



\$~121

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

CNR No. DLHC011073192025

+ **W.P.(C) 19725/2025 and CM APPL. 22750/2026**

SAFELOGIC FREIGHT AGENCY LLCPetitioner

Through: Ms. Aastha Sharma, Mr.
Abhishek Kumar Garg, Mr.
Manu Kumar, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.Respondents

Through: Mr. Neeraj Garg (SPC), Mr.
Ravi Mittal (GP), Mr.
Soumyadeep Chakarborty and
Mr Prakhar Negi Advs. for R-1.
Mr. Balendu Shekhar, Mr.
Krishna Chaitanya, Mr.
Rajkumar Maurya and Mr.
Divyansh Singh Dev, Advs. for
CPCB.
Mr. Sanjay Jain, Sr. Adv. with
Mr. R.K. Joshi, Mr. Ojusya
Joshi, Ms. Harshita, Mr.
Nishant, Ms. Rishika, Advs. for
R-4.
Mr. Piyush Beriwal, Ms.
Ruchita Srivastava and Mr.
Sparsh Jain, Advs. for R-2, 3 &
5.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SHAIL JAIN

ORDER

% **20.08.2026**

1. On 29.07.2026, the following order was passed:

*“1. After having heard learned counsel representing
the parties, it appears that the dispute is driven more*



on account of ego than on any question of law. The Custom Authorities have filed an affidavit contending that the Respondent No.4 is required to destuff the container and return the container to the Petitioner.

2. On the other hand, Respondent No.4 contends that it does not have adequate space for completion of the aforesaid process.

3. In the present case, the importer had misdeclared the goods and imported plastic trash in the container instead of aluminum. The importer has since absconded. Consequently, the stuffed container (PVC Regrind) has been lying in the yard maintained by Respondent No. 4 for the more than three years.

4. Keeping in view the aforesaid position, a last opportunity is granted to the Respondents to reconcile their differences, failing which this Court will be compelled to pass appropriate orders.”

2. Thereafter, on 18.08.2026, the following order was passed:

“2. Despite an adjournment of 20 days, no substantive action appears to have been taken by Respondent No. 4.

3. Having regard to the peculiar facts and circumstances of the present case, particularly the fact that the container is stated to contain hazardous waste comprising plastic and metal scrap, the Central Pollution Control Board (CPCB) and the Delhi Pollution Control Committee (DPCC) are directed to be impleaded as Respondent Nos. 6 and 7, respectively.

4. Notice be served upon the newly impleaded Respondent Nos. 6 and 7 through their respective learned Standing Counsels.”

3. This Court is of the opinion that the present case is a typical instance of passing the buck. Neither the Central Pollution Control Board (CPCB) nor the Delhi Pollution Control Committee (DPCC) is willing to assume responsibility for the disposal of the hazardous goods.



4. The Container has, in the meantime, remained lying in the yard of the Container Corporation of India for the last four years.
5. In view of the aforesaid circumstances, one last opportunity is granted to the Respondents to *inter se* resolve the controversy. Failing such resolution, this Court may be constrained to pass appropriate and stringent directions.
6. The Chief Scientist/Senior-most Scientist of the Central Pollution Control Board (CPCB) as well as the Delhi Pollution Control Committee (DPCC) are directed to visit the Inland Container Depot (ICD), Tughlakabad, Delhi, and submit a report, before this Court, setting out the manner in which the alleged hazardous goods can be safely and lawfully disposed of, on the next date of hearing.
7. List the present matter on 24.08.2026.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J.

SHAIL JAIN, J.

AUGUST 20, 2026/kp/MM