

\$~

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

19.

+

ITA 226/2016

PR. COMMISSIONER OF I. TAX-2

..... Appellant

Through: Mr P. Roy Chaudhuri, Senior Standing
Counsel with Ms Laxmi Gurung, Junior Standing
counsel.

versus

**M/S. BHARTI AIRTEL LTD. (ERSTWHILE
BHARTI TELEVENTURES LTD)**

..... Respondent

Through: Ms Kavita Jha and Ms Mehak Gupta,
Advocates.

CORAM:

JUSTICE S.MURALIDHAR

JUSTICE R. K. GAUBA

ORDER

%

01.04.2016

CM No.11995/2016 (for condonation of delay in re-filing the appeal) &

ITA 226/2016

1. There is an inordinate delay of 904 days in re-filing the appeal.
2. The Court finds that the standard excuse that the department is putting forth in all such applications for condonation of delay in re-filing the appeal is regarding the practice directions issued by the Court pertaining to filing of soft copies of the paperbooks in tax matters.
3. As regards this ground, sufficient advance notice had been given to the litigants and Advocates about the filing of soft copies of the paperbooks.

Further, the Registry of the Court had made appropriate arrangements for scanning services at the filing counters to facilitate the making of soft copies so that the inconvenience, if any, caused to the Advocates and the litigants is minimised. In any event the change could not have entailed a delay of about two and a half years.

4. Learned counsel for the Appellant pointed out a second reason. The change of Standing counsel for the Department. This again, does not impress the Court. It is not possible to accept that no one followed up on the filing of appeals and allowed a period of about two and a half years to elapse before the appeal could be re-filed. The Department has a cell in the High Court which is under the supervision of a Deputy CIT. He ought to be keeping track of the filing of appeals and should be able to know if any appeal entrusted to the panel counsel for filing has not been listed even once before the Court for a long time.

5. The application CM No.11995/2016 for condonation of the delay of 904 days in re-filing the appeal is dismissed. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

S. MURALIDHAR, J

R. K. GAUBA, J

APRIL 01, 2016

MK