



\$~2

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI*Date of decision: 26th November, 2025**Uploaded on: 1st December, 2025*

+

W.P.(C) 15572/2025

SUMAN

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. D.S. Chadha, Ms. Harsimran
Kaur and Ms. Prabjyoti K. Chadha,
Advts

versus

COMMISSIONER OF CUSTOMS NEW DELHIRespondent

Through: Mr. Akarsh Verma, SSC for CBIC
with Ms. Aanchal Uppal, Adv.

CORAM:**JUSTICE PRATHIBA M. SINGH****JUSTICE RENU BHATNAGAR****JUDGMENT****Prathiba M. Singh, J.**

1. This hearing has been done through hybrid mode.
2. This matter is being taken up today, as 25th November, 2025 was declared a holiday on account of 'Guru Tegh Bahadur's Martyrdom Day' *vide Notification No. 35/G-4/Genl.-I/DHC*.
3. The present petition has been filed, *inter alia*, seeking release of the gold chain of the Petitioner weighing 188 grams (hereinafter "*the seized gold chain*") which has been seized by the Customs Department *vide* detention receipt dated 17th January, 2024 bearing no. DR/INDEL4/17-01-2024/003548.
4. The case of the Petitioner is that she had arrived at Indira Gandhi International Airport, New Delhi on 17th January, 2024 from Bangkok. Upon her arrival at the Indira Gandhi International Airport, New Delhi, the



Petitioner was intercepted by the concerned officials of the Customs Department and the seized gold chain was detained. However, it is stated that no Show Cause Notice (hereinafter “SCN”) has been issued to the Petitioner till date.

5. The Id. Counsel for the Petitioner relies on the decision of the Supreme Court in *Union of India & Anr. v. Jatin Ahuja, Civil Appeal No. 3489/2024*, dated 11th September, 2025 to argue that since no SCN has been issued within the prescribed time period under Section 110 of the Customs Act, 1962, (hereinafter “the Act”) the seized gold chain is liable to be released.

6. Mr. Verma, Id. SSC for the Customs Department submits on instructions that SCN has not been issued in this matter.

7. The Court has heard the parties and perused the documents on record. The decision of the Supreme Court in *Jatin Ahuja (supra)* has been considered wherein it has been held as under:

*“17. It is difficult for us also to subscribe to the views expressed by the Bombay High Court in Jayant Hansraj Shah’s case (supra). **We are of the view that the only power that has been conferred upon the Revenue to extend the time period is in accordance with the first proviso to Sub-section (2) of Section 110 of the Act, 1962. The Delhi High Court is right in saying that any effort to say that the release under Section 110A of the Act, 1962 would extinguish the operation of the consequence of not issuing show-cause notice within the statutory period spelt out in Section 110(2) would be contrary to the plain meaning and intendment of the statute.***

18. The Delhi High Court has done well to explain that this is so because Section 110A, is by way of an interim order, enabling release of goods like fast moving or



perishable etc. The existence of such power does not, in any way, impede or limit the operation of the mandatory provision of Section 110(2).

19. In the case in hand, indisputably the car was seized under sub-section (1) and furthermore no notice in respect of the goods seized was given under clause (a) of section 124 of the said Act within six months of the seizure. The consequence, therefore, in such a case is that the goods shall be returned to the person from whose possession they were seized. The first proviso to sub-section (2) of section 110 of the said Act, however, provides that the Principal Commissioner of Customs or Commissioner of Customs may, for reasons to be recorded in writing, extend the six months' period by a period not exceeding six months and inform the person from whom such goods were seized before the expiry of the period so specified. The proviso therefore contemplates that the period of six months mentioned in sub-section (2) of section 110 of the said Act can be extended by the higher authority for a further period not exceeding six months, for reasons to be recorded in writing. The proviso also requires the higher authority to inform this to the person from whom such goods were seized before the expiry of the period of six months mentioned in sub-section (2) of section 110. We find that in respect of the seized car, there is neither any notice under clause (a) of section 124 issued to the respondent within six months of the seizure nor the period of six months ever came to be extended for a further period of six months. In the absence of there being any notice as required by the first proviso even within the extended period upto one year, the consequence that ought to follow is release of the seized car.

[...]



24. The appeals before us are all anterior in time to the coming into force of the second proviso to Section 110(2) of the Act, 1962. Although, it is not necessary for us to say anything further, yet we may clarify that the time period to issue notice under Clause (a) of Section 124 is prescribed only in sub-section (2) of Section 110 of the Act, 1962. This time period has nothing to do ultimately with the issuance of show-cause notice under Section 124 of the Act, 1962. The two provisions are distinct and they operate in a different field.

8. The above decision is clear to the effect that if no SCN is issued within the time prescribed under Section 110 of the Act, the seized goods are liable to be released. The time prescribed under Section 110 of the Act, is a period of six months and subject to reasons recorded in writing, the same may be extended for a maximum period of six months. In this case, the one year period itself has elapsed, thus no SCN can be issued at this stage. The continued detention of seized gold chain is, therefore, impermissible and the same are liable to be released to the Petitioner.

9. Accordingly, considering the above decision as also the facts of the case, it is directed that the Customs Department shall release the seized gold chain to the Petitioner in the following terms:

- i. The applicable customs duty shall be paid by the Petitioner;
- ii. The warehousing charges shall be collected based on the charges applicable on the date of detention.

10. Let the Petitioner appear before the Customs Department on 22nd December, 2025 in person or through an Authorised Representative. Where the Authorised Representative is appearing, the Petitioner shall join the proceedings virtually and a proper email or some other form of



communication from the Petitioner shall be sent to the Customs Department verifying the authorisation of the said representative to appear on behalf of the Petitioner.

11. Upon the above directed payments being made, the gold items shall be released. The Nodal Officer mentioned below shall facilitate the Petitioner's appearance before the competent authority for compliance with the present order:

***Mr. Mukesh Gulia, Superintendent, Legal
Office of Commissioner, Customs
IGI Airports, T-3, New Delhi
Email id: igilegaldelhi@gmail.com
Mobile No.: 9999922479***

12. The petition is disposed of in the above terms. Pending applications, if any, are disposed of.

**PRATHIBA M. SINGH
JUDGE**

**RENU BHATNAGAR
JUDGE**

NOVEMBER 26, 2025

Rahul/msh