



\$~1

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+

W.P.(C) 5216/1998

M/S DELHI ARMOUR

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ajay Pal Singh Kullar, Adv. with
petitioner in person (Dinesh Chaddha,
partner of the firm)

versus

UOI & ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Anjana Gosain and Ms. Akansha
Choudhary, Ms. Shreya Manjari,
Advocates for R-1 and 2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT SHARMA

ORDER

19.11.2025

%

1. This hearing has been done through hybrid mode.
2. The present petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, seeking the following prayers: -

“(a) issue Rule Nisi;

(b) issue appropriate writ in the nature of Certiorari quashing the impugned demand of Rs. 4,18,039 and/or any other such demand towards demurrage/handling charges for the consignment of cartridges imported by the Petitioner under Invoice dated 18.11.1993, Bill of Entry No. 269535 dated 6.12.1993;

(c) issue appropriate writ in the nature of Prohibition restraining Respondent No. 2 from claiming the demurrage charges from the Petitioner towards the consignment of cartridges imported by the Petitioner, which have been lying with Respondent no. 2;

(d) issue a writ in the nature of Mandamus, directing Respondent No. 1 to pass necessary orders asking Respondent No. 2 not to levy any demurrage charges from the date of import of the consignment till the date of its release and direct Respondent No. 2 to release the



consignment of cartridges imported by the Petitioner under Invoice dated 18.11.1993, Bill of Entry No. 269535 dated 6.12.1993, without charging any demurrage/handling charges;
(d) issue ex-parte ad-interim orders in terms of prayers (a) to (c) above; and
(e) pass such other orders/directions as may appear to your Lordships to be just, fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case.”

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent nos. 1 and 2 has placed on record an affidavit dated 12.09.2023, wherein, it has been stated that the petitioner has already been granted a waiver of 80% of the penalty charges, which is the maximum waiver provided in the revised policy of waiver as annexed in the said affidavit.
4. In view of the above statement made by the learned counsel for the respondent nos. 1 and 2, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner, on instructions from Mr. Dinesh Chaddha, partner of the petitioner firm, present in Court, does not wish to press the present petition with liberty to initiate appropriate proceedings *qua* respondent no. 3.
5. The present petition is disposed of as not pressed with the liberty to the petitioner to initiate appropriate remedies, if available, in law against respondent no. 3.
6. Pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

AMIT SHARMA, J

NOVEMBER 19, 2025/kr/sg