$~
* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
23
\+ **W.P.(C) 350/2016**

THUKRAL STEEL CORPORATION
THROUGH ITS PROPRIETOR DAMAN THUKRAL .. Petitioner
Through: Mr. Ashok Babbar with Mr. Ankuar Sethi, Mr. Vasdev Lalwani and Mr. Rohit, Advocates.

versus

COMMISSIONER VALUE ADDED TAX & ANR....Respondents
Through: Mr. Shatarjit Banerjee, Advocate for Mr. Gautam Narayan, Addl. Standing counsel.

CORAM:
JUSTICE S.MURALIDHAR
JUSTICE VIBHU BAKHRU

O R D E R
% 15.01.2016

1. Notice. Mr. Shatarjit Banerjee, learned counsel accepts notice on behalf of the Respondents.

2. The Petitioner, a proprietary concern, is registered under the Delhi Value Added Tax Act, 2004 as well as the Central Sales Tax Act, 1956. It holds a VAT registration which is valid as of date.

3. The Petitioner was surveyed by the Enforcement officials of the Respondents on 5th November 2015 pursuant to a deployment order of that date issued by the Enforcement Branch of the Government of

National Capital Territory of Delhi ('GNCTD'), Department of Trade & Taxes in terms of which searches were conducted in the premises of M/s. Thukral Steel Corporation (the Petitioner herein), M/s Shubh Steel and M/s. Surya Enterprises all of whom were having their offices in the same building at Loha Mandi, Naraina, Delhi.

4. As far as the present petition is concerned, the grievance is that the premises having been sealed on 5th November 2015 itself, there was no justification to continue to keep it sealed till date. It is submitted that the survey report dated 6th November 2015 prepared by the Enforcement officials reveals that the Department had already collected the necessary documents and information. Reliance is placed on the orders passed by the Court in similar cases including the order dated 19th May 2014 in Writ Petition (C) No. 3107/2014 (***Sandeep Chemical Corporation v. Commissioner, Value Added Tax***), order dated 26th May 2014 in W.P. (C) No. 3441/2014 (***Reema Polychem Ltd. v. GNCTD***) and order dated 8th July 2014 in W.P. (C) No. 1324/2014 (***S.D. Enterprises v. GNCTD***) where in similar circumstances, the Court had directed de-sealing of the premises within 48 hours of the sealing.

5. Learned counsel for the Respondents does not dispute the legal position as explained by the Court in the above orders. He, however,

states that in the event that the Department is yet to take custody of the documents that it requires from the sealed premises, it will do so within 48 hours from now.

6. In view of the above statement, it is directed that within 48 hours from now the Department will, if it has not already done so, take custody of any documents, records, registers, books of accounts or goods lying in the premises of the Petitioner, which it requires for the purposes of the case against the Petitioner, after handing over copies thereof, where possible, to the Petitioner. An inventory of the documents, records, registers, books of accounts or goods seized will be prepared. The premises will be de-sealed and handed back to the Petitioner on or before the expiry of 48 hours from now.

7. The petition is disposed of in the above terms. Order be given *dasti.*

S.MURALIDHAR, J

VIBHU BAKHRU, J

JANUARY 15, 2016
Rk