



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY**  
**NAGPUR BENCH : NAGPUR**  
**WRIT PETITION NO.7721/2025**

M/s. Chia Technologies Pvt. Ltd, Thane .Vs. Union of India and Ors.

---

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram,  
appearances, Court's orders of directions  
and Registrar's orders

Court's or Judge's orders

---

Mr. Deven Chauhan, Senior Advocate assisted by Mr. A. S. Dhore, Mr. Ravikant, Mr. G.S.Gour and Mr. Y.S. Bangale, Advocates for petitioner. Mr. Jitendra Mishra, Advocate with Mrs. Ketki Jaltare, Advocate for respondent Nos. 1 to 4.  
Mr. Rohan Kothari, Advocate for respondent No.5.

**CORAM : ANIL L. PANSARE AND NIVEDITA P MEHTA, JJ.**  
**DATE : MARCH 13, 2026.**

Heard for sometime.

2. In continuation to earlier order, what we find is that one out of the two parties is taking the Court for a ride. The question is; whether respondent No.5–Bharat Shipping Agency was an authorized agent of the petitioner. The term “Authorized Agent”, in terms of Section 147 (3) of the Customs Act, 1962, includes a person expressly or impliedly authorized by owner, importer or exporter of any goods to be his agent.

3. The case pertains to seizure of four containers, containing goods, which according to petitioner, are Skateboards and according to respondents – Scooter (toy). Seizure, according to the respondent Nos. 1 to 4, was done in the presence of respondent No.5. The question is whether he has been authorized by the petitioner to act as an agent.

4. The petitioner, who otherwise does not dispute that respondent No.5 is working as his agent since the year 2020, disputes him as an agent to the extent of he acting as petitioner's representative for seizure of the goods that was done on 30.09.2025 and 22.10.2025. According to petitioner, respondent No.5, though is authorized to represent the petitioner for routine examination of the

goods, he was not authorized for the examination of goods for the purpose of seizure.

5. Our attention is invited to letter dated 22.09.2025, issued by Assistant Commissioner, SIIB (Customs Duty), Nagpur (Investigating Officer) to the Assistant Commissioner, ICD Borkhedi, Customs, Nagpur by which the investigating officer informed the addressee, under whose supervision the goods were kept at the ICD depot, that the goods imported by the petitioner on 29.08.2025 will be examined and thus presence of petitioner or his representative is necessary. It appears that pursuant thereto goods were examined on 29.09.2025 and for the purpose, the petitioner has allegedly authorized respondent No.5 to handle the customs related matters. The petitioner has allegedly sent its representatives named Mr. Ankur G. Raut to remain present on its behalf. Letter to that effect was allegedly issued by petitioner on 29.09.2025.

6. According to the petitioner, Mr. Ankush Raut is a stranger to the petitioner company and, therefore, it has never authorized him to remain present on behalf of the petitioner.

7. According to respondent No.5, Mr. Ankush Raut is employee of M/s. Rajeshwar Logistics, who transports the petitioner's goods from Nagpur to Mumbai.

8. The original letter dated 29.09.2025 is not placed before us. Respondent No.5 submits that this letter was forwarded to him by M/s. Ryder Shipping Lines Pvt. Ltd. on WhatsApp and the same was accordingly produced before the investigating officer taking out print of the said letter. Goods examination panchanama is signed by the employee of respondent No.5 and Mr. Ankush Raut.

9. Since petitioner is disputing the status that respondent No.5 or Mr. Ankush Raut were authorised by him, it will be necessary to get their responses to find out the truth. Accordingly, the petitioner shall add M/s. Ryder Shipping Lines Pvt. Ltd and Mr. Ankush G. Raut

as party respondent Nos.6 and 7. The amendment shall be carried out forthwith.

10. Issue notice to the newly added respondents, returnable on 17.03.2026. In addition to the usual mode of service, the petitioner shall serve the respondents through e-mail, speed post and shall file affidavit of service.

11. We would caution the parties that the one who is misleading the Court will not only suffer the consequence in the form of imposing costs but may also be prosecuted under the appropriate provisions. That apart, the conduct may amount to interference in administration of justice and the party concerned will also be liable for criminal contempt of Court.

12. Counsel for respondent Nos.1 to 3 had earlier made a statement that no coercive action will be taken against the petitioner. He, however, submits that he is not in a position to continue the said statement since certain facts have been revealed in the investigation. When inquired, he submits that the facts so revealed will be placed before the Court in a sealed envelope, which according to respondent Nos.1 to 4 may require custodial interrogation of petitioner. Nonetheless, what we have noted hereinabove and since it is not clear as to who out of the two parties is misleading the Court, we are inclined to continue interim relief till the next date. Order accordingly. Needless to say that the investigation may continue.

13. List on 17.03.2026.

(JUDGE)

(JUDGE)