

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

PRACHI
PRANESH
NANDIWADEKAR

Digitally signed by
PRACHI
PRANESH
NANDIWADEKAR
Date: 2025.10.14
11:37:54 +0530

REVIEW PETITION NO.54 OF 2025
WITH
IN-PERSON APPLICATION (L) NO.28081 OF 2025
IN
WRIT PETITION NO. 1094 OF 2024

Goldie Sud

... Petitioner

Versus

The Commissioner of Customs
(Passenger Arrivals) & Ors.

... Respondents

Mr. Goldie Sud, petitioner in-person.

Mr. Piyush Todkar i/by Mr. Harshad Shinganapurkar for
Respondent no.1.

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

DATED : 13 October 2025

PC. :-

1. Heard Mr. Goldie Sud, petitioner who appears in-person and Mr. Piyush Todkar, learned counsel for the respondents.
2. This petition seeks review of our order date 28 July 2025. Mr. Sud refers to the grounds set out in paragraphs 3(a) to 3(k) of the review petition. On a perusal of those grounds it would show that this is nothing but an attempt to re-argue the matter by the petitioner who appears in-person. Earlier, when the order dated 28 July 2025 was made, the petitioner, was represented by a counsel.

3. Based on the grounds set out in the review petition, no case whatsoever is made out to review our order dated 28 July 2025. By our order dated 28 July 2025, we had granted the petitioner limited relief by restraining the respondents from selling the seized gold pending the disposal of the adjudication proceedings. We also directed that this restraint will continue for an additional period prescribed in the order in case any adverse orders are made against the petitioner. We have also issued directions for adjudication of the show cause notice depending upon the cause shown by the petitioner on merits.

4. Mr. Sud now states that he should be granted liberty to challenge the show cause notice. There is no question of grant of any liberty considering the directions issued by us in our order dated 28 July 2025. Even otherwise, whatever contention that the petitioner has now raised in the review petition, can always be raised in response to the show cause notice. Already, liberty was granted to the petitioner to raise all permissible contentions in response to the show cause notice.

5. For the above reasons, we see no merit in this review petition and consequently, dismiss the same along with the In-Person Application without any order for costs.

(Jitendra Jain, J)

(M.S. Sonak, J)