

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CWP No. 108 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of decision: 14.7.2016

IIC Limited

.. Petitioner

VS

The State of Haryana and others

.. Respondents

Coram: **Hon'ble Mr. Justice Rajesh Bindal**
 Hon'ble Mr. Justice Harinder Singh Sidhu

Present: Mr. Sandeep Goyal, Advocate, for the petitioner.
 Mr. Mamta Singal Talwar, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

Rajesh Bindal, J.

The only grievance of the petitioner in the present case is that the surety bond of sister concern, namely, M/s IINFC Limited submitted by the petitioner to secure the demand of ₹ 4,71,11,175/- as raised by the assessing authority against which appeal is pending before the Joint Excise and Taxation Commissioner (Appeals), Faridabad, is not being accepted without any good reason, as a result of which, appeal being filed by the petitioner was not entertained and heard on merit.

Learned counsel for the respondents while referring to the letter Anneuxre P-6 submitted that the surety bond submitted by the petitioner has not been rejected, as such. He has only been given notice to produce the documents in support of the solvency of the surety. The petitioner may furnish those documents. After considering the same, the competent authority will either accept or reject the bonds.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner will do the needful within four weeks. On doing the needful, the competent authority will examine the surety bond submitted by the petitioner and pass a speaking order thereon, in case the same is sought to be rejected.

The petition stands disposed of, accordingly.

(Rajesh Bindal)
Judge

(Harinder Singh Sidhu)
Judge

14.7.2016

sharmila