



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 30TH DAY OF JUNE, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURAJ GOVINDARAJ

WRIT PETITION NO. 25615 OF 2024 (GM-RES)

BETWEEN:

POWER TECH
A PROPRIETORSHIP CONCERN
REPRESENTED BY ITS PROPRIETOR
SHRI C RAVI,
SON OF SHRI CHOKKANATHA NAIDU
AGED ABOUT 51 YEARS
HAVING OFFICE AT NO.24,
5TH MAIN, BEHIND ARVIND MOTORS,
OPP: UCO BANK, 3RD PHASE,
PEENYA,
BENGALURU-560 058.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. PRADYUMNA HEJIB, ADVOCATE)

AND:

THE DEPUTY DIRECTOR GENERAL
OF FOREIGN TRADE
C & E WING, 6TH FLOOR,
KENDRIYA SADAN,
KORAMANGALA,
BENGALURU - 560 034.

...RESPONDENT

(VIDE ORDER DATED 03.03.2025,
BY SRI. M.N.KUMAR, ADVOCATE)

Digitally signed
by SHWETHA
RAGHAVENDRA
Location: HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA



THIS WP IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE IMPUGNED ORDER BEARING ORDER IN ORIGINAL BEARING F.NO BNGECAAPPLY00039850AM22 DATED 23.11.2021 (ANNEXURE-A) PASSED AND ISSUED BY THE RESPONDENT.

THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR PRELIMINARY HEARING IN 'B' GROUP, THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURAJ GOVINDARAJ

ORAL ORDER

1. Petitioner is before this Court seeking for the following reliefs:-

"(a) Issue a writ in the nature of Certiorari or any other writ quashing and setting aside the impugned order bearing order-in-original bearing F.No.BNGECAAPPLY00039850AM22 dated 23.11.2021 (Annexure-A) passed and issued by the Respondent.

(b) Grant such other order or direction as deemed fit in the facts and circumstances of the case in the interest of justice."

2. The submission of the petitioner is that the impugned order bearing Order-in-Original bearing F.No. BNGECAAPPLY00039850AM22 dated 23.11.2021 at Annexure - A was passed without a notice having



been issued to the petitioner and as such, the petitioner could not participate in the proceedings.

3. Sri.M.N.Kumar, learned counsel appearing for the respondent has filed a memo enclosing copy of the Show Cause Notice dated 09.07.2018 and the returned cover. His submission is that the said notice was returned with the endorsement of 'No such person' and as such, he submits that service is duly effected. The petitioner not having furnished any details of change in address, the notice issued by the respondent to the address available on record is sufficient compliance with the requirements.

4. Having heard both the counsels and perused the papers, it is seen that the petitioner is now operating from a different address than the address that the notice was sent to. Though there seems to be some laxity on the part of the petitioner in informing the respondent of the change in address, this Court is of



the considered opinion that the petitioner cannot be deprived of presenting their case in the matter.

5. The petitioner has continued to be in business even after the said order and as such, cannot be said to be a fly-by-night operator.

6. In that view of the matter this Court passes the following:-

ORDER

- i. The writ petition is ***allowed***. A certiorari is issued.
- ii. Order-in-Original bearing F.No. BNGECAAPPLY00039850AM22 dated 23.11.2021 at Annexure - A is quashed.
- iii. The matter is remitted to the respondent for fresh consideration. The petitioner now having copy of the order in original and all other documents would be at liberty to submit its objections within two weeks from today i.e. on or before 20.07.2026 without requirement of any further notice from the



respondent. If such objections are filed by end of day 20.07.2026, the respondent is directed to consider the same and pass necessary orders thereon, if required by providing personal hearing to the petitioner. It is made clear that if the objections are not submitted by end of day 20.07.2026, the indulgence granted to the petitioner would stand revoked.

Sd/-
(SURAJ GOVINDARAJ)
JUDGE

MH/-
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 45