

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION
INCOME TAX APPEAL NO. 2431 OF 2013

Commissioner of Income Tax, Central II,
Mumbai 400 020 ... Appellant

v/s

M/s The Indian Hume Pipe Co.Ltd.
Mumbai 400 001 ... Respondent

Mr A.R. Malhotra with Mrs Padma Divakar for Appellant.

Mr Sameer Dalal with Mr S.G. Lakhani for Respondent.

**CORAM : M.S. SANKLECHA AND
B.P. COLABAWALLA JJ.**

DATE : 07th JANUARY, 2016

P.C.:-

1. This Appeal relates to Assessment Year 2008-09.
2. Mr Malhotra, learned counsel appearing for the Revenue invited our attention to Circular No.21 of 2015 issued by the Central Board for direct Tax dated 10th December 2015. In particular, our attention is invited to paragraphs 3 and 10 therein which read as under :-

“3. Henceforth, appeals / SLPs shall not be filed in

WRD

cases where the tax effect does not exceed the monetary limits given hereunder :-

Sr.No.	Appeals in Income Tax matters	Monetary Limit (in Rs.)
1	Before Appellate Tribunal	10,00,000/-
2	Before High Court	20,00,000/-
3	Before Supreme Court	25,00,000/-

It is clarified that an appeal should not be filed merely because the tax effect in a case exceeds the monetary limits prescribed above. Filing of appeal in such cases is to be decided on merits of the case.”

“10. This instruction will apply retrospectively to pending appeals and appeals to be filed henceforth in High Courts / Tribunals. Pending appeals below the specified tax limits in para 3 above may be withdrawn / not pressed. Appeals before the Supreme Court will be governed by the instructions on this subject, operative at the time when such appeal was filed.”

3. In the present case, the tax effect is Rs.14.13 lakhs as mentioned in paragraph 11 of the Appeal Memo.

4. In view of the above, Mr Malhotra, learned counsel appearing for the Revenue does not press the present appeal.

5. Accordingly, Appeal dismissed, as not pressed.

6. Refund of Court Fees, as per Rules.

(B.P.COLABAWALLA, J.)

(M.S. SANKLECHA, J.)