

\$~

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

3.

+

ITA 132/2016

THE COMMISSIONER OF INCOME TAX-II Appellant

Through: Mr Rahul Chaudhary, Senior Standing
Counsel with Mr Raghvendra Singh, Junior
Standing Counsel and Mr Sharad Agarwal,
Advocate.

versus

MARUTI UDYOG LIMITED

..... Respondent

Through: Ms Kavita Jha and Mr Vaibhav
Kulkarni, Advocates.

CORAM:

JUSTICE S.MURALIDHAR

JUSTICE VIBHU BAKHRU

ORDER

%

15.02.2016

CM No.4774/2016

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

2. The application stands disposed of.

**CM No.4775/2016 (for condonation of delay in re-filing the appeal) &
ITA 132/2016**

3. There is an inordinate delay of 975 days in re-filing the appeal.

4. 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 the change of Standing Counsel for the Department and the failure by the earlier counsel to inform the Department about the appeal lying in defect. This explanation does not impress the Court. It is not possible to accept that no one in the Department followed up on the filing of appeals and allowed a period of almost two years and six months 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 bearing CM No.4775/2016 for condonation of the delay of 975 days in re-filing the appeal is dismissed. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

S.MURALIDHAR, J

VIBHU BAKHRU, J

FEBRUARY 15, 2016
MK