



\$~30

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(C) 1047/2026**

LAHAR SINGH GAHLOT

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Bharat Bhushan, Ms. Nidhi
Gupta, and Mr. Anunay Mishra,
Advocates.

versus

DIRECTORATE GENERAL OF GST INTELLIGENCE

.....Respondent

Through: Appearance not given

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

%

23.01.2026

CM APPL. 5062/2026

Exemptions allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

Application stands disposed of.

W.P.(C) 1047/2026

1. Heard learned counsel appearing for the petitioner.
2. The petitioner is an agriculturist and claims to be the owner of the building in Dabri Village, Delhi (*hereinafter 'premises'*).
3. In April 2015, he rented parts of his building to one Sanjay Gupta (*hereinafter 'tenant'*). On 16.09.2016, officers of the Directorate General of GST Intelligence seized packing machines, raw materials, and finished goods that belonged to the tenant.
4. According to the petitioner, the concerned officers blocked and sealed the premises and retained the keys in their custody. The petitioner made several applications to the respondent authority seeking vacation of the



premises or, in the alternative, payment of rent. However, it is stated that the premises continued to remain sealed.

5. According to the petitioner, on 18.05.2018, the officers shifted the seized goods to a large hall within the same building and sealed the said hall as well. Although the goods have already been confiscated, the respondents have not restored the possession of the premises to the petitioner.

6. It is the petitioner's contention that he has suffered financial loss on account of non-payment of rent and his inability to use the premises, which entitles him to claim appropriate damages.

7. It is seen that the petitioner has made multiple representations; however, no orders have been passed by the concerned authorities. The Court is of the opinion that once the statutory authority no longer requires the continuous possession of the seized property, it must take necessary steps for its release to the owner. Retention of the property beyond the permissible period seems to be unlawful and arbitrary.

8. In view thereof, let the respondent to deal with the petitioner's pending application in accordance with law and to pass an appropriate order. If, for any reason, the premises cannot be released to the petitioner, let the specific reasons be assigned. The petitioner, thereafter, shall be at liberty to take appropriate recourse in accordance with the law.

9. Let the aforesaid exercise be carried out within a period of six weeks on the date of receipt from the copy of the order passed today.

PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV, J
JANUARY 23, 2026/SH/mj