

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

WRIT PETITION NO. 4195 OF 2025

M/s IZI Ventures Private Limited & Anr. ...Petitioners

Vs.

Union of India & Ors. ...Respondents

**WITH
INTERIM APPLICATION NO. 11650 OF 2025**

Mr. Ashwini Kumar a/w Shubham Waphare, Abhishek Godse and Bharat Jadhav i/by Enact Legal for the Petitioners.

Mr. Jitendra B. Mishra a/w Sangeeta Yadav, Ashutosh Mishra and Rupesh Dubey for the Respondents.

**CORAM : M.S. Sonak &
Advait M. Sethna, JJ.**

DATED : 22 September 2025

P.C.:-

1. Heard Mr Kumar, learned counsel for the Petitioners and Mr Mishra, learned counsel for the Respondents.

2. The Petitioners challenge seizure memos dated 5 February 2025, 11 February 2025 and 20 February 2025, by which the goods sought to be imported by the Petitioner, having a description as “Drone Parts and Components” covered under bill of entry No.7724157 dated 10 January 2025, came to be seized.

3. Mr. Kumar argues that the seized goods are neither prohibited nor were they sought to be imported in breach of the conditions of notification No.54/2015-2020 dated 9 February 2022. He submits that, by an application dated 28 February 2025, the Petitioner applied for provisional release, without prejudice, and this application is yet to be disposed of.

4. At this stage, instead of this Court considering the issue of whether the seized goods are prohibited goods or have been sought to be imported in breach of the terms and conditions laid down in the above referred notification, we think that it would be appropriate if the customs authorities are directed to consider and dispose of in accordance with the law, the Petitioner's application dated 28 February 2025 for provisional release of these goods as expeditiously as possible.

5. Accordingly, we direct the concerned adjudicating authority to consider Petitioner's application dated 28 February 2025 for provisional release of the seized goods on its own merits in accordance with law without being influenced by the affidavit filed on behalf of the Respondents in this Petition as expeditiously as possible and in any event within three weeks from the date of uploading of this order. The Petitioner must be heard, and a reasoned order must be communicated to the Petitioner in this regard.

6. All contentions of all parties are explicitly left open. We have not expressed any opinion on the merits of the rival contentions.

7. If the decision of the adjudicating authority aggrieves the Petitioners, it shall be open to them to challenge the same in accordance with law.

8. The captioned Interim application does not survive in view of the disposal of the main Petition. The same is also disposed of.

(Advait M. Sethna, J)

(M. S. Sonak, J.)