

\$~24.

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **W.P. (C) 10236/2017**

M/S NITIN ENTERPRISES

..... Peitioner

Through Mr. Priyanshu Upadhyay, Advocate.

versus

THE COMMISSIONER OF CUSTOMS (EXPORT)... Respondent

Through Mr. Sanjeev Narula, Sr. Standing
Counsel.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV KHANNA

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE PRATHIBA M. SINGH

ORDER

20.12.2017

%

Counsel for the Directorate of Revenue Intelligence states that show cause notice No.96/2017 dated 15th December, 2017 has been issued. Counsel for the petitioner accepts the said position, but states that they have not received the documents relied upon in the said notice.

Be that as it may, the fact is that the respondents have inspected the goods and thereafter they have passed an order dated 17th October, 2017 pursuant to their investigation. If the conditions imposed are onerous and not justified, the petitioner can challenge the said order in appeal. We would not like to entertain the present writ petition in view of the alternate efficacious remedy. Questions of fact are involved with reference to the goods imported and the bill of entry, etc., and would have to be examined.

With the aforesaid observations, the writ petition is not entertained,

without expressing any opinion on merits. No costs.

SANJIV KHANNA, J.

PRATHIBA M. SINGH, J.

DECEMBER 20, 2017
VKR