

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY  
NAGPUR BENCH, NAGPUR

Writ Petition No.1091 of 2022

Darkline Copier

... Petitioner

Versus

Union of India and others

... Respondents

Mr. Subhash Jha along with Mr. Manoj Chauhan, Advocates for Petitioner.

Ms. Mugdha Chandurkar, Advocate for Respondent No.1.

Mr. S.N. Bhattad, Advocate for Respondent Nos.2 to 4.

**CORAM : NITIN JAMDAR AND  
ANIL L. PANSARE, JJ.**

**DATE : 29 APRIL 2022**

P.C. :

Heard the learned Counsel for the parties at length.

2. After arguing the matter for some time, the learned Counsel for the Petitioner states that the Petitioner has applied for provisional release of the goods and would be satisfied that the application is decided within a short time and depending upon the outcome thereof, the Petitioner can then proceed to avail the appropriate remedies as may be available in law.

3. The learned Counsel for the Respondent Nos.2 to 4, on instructions, states that the application made by the Petitioner for provisional release of the goods will be decided as per law within a

period of thirty days. The statement is accepted. The learned Counsel for the Respondent Nos.2 to 4 states that he is accepting the statement of the learned Counsel for the Petitioner that the application for provisional release of the goods has been made.

4. The learned Counsel for the Petitioner states that to ensure the compliance, the Writ Petition be kept pending. It is not necessary to keep the Writ Petition pending, as the provision to decide the provisional release of the goods is provided under the Statute. We reiterate that the commitment to decide the application within a period of thirty days is accepted by this Court and the Respondent Nos.2 to 4 are bound by this time-limit.

5. The Writ Petition is disposed of accordingly.

(ANIL L. PANSARE, J.)

(NITIN JAMDAR, J.)