

* IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+ **W.P.(C) 11318/2016, C.M. APPL.44322/2016**
M V M HANGERS P. LTD. Petitioner
 versus
COMMISSIONER, TRADE & TAXES & ANR..... Respondents

+ **W.P.(C) 11320/2016, C.M. APPL.44326/2016**
M V M HANGERS P. LTD. Petitioner
versus
COMMISSIONER, TRADE & TAXES & ANR. Respondents

+ **W.P.(C) 11333/2016, C.M. APPL.44387/2016**
M V M HANGERS P. LTD. Petitioner
versus
COMMISSIONER, TRADE & TAXES & ANR. Respondents

+ **W.P.(C) 11339/2016, C.M. APPL.44417/2016**
M V M HANGERS P. LTD. Petitioner
versus
COMMISSIONER, TRADE & TAXES & ANR. Respondents

+ **W.P.(C) 11620/2016, C.M. APPL.45866/2015**
KOMAL ENTERPRISES Petitioner
versus
COMMISSIONER OF VAT & ANR. Respondents

+ **W.P.(C) 10532/2016**
AMBIENCE SERVICES Petitioner
 versus

COMMISSIONER, TRADE & TAXES & ANR. Respondents

+ **W.P.(C) 11300/2016**

SARAL TOOLS

..... Petitioner

versus

COMMISSIONER OF TRADE & TAXES & ANR..... Respondents

+ **W.P.(C) 11301/2016**

APEX PACKAGING

..... Petitioner

versus

COMMISSIONER OF TRADE & TAXES & ANR..... Respondents

+ **W.P.(C) 11302/2016**

UNITECH ENGINEERING

..... Petitioner

versus

COMMISSIONER OF TRADE & TAXES & ANR..... Respondents

+ **W.P.(C) 11303/2016**

HARYANA ENTERPRISES

..... Petitioner

versus

COMMISSIONER OF TRADE & TAXES & ANR..... Respondents

Through : Sh. Vineet Bhatia and Sh. Chander Kant, Advocates, in Item No.11.

Sh. Ruchir Bhatia, Advocate, for petitioner, in Item Nos. 12 to 15.

Sh. Anuj Aggarwal, ASC with Ms. Deboshree Mukherjee, Advocate, for respondents, in Item Nos. 11, 67, 71 & 74.

Sh. Peeyosh Kalra, ASC with Sh. Shiva Sharma, Advocate, for VAT Dept. in Item Nos. 12 to 15.

Sh. Vasdev Lalwani, Sh. Sandeep Gupta and Sh. Rohit Gautam, Advocates, for petitioner, in Item No.27.

Sh. Siddharth Dutta, Advocate, for respondents, in Item No.27.

Sh. Satyakam, Advocate, for respondent, in Item

Nos. 72, 73

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S. RAVINDRA BHAT

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAJMI WAZIRI

ORDER

%

19.12.2016

In all these cases where the writ petitioners seek directions for refund of excess amounts paid towards VAT liability and interest. Learned counsel for the respondents state that the claims have been approved in principle and that the amounts would be remitted along with interest on an early date.

The Court hereby directs that the respondents shall ensure that the refund orders are furnished to the petitioners in each of these cases within a week. Wherever up-to-date interest is not paid or partly paid, the concerned VATO shall indicate specific reasons in such cases. In case of any discrepancy, the applicants are at liberty to move the concerned VATO who shall decide such issues within 30 days of receipt of such application(s).

The writ petitions are disposed of in the above terms.

S. RAVINDRA BHAT, J

NAJMI WAZIRI, J

DECEMBER 19, 2016

‘ajk’