



\$~71

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ CONT.CAS(C) 601/2025 CM APPL. 23272/2025 CM APPL.
23273/2025

PUNJ LLOYD LIMITED

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Siddhartha Iyer

versus

ANU KUKREJA & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Arunima Dwivedi(C.G.S.C), Ms.
Pinky Pawar(G.P), Mr.Sainyam
Bhardwaj adv., Ms. Kritika Sharma
Adv. for R-1
Mr. Siddharth, Adv. With Mr.
Prateek Goyal and Mr. Harshit
Manwani, Advs. for R- 7 to 9

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANISH DAYAL

ORDER

22.04.2025

%

1. This petition alleges wilful disobedience of order dated 7th January 2025 passed in *W.P. (C) No. 8795/2022*.
2. The issue relates to removal of the Full-Body Truck Scanning Systems ('**FBTSS**') installed at the Integrated Check Post ('**ICP**') at Attari.
3. The following directions were passed by the Division Bench in order dated 7th January 2025:

9. Having heard respective counsel, this Court finds that there is no justification for the respondent to seek to resile from its communication dated 14.10.2022 whereby the petitioner was expressly directed to remove its machinery. This is especially so since the respondent has not initiated any arbitral/ other proceedings to recover any amount/s from the petitioner.

10. Accordingly, the present application is allowed. The petitioner is permitted to remove its machinery in terms of the letter dated 14.10.2022 addressed by the respondent to the petitioner. The petitioner is also permitted to withdraw the present petition with liberty to invoke the arbitration clause in accordance with law.



4. In respect of this, a communication was sent by the Ministry of Home Affairs to the petitioner stating that they were allowed to remove the FTBSS installed at ICP Attari according to the Court's order and necessary gate passes will be given by the Land Port Authority of India ('LPAI'), counsel for respondent states that copy of communication dated 17th February 2025 was sent to LPAI.

5. Counsel for LPAI appears on advance notice and states that they have no information as to who is the authorized person to whom the said machinery is to be released, since it is sensitive machinery and they must have proper documents in order. It is stated that petitioner/company is in liquidation and is represented through a Liquidator.

6. Counsel for petitioner will therefore, file appropriate documents with MHA in this regard, by way of an appropriate application and attendant documents, for confirming the authorized person to whom this machinery is to be released.

7. The MHA, after verification of the documents, shall issue instructions to LPAI to release the FTBSS to the said authorized person.

8. Upon the application being moved by the petitioner, the necessary decision/action by the MHA/ LPAI shall be taken within 4 weeks thereafter.

9. This Contempt Petition is disposed of, with the above directions.

10. Order be uploaded on the website of this Court.

ANISH DAYAL, J

APRIL 22, 2025/sm