300	₹26(##)	₹20(A)	₹13(B)	₹27(##)	₹21(A)	₹14(B)
₹301-₹500	₹22(##)	₹18(C)	₹14(D)	₹23(##)	₹19(C)	₹15(D)
₹501-₹1000	₹27			₹30		
Above ₹1000	₹52/₹72*			₹55/₹75*		

(Group #) For items priced between INR 0-300, ₹27 closing fee applies to select fee categories ↑

(Group ##) For items priced between INR 301-500, ₹23 closing fee applies to select fee categories ↑

(Group A) For items priced between INR 0-300, ₹21 closing fee applies to select fee categories ↑

(Group B) For items priced between INR 0-300, ₹14 closing fee applies to select fee categories ↑

(Group C) For items priced between INR 301-500, ₹19 closing fee applies to select fee categories ↑

(Group D) For items priced between INR 301-500, ₹15 closing fee applies to select fee categories ↑

* For items priced above INR 1,000, ₹75 closing fee applies to select fee categories ↑

Seller flex

Closing Fee for Seller flex		
Item price including shipping charges (INR)	Current Fee	Effective September 7th, 2026
	All categories	All categories
₹0-₹300	₹6	₹7
₹301-₹500	₹12	₹13
₹501-₹1000	₹35	₹38
Above ₹1000	₹66	₹69

Easy Ship

Seller Login

Weight Handling Fees

What does this fee mean?

If you use fulfilment by Amazon (FBA) or Easy Ship (ES) as your delivery method, Amazon.in delivers your products to customers and levies a fee, which is termed as weight handling fees. In addition, if you are part of the Seller Flex program this fee will also be applicable. Weight handling fees has been revised basis applicable STEP level, refer below tables for changes.

Weight handling Fees

Weight Handling fee



Seller Login

https://sell.amazon.in/fees-and-pricing/fee-schedule?initialSessionID=523-6197291-5646155&Id=AZINSOANavDesktopFooter_C&pageName=IN%3A... 8/9

9/9/26, 11:14 AM

Fee Changes



Start ▾

Grow ▾

Pricing ▾

Resources ▾

Start Selling

NOTE

All the fee types listed above are displayed excluding Goods and Services Tax (GST). We will apply 18% (eighteen percent) GST to all fees displayed above. Please feel free to write to in-fee-feedback@amazon.com to provide your feedback on the new changes. If you have any further questions, you can contact Seller Support (sign-in required)

Best time to start selling with us

Zero referral fees on products priced under ₹1,000 across 1,800+ categories.

Start selling



[Sitemap](#)

[Confidentiality Policy](#)

[Terms of Use](#)

[Cookies](#)

© 2024 Amazon.com, Inc. or its affiliates. All rights reserved.