सीमाशुल्क आयुक्त (सामान्य) का कार्यालय
OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER OF CUSTOMS (GENERAL)
कस्टम ब्रोकर अनुभाग, नवीन सीमाशुल्क भवन,बेलार्ड इस्टेट, मुंबई– 400 001
CUSTOMS BROKER SECTION, NEW CUSTOM HOUSE, BALLARD ESTATE, MUMBAI – 400001
Email-Id: cbsec.nch@gov.in

F. No. GEN/CB/480/2025-CBS **26-11-2025**

DIN- 20251177000000914098

ORDER No. 15/2025-26

M/s Rudra Shipping Services LLP (PAN No. AAYFR4399D) (CB No. 11/2497), having registered address: Office No 628 ,Sixth Floor, Grohitam Premises Co-Op Soc Ltd Plot No 14b, Sector 19 ,Near Apmc Market Vashi , Navi mumbai- 400705 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Custom Broker' or 'the CB') is holder of Customs Broker License No. 11/2497, issued by the Commissioner of Customs, Mumbai under Regulation 7(2) of CBLR, 2018 and as such they are bound by the regulations and conditions stipulated therein.

BRIEF FACTS OF THE CASE:

2. The exporter, M/s Humiseal India Private Limited (IEC: 0388189801), engaged into the manufacturing of chemical & chemical products, having registered address at J-154, MIDC, Bhosari, Pune, Maharastra-411026 had filed Shipping Bill No. 1813626 dated 20.06.2024 for export of goods declared as "Humiseal 1A33 Aerosol 365 ml", "Humiseal 1B73 Aerosol 400 ml" and "Humiseal 1B31 Aerosol400 ml" destined to United States. The details of the Shipping Bill No. 1813626 dated 20.06.2024 filed by the Customs Broker M/s Rudra Shipping Services LLP on behalf of the exporter are as tabulated below:

Table-I

Sr. No.	SB No./Date	Item Sr. No.	RITC	Description of Goods	Qty (Nos.)	FOB (INR)	DBK (Rs.)	RoDTEP (Rs.)	IGST (INR)
1	1813626 dated 20.06.2024	1	32082090	Humiseal 1A33 Aerosol 365 ml	4800	50,63,173	65,821.25	40,505.38	
		2	32082090	Humiseal 1B73 Aerosol 400 ml	3840	27,50,234.30	35,753.05	22,001.87	
		3	32082090	Humiseal 1B31 Aerosol 400 ml	960	6,97,432.38	9,066.62	5,579.46	
	Total					85,10,839.68	1,10,640.92	68,086.71	LUT

3. During scrutiny of MSDS documents by the docks officer, JWR Logistics CFS, it was observed that Methyl Ethyl Ketone is one of the ingredients of the goods declared in the above Table-I and is also present in proportions of 1-3%, 20-30% and 5-10% respectively. So, as per Gazette of India, Ministry of Finance, Dept. of Revenue notification dated 26.03.2013, all the items containing Methyl Ethyl Ketone are controlled substances and cannot be exported without NOC from CBN. Further, the exporter has declared the goods as dangerous/hazardous class: 2.1. Hence, no samples were withdrawn by the docks officer.

4. Thereafter, the docks officer sought clarification from the exporter as Methyl Ethyl Ketone requires a No Objection Certificate from the Narcotics Commissioner of CBN, Gwalior vide DGFT Notification no. 35(RE) 1997-2002 dated 01.09.98 (NOC for Export only). Despite the clarification sought, the exporter did not produce any NOC/authorization for the export of the said goods.

5. In view of the queries raised and observations made by the docks officer, the file was forwarded to CEAC, which was further forwarded to SIIB(X), JNCH on 01.08.2024 for further investigation on the subject matter.

6. EXAMINATION & INVESTIGATION

6.1 Goods covered under live shipping bill no. 1813626 dated 20.06.2024 filed by the exporter M/s Humiseal India Private Limited (IEC: 0388189801) was examined 100% under panchanama dated 06.08.2024 conducted at JWR CFS in the presence of Shri Nishant Hariram Bhanusali, authorized representative of CB firm M/s Rudra Shipping Services LLP (Lic. No. AAYFR4399D) and authorized representative of the exporter. During examination, it was observed that the quantity and description of the subject goods were found as per the declaration in the shipping bill, packing list and its invoice. However, the exact composition of the subject goods could only be determined after testing; therefore, Representative sealed samples (RSS) were withdrawn in duplicate randomly. The goods were seized vide seizure memo CBIC DIN 20240878NW0000444CB0 dated 06.08.2024 under the provisions of section 110 of the Customs Act 1962, read with the provisions of the NDPS Act, 1985, in the absence of authorization/NOC from CBN.

6.2 Further, RSS pertaining to the live shipping bill no. 1813626 dated 20.06.2024 wherein the goods were declared as "Humiseal 1A33 Aerosol 365 ml", "Humiseal 1B73 Aerosol 400 ml" and "Humiseal 1B31 Aerosol 400 ml" were forwarded to DYCC, JNCH for testing on 08.08.2024.

In this regard, as per the DYCC, JNCH reports Lab no. 636 dated 13.09.2024, Lab no. 637 dated 12.09.2024 and Lab no. 638 dated 19.09.2024, the following has been informed to SIIB(X):

Item No.	Report No. and date	Item Description	DYCC Test report
1.	Lab no. 637 Dated 12.09.2024	Humiseal 1A33 Aerosol 365 ml	The sample as received is in unit packing metallic bottle labelled pasted as Humiseal 365 ml 1A33. The sample is in form of Aerosol. It is a preparation containing Acetone, Xylene, Heptane, Methyl Ethyl Ketone, Toluene, Ethylbenzene, Butane, Propane and Ethy-3-ethoxy propionate. % of Methyl Ethyl Ketone = Less than 3% No literature/method is available in this laboratory for extraction/separation of MEK from such type of preparation.
2.	Lab no. 636 Dated 13.09.2024	Humiseal 1B73 Aerosol 400 ml	The sample as received is in unit packing metallic bottle labelled pasted as Humiseal 400 ml 1B73. The sample is in form of Aerosol. It is a preparation containing Toluene, Methyl Ethyl Ketone, Isobutyl acetate, Butane, Isobutane, propane and Propanoic acid, 3 ethoxy, ether ester. % of Methyl Ethyl Ketone = 26.48% No literature/method is available in this laboratory for extraction/separation of MEK from such type of preparation.
3.	Lab no. 638 Dated 19.09.2024	Humiseal 1B31 Aerosol 400 ml	The sample as received is in unit packing metallic bottle labelled pasted as Humiseal 400 ml 1B31. The sample is in form of Aerosol. It is an organic solvent preparation containing toluene, Acetone, Methyl Ethyl Ketone, Butane, Iso Butane, Propane. % of Methyl Ethyl Ketone = 5.50% No literature/method is available in this laboratory for extraction/separation of MEK from such type of preparation.

7. The exporter vide letter dated 29.07.2024 requested for provisional release of the goods for Back To Town. Hence, an email with 04 reminders was sent to CBN Gwalior on 05.08.2024 for further clarification of the NOC to export and its domestic use in India to ascertain applicability for provisional release of the goods for BTT. A letter dated 01.11.2024, Reminder-I dated 29.11.2024 and Reminder-II dated 14.01.2025 were also sent to CBN Gwalior. However, no reply has been received in this regard.

8. **Statements of the concerned persons**

8 . 1 The exporter M/s Humiseal India Private Limited (IEC: 0388189801) was summoned to appear on 09.12.2024. Thereafter, the statement of authorized representative of the exporter Miss Karishma Hamid Shaikh was recorded under section 108 of the Customs Act, 1962 on 09.12.2024 wherein she inter-alia stated that:

- She is authorized to record the statement on behalf of the exporter and has submitted the authority letter.

- She works with M/s Humiseal India Pvt. Ltd., having its official address at J-154, MIDC, Bhosari, Pune-411026. She has been working in this company since June 2023 as a Compliance Officer. M/s Humiseal India Pvt. Ltd. is a manufacturer-exporter of aerosols and is a multinational company based in the USA. Their parent company is M/s Chase Corporation. Mr. Atul Dixit is the Non-Executive Director for the India operations. The company has only one manufacturing plant in India at the above-mentioned address. Mr. Steven Carter is the Director of Manufacturing for EMEIA (Europe, Middle East, India, and Asia) and is responsible for day-to-day operations.
- The company has been exporting aerosols and thinner since 2019 through Nhava Sheva Port. She stated that she will submit the end-use certificate from their buyer.
- M/s Humiseal India Pvt. Ltd. (IEC: 0388189801) filed the above-mentioned shipping bill through their Customs Broker, M/s Rudra Shipping Services LLP.
- They do not possess any licence or NOC for the export of the said goods. They have applied for a licence with the CBN, Gwalior on 18.11.2024, and are currently in the process of obtaining the required licence/NOC for export of the product.
- She does not have technical knowledge about the reference number mentioned on the product and stated that she will submit the MSDS copies.
- The company has been exporting similar goods since 2019. The exporter did not obtain NOC for past consignments as the MEK content was within permissible limits as per the MSDS.
- The exporter was not aware of the applicability of the mandatory NOC for export of products containing MEK.
- The Customs Broker informed the exporter about the requirement of the NOC only after the consignment was placed on hold by the docks officer.
- The exporter files GST returns regularly.
- The exporter is not facing any cases related to Customs or GST.
- She further stated that they are sincere and willing to keep their company fully compliant. They will make their best efforts to obtain a valid NOC from CBN at the earliest and will update the same to SIIB(X).

8.2 The statement of Mr. Nishant Hariram Bhanusali, Director of the CB M/s Rudra Shipping Services LLP (Lic. No. AAYFR4399D), was recorded under section 108 of the Customs Act, 1962 on 20.01.2025 wherein he inter-alia stated that:

- M/s Rudra Shipping Services LLP (Licence No. AAYFR4399D) has its registered office at Vashi, Navi Mumbai, and has been engaged in customs clearance of import and export consignments since 2019. He is a Director in the firm and has submitted a copy of his pass for reference. The firm filed Shipping Bill No. 1813626 dated 20.06.2024 for the exporter M/s Humiseal India Pvt. Ltd. (IEC: 0388189801).
- They came into contact with the exporter through a freight forwarder.
- To verify the genuineness of the exporter, they obtained documents such as the IEC, GST registration certificate, PAN card, and Aadhaar card. They also verified these details on the GST and DGFT online portals. Additionally, they visited the exporter's factory premises at Pune.
- They were aware of the description of the goods for which the shipping bill was filed. The exporter provided documents such as the export invoice and packing list, based on which they filed the above-mentioned shipping bill.
- The exporter did not provide any NOC for the export of the said product. When they began filing shipping bills for the exporter in 2021, they had requested documents related to past exports. The exporter had exported similar goods earlier as well. Therefore, they continued filing shipping bills for them based on the documents provided. As the description of the goods was declared as *Aerosol*, they were not aware that any NOC/authorization was required.
- They were not aware of the Order issued by the Narcotics Commissioner, Gwalior vide F.No. XVI/6/1/PC/MEK/2017-292 dated 03.11.2017.
- They are aware of the provisions of the CBLR, 2018. They verified the genuineness of the exporter and filed the shipping bill based on the documents provided. Since the goods were described as *Aerosol*, which they believed to be freely exportable, they proceeded to file the shipping bill. They have been filing shipping bills for this exporter since 2021 and have filed around 18–19 shipping bills during this period.
- He further stated that they filed the shipping bills based solely on the documents provided by the exporter. He asserted that they are a genuine Customs Broker firm with a presence across India and that they diligently handle all export shipments processed by them. He added that they will continue to fully cooperate with the Customs authorities in the ongoing investigation.

9. Findings of the Investigation:

9.1 M/s Humiseal India Private Limited (IEC: 0388189801) has attempted to export the goods declared as "Humiseal 1A33 Aerosol 365 ml", "Humiseal 1B73 Aerosol 400 ml" and "Humiseal 1B31 Aerosol 400 ml", wherein one of the constituents is Methyl Ethyl Ketone (a precursory substance under RCS, 2013) vide live Shipping Bill No. 1813626 dated 20.06.2024. The said item falls under the purview of Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances (Regulation of Controlled Substances) Order, 2013 as the said goods are a controlled substance as mentioned at Sr. 10 of Schedule-B of Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances (Regulation of Controlled Substances) Order, 2013. Further, as per Regulation 10(1), "No person shall export any controlled substance in Schedule-B except in accordance with the conditions of the No Objection Certificate issued by the Narcotics Commissioner." Accordingly, the exporter was asked to submit NOC from the Narcotics

Commissioner, Gwalior. However, they failed to submit the same. Clarification was sought from the Central Bureau of Narcotics, Gwalior, for the applicability of NOC on the said items. However, no response from the Central Bureau of Narcotics, Gwalior received to date.

9.2 It is clear that the exporter has attempted to export the goods declared **as "Humiseal 1A33 Aerosol 365 ml", "Humiseal 1B73 Aerosol 400 ml" and "Humiseal 1B31 Aerosol 400 ml"** wherein one of the constituents is Methyl Ethyl Ketone (a precursor substance under RCS, 2013), without submission of NOC from the Narcotics Commissioner, Gwalior. In the absence of a valid NOC, the impugned goods are to be prohibited goods and hence in the event of their export without proper export authorization, render the same liable for confiscation under section 113(d), 113(ia) and 113(ja) of the Customs Act, 1962.

9.3 During investigation, it was found that the impugned goods (containing MEK) is a controlled substance as mentioned in Sr. 10 of Schedule-B of Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances (Regulation of Controlled Substances) Order, 2013 and export of impugned goods requires NOC from During investigation, it was found that the impugned goods (containing MEK) is a controlled substance as mentioned in Sr. 10 of Schedule-B of Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances (Regulation of Controlled Substances) Order, 2013 and export of impugned goods requires NOC from CBN which has not been fulfilled and incorrect declaration with respect to goods covered under live Shipping Bill No. 1813626 dated 20.06.2024 has been furnished. Further, in order passed vide F.No. XVI/6/1/PC/MEK/2017-292 dated 03.11.2017, in pursuance of Order dated 13.10.2017 passed by Honorable High Court of Bombay, in the Writ Petition No. 10370 of 2017 in case of M/s Videojet Technologies(I) Pvt. Ltd., Vs Commissioner of Customs(Import) NS-III and others, the Honorable Narcotics Commissioner, Central Bureau of Narcotics, Gwalior, ruled that *"considering the larger purpose behind framing of RCS order 2013 to regulate trade of Precursor Chemical(which are capable of being used for manufacture of Narcotic Drugs or Psychotropic Substances), I hold that for the purpose of interpretation for scope of term MEK in RCS Order 2013, principles as mentioned in Para 14 of Article 12 of the said convention should be adopted i.e. NOC will be required if MEK is present in any item and such MEK can either be extracted from such item and/ or such an item can be used in place of MEK (may be not as efficiently as MEK) for manufacture of Narcotic Drug or Psychotropic Substances."*.

9.4 The exporter in their voluntary statement dated 09.12.2024 had inter-alia admitted that they were not aware of the requirement of CBN NOC for goods filed for export under the subject Shipping Bills. However, "Ignorantia Juris Non Excusat" i.e. the exporter now at this stage cannot plead that they were unaware of the mandated requirement of CBN NOC for the goods filed for export by them. The averment of the exporter cannot at this stage be admissible since they have exported the subject goods in the past as well. It is only when one of their consignments was intercepted for investigation that they acknowledged their contraventions done. The exporter have therefore made themselves liable for penalty under section 114AA of the Customs Act, 1962.

9.5 The exporter has attempted to claim drawback of Rs.1,10,640.92/- and RoDTEP of Rs. 68,086.71/- in the current Shipping bill No. 1813626 dated 20.06.2024. However, the exporter was not eligible for export without proper NOC from the Central Bureau of Narcotics, Gwalior, and such export of restricted goods cannot be treated as legitimate and falls in the category of illegal export under the definition of section111H(a) of the Customs Act, 1962. Therefore, it appears that the exporter was not entitled to export incentives i.e. Drawback and RoDTEP. The total claimed Drawback amount of Rs. 1,10,640.92/-and RoDTEP amount of Rs. 68,086.71/- would not be available to the exporter.

9.6 The exporter has violated the provisions of Rule 11 of the Foreign Trade (Regulations), 1993 in as much, since they did not make a correct declaration of description, composition and value of goods in the Shipping Bill filed by them to the Customs authorities.

9.7. As the Exporter had not made a truthful declaration in the said live Shipping Bill No. 1813626 dated 20.06.2024, and they have violated the conditions of Section 50(2) of the Customs Act, 1962. The exporter being in the business for such a long period ought to have known the requirements and compliances needed for products which they are exporting. Hence, it appears that there was a mis-declaration, mis-statement and suppression of facts regarding the actual compliances needed for export of the impugned goods, on the part of the Exporter with mala-fide intention to circumvent the procedure established by law. Thus, it appears that the said goods were attempted to be exported in violation of Section 50(2) of the Customs Act, 1962 read with Section 11(1) of Foreign Trade (Development &Regulation) Act 1992 & Rules 11 of Foreign Trade Rules 1993, as exporter had furnished wrong declaration to the Custom Authorities.

9.8 M/s Humiseal India Private Limited (IEC: 0388189801) has attempted to export goods containing MEK which is a precursor substance mentioned at Sr. 10 of Schedule-B of Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances (Regulation of Controlled Substances) Order, 2013, without the requisite NOC form the CBN, Gwalior. Hence, this act of omission and commission on the part of the exporter has rendered the goods covered under the Shipping Bill No. 1813626 dated 20.06.2024, liable for confiscation under section 113(d), 113(ia) and 113(ja) of the Customs Act,1962. Accordingly, the exporter is liable for penalty under section 114(i) of the Customs Act, 1962.

9.9 Summons CBIC DIN 20241278NT000071287F dated 02.12.2024 was issued to the director of M/s Humiseal India Private Limited (IEC: 0388189801) to appear for statement on 09.12.2024. However, on behalf of the director, authorized representative of the exporter Miss Karishma Hamid Shaikh appeared for statement. In her statement, she stated that they were not aware of the fact that MEK requires NOC from CBN, Gwalior. She further stated that they have applied for NOC and she will produce it in 10-15 days. However, till date, no NOC has been produced by the exporter in this regard.

9.10 The Customs Broker M/s Rudra Shipping Services LLP (Lic. No. AAYFR4399D) had filed the Shipping Bill No. 1813626 dated 20.06.2024 on behalf of the exporter M/s Humiseal India Private Limited (IEC: 0388189801). The exporter attempted to export the items declared as "Humiseal 1A33 Aerosol 365 ml", "Humiseal 1B73 Aerosol 400 ml" and "Humiseal 1B31 Aerosol 400 ml" wherein one of the constituents is Methyl Ethyl Ketone (a precursory substance under RCS, 2013). Hence, No Objection certificate from the office of the Narcotics Commissioner, Central Bureau of Narcotics, Gwalior (MP) is required. In view of the above, it appears that the Customs Broker M/s Rudra Shipping Services LLP (Lic. No. AAYFR4399D) had not advised their client for submission of CBN NOC for the export of the said goods.

10. Therefore, in view of the above said offence report, it is observed that violations of the following provisions of CBLR, 2018 have been committed by the Customs Broker.

10.1 Regulation 10(d) of the CBLR, 2018, which reads as "*advise his client to comply with the provisions of the Act, other allied Acts and the rules and regulations thereof, and in case of non-compliance, shall bring the matter to the notice of the Deputy Commissioner of Customs or Assistant Commissioner of Customs, as the case may be*";

From the offence report, it appears that the goods exported contained Methyl Ethyl Ketone, which is a controlled substance under the NDPS Act, 1985. Export of such substances without the mandatory NOC from CBN amounts to a violation of the NDPS and DGFT provisions.

The Material Safety Data Sheet (MSDS) enclosed with the export documents clearly indicated the presence of Methyl Ethyl Ketone ranging between 1–30% concentration. Being a licensed Customs Broker, M/s. Rudra Shipping Services LLP was expected to examine these documents carefully and advise their client to comply with the relevant allied Acts before filing the Shipping Bill. However, the Customs Broker neither advised the exporter to obtain the requisite NOC from the Narcotics Commissioner, CBN, nor did he bring this non-compliance to the notice of the Customs authorities. By his act of omission, the Customs Broker failed to advise his client to comply with the provisions of the Customs Act and allied laws, thereby violating Regulation 10(d) of the Customs Brokers Licensing Regulations, 2018.

10.2 Regulation 10(e) of the CBLR, 2018, which reads as "*exercise due diligence to ascertain the correctness of any information which he imparts to a client with reference to any work related to clearance of cargo or baggage*";

From the investigation, it appears that the CB did not exercise due diligence in verifying the nature and composition of the goods prior to filing the Shipping Bill. The MSDS submitted with the shipping documents clearly mentioned Methyl Ethyl Ketone, a regulated chemical, yet the CB filed the export declaration describing the goods as ordinary "Aerosol Coatings," without any caution or verification of their compliance status.

The CB also failed to ensure whether the export of goods containing Methyl Ethyl Ketone required an NOC, although such a requirement is a matter of public record under DGFT Notification No. 35(RE)1997-2002. Thus, it is evident that the Customs Broker failed to exercise the due diligence required under the said regulation, thereby violating Regulation 10(e) of the CBLR, 2018.

10.3 Regulation 10(f) of the CBLR, 2018, which reads as "*not withhold information contained in any order, instruction or public notice relating to clearance of cargo or baggage issued by the Customs authorities, as the case may be, from a client who is entitled to such information*";

The Customs Broker is expected to be conversant with the public notifications, DGFT circulars, and instructions relating to prohibited and restricted items. In the instant case, the Customs Broker failed to inform his client, M/s. Humiseal India Pvt. Ltd., that export of goods containing Methyl Ethyl Ketone required prior NOC from CBN.

This omission demonstrates that the Customs Broker did not share essential regulatory information with the client and allowed the client to proceed with the export in violation of allied laws. Hence, it appears that the Customs Broker failed to communicate relevant public instructions and thereby violated Regulation 10(f) of the CBLR, 2018.

11. As per the offence report, CB neither exercised due diligence while scrutinizing the MSDS nor advised the exporter to comply with the mandatory restrictions prescribed under the NDPS and DGFT laws. Further, the CB failed to bring this non-compliance to the notice of the Customs authorities at the time of filing the Shipping Bill. These omissions constitute serious violations of Regulations 10(d), 10(e) and 10(f) of the CBLR, 2018 by CB M/s Rudra Shipping Services LLP (Lic. No. AAYFR4399D) and its employee, which has made them unfit to transact any business at Mumbai Customs and also in other Customs Stations and also the CB M/s Rudra Shipping Services has committed a gross offence and their negligence may not be ignored.

12. Under CBLR, 2018, it is evident that there are certain obligations cast on the Customs Broker under Regulation 10, which a Customs Broker shall comply with. These decide the very nature of Customs Broker's interaction with their clients and Customs and form the bedrock of the work of a Customs Broker. If these are overlooked as mere procedural requirements and minor contraventions, then the whole substance of CB's work stands nullified. Therefore, these may be termed as substantive requirements that a Customs Broker is bound to comply with. It is the responsibility of the CB to advise the importer to comply with provisions of the Act, other allied Acts and the rules and regulations thereof as laid down under CBLR, 2018. It is not difficult to foresee the adverse consequences that may arise if CB acts in a negligent manner.

13. Customs Brokers has a very important role in customs clearances and a lot of trust has been placed by the Department in the CB. In the regime of trade facilitation and with more and more of the goods being facilitated by the Risk Management Systems without examination by the Customs, the role of CB has further increased so that economic frontiers of the country are well guarded.

14. The acts of omission and commission on the part of the Customs Broker directly contributed to the attempted export of a restricted/controlled substance in violation of Section 50(2) of the Customs Act, 1962, read with the NDPS Act and DGFT Notification No. 35(RE)/1997-2002. Such conduct undermines the statutory framework regulating precursor chemicals and compromises national interest. The role of the Customs Broker, therefore, assumes grave significance, as the attempted export of restricted goods without lawful authorization renders the goods liable for confiscation under Section 113 of the Customs Act, 1962 .

15. Further, it is apprehended that the Customs Broker may commit a similar offence in future consignments and the department cannot remain oblivious to the danger posed by such an eventuality. Hence, I observe that this case is a fit case where immediate action is needed for invoking Regulation 16 of the CBLR, 2018.

16. Accordingly, I pass the following order: -

ORDER

16.1 I, Commissioner of Customs (General), in exercise of powers conferred upon me under the provisions of Regulation 16 (1) of CBLR, 2018 hereby suspend the CB licence of Custom Broker, M/s Rudra Shipping Services LLP (PAN No. AAYFR4399D) (CB No. 11/2497) with immediate effect, being fully satisfied that the Customs Broker has prima-facie did not fulfil their obligations as laid down under Regulation 10(d), 10(e) & 10(f) of Customs Brokers Licensing Regulations, 2018.

16.2 However, I offer the Custom Broker, M/s Rudra Shipping Services LLP (PAN No AAYFR4399D) (CB No. 11/2497) an opportunity of personal hearing on 09/12/25 at 01:00 hours. Any written representation against this order should reach the undersigned before the date of the hearing.

16.3 M/s Rudra Shipping Services LLP (PAN No. AAYFR4399D) (CB No. 11/2497) is directed to surrender all the original Custom Passes issued to their employee/partner/director/Proprietor immediately.

17. This order is being issued without prejudice to any other action that may be taken against the CB or any other person(s)/firm(s) etc, under the provisions of the Customs Act, 1962 and Rules/Regulations framed thereunder or under any other law for the time being in force.

Digitally signed by
Shraddha Joshi Sharma
Date: 26-11-2025
17:55:32

(SHRADDHA JOSHI SHARMA)
Commissioner of Customs (General)
New Custom House, Mumbai

To,

M/s Rudra Shipping Services LLP (PAN No. AAYFR4399D) (CB No. 11/2497)
Office No 628 ,Sixth Floor, Grohitam Premises Co-Op Soc Ltd
Plot No 14b, Sector 19 ,Near Apmc Market Vashi ,
Navi mumbai- 400705

Copy to:

1. The Pr./Chief Commissioner of Customs, Mumbai Zone I, II, III.
2. The Pr./Commissioner of Customs, Mumbai Zone I, II, III.
3. The DC/SIIB(I), JNCH,
4. The DC/ Group-I/IA, JNCH
5. CIU's of NCH, ACC & JNCH, Mumbai
6. EDI of NCH, ACC & JNCH, Mumbai
7. BCBA
8. Office copy.
9. Notice Board.