

Sayali

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION**

WRIT PETITION NO. 2996 OF 2025

Heena Metal Pvt Ltd

...Petitioner

Versus

Union of India and Others

...Respondents

**Mr Prasad Paranjape, and Ms. Radha Halbe, for Petitioner.
Ms. Mamta Omle i/b Mr. Satya Prakash Sharma, for
Respondents.**

**CORAM: M.S. Sonak &
Jitendra Jain, JJ.**

DATED: 05 August 2025

PC:-

1. At the request of Ms. Omle, learned Counsel for the Respondents, we place this matter on 11 August 2025.
2. The Respondents should come up with some solutions for the problem now presented by the Petitioner in this Petition. It is the Petitioner's contention that after this Court set aside the order and the matter was remanded to the Appellate Authority for de novo consideration, the Appellate Authority substantially allowed the Appeal and reduced the demand from Rs.71,83,778/- to Rs. 1,09,007/-. However, the

effect of this order was not reflected in the electronic liability register.

3. Mr. Paranjape, the learned Counsel for the Petitioner, pointed out that the Respondent–Authorities orally informed the Petitioner that the system does not permit uploading of the reduced liability in terms of the Appellate Authority's order. He states that even the correspondence between the parties indicates that this was only a systemic issue and, in principle, there was and there could be no objection to reflecting the correct position in terms of the Appellate Authority's order.

4. At least prima facie, we think that the substantive rights of the parties cannot be defeated by stating that the system does not accommodate such alterations. The system must fall in line with the substantive rights and entitlements of the parties.

5. Therefore, we post this matter on 11 August 2025 in the hope that the Respondents come up with some practical solutions to the issue now raised in this matter.

(Jitendra Jain, J)

(M.S. Sonak, J)