

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

**CWP No. 8227 of 2015
Date of decision : 17.11.2015**

M/s Balaji Ispat, Sirhind

.....Petitioner

v.

Union of India and others

.....Respondents

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY KUMAR MITTAL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMENDRA JAIN**

Present : Mr. Jagmohan Bansal, Advocate
(in CWP No. 8227, 8309 of 2015)
Mr. Saurabh Kapoor, Advocate
(in CWP No. 16770, 16792 and 16906 of 2015)
for the petitioner(s)

Mr. IPS Doabia, Advocate, for respondent No.2

Mr. Sunish Bindlish, Advocate, for respondents No.3 and 4

Ajay Kumar Mittal, J. (Oral)

1. This order shall dispose of five writ petitions bearing CWPs No. 8227, 8309, 16770, 16792 and 16906 of 2015 as according to learned counsel for the parties, the issues involved in these writ petitions are identical. The facts are being taken from CWP No. 8227 of 2015.

2. The petitioner in the petition (CWP No. 8227 of 2015) filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, is seeking issuance of a writ of certiorari quashing policy condition No.3 annexed to Chapter 72 of ITC (HS) classification of export and import items (Annexure P-1) whereby import of non prime steel items has been permitted only through customs

sea port at Mumbai, Chennai and Kolkata.

3. In the reply filed on behalf of respondents No.1 and 2, it has been stated that if the petitioner was aggrieved by the condition imposed by the respondent(s), the remedy available to the petitioner was to have represented to the appropriate authority for revising its policy in that regard.

4. In view of the above, learned counsel for the petitioner(s) submitted that the petitioners want to move detailed and comprehensive representation(s) to raise all the claims as have been raised in the present writ petitions before respondent No.2 within one month from today.

5. It was stated by learned counsel for respondents No. 1 and 2 that in case such representations are filed within the stipulated period, an order shall be passed thereon by respondent No.2 within two months from the date of its filing after affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner(s) and by passing a speaking order in accordance with law.

6. Ordered accordingly.

7. In view of the above, these writ petitions stand disposed of.

(AJAY KUMAR MITTAL)
JUDGE

(RAMENDRA JAIN)
JUDGE

17.11.2015
Ashwani