①

$~
* IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI
4.
\+ ITA 67/2016 & CM No.989/2016

THE COMMISSIONER OF INCOME TAX DELHI-IV .... Appellant
Through: Mr Raghvendra Singh, Junior Standing Counsel.

versus

INDRAPRASTHA GAS LTD. .... Respondent
Through

AND

5.
\+ ITA 68/2016 & CM No.990-991/2016

THE COMMISSIONER OF INCOME TAX DELHI-IV ..... Appellant
Through: Mr Raghvendra Singh, Junior Standing Counsel.

versus

INDRAPRASTHA GAS LTD. ..... Respondent
Through

CORAM:
JUSTICE S.MURALIDHAR
JUSTICE VIBHU BAKHRU

<u>O R D E R</u>
% 27.01.2016

1. There is an extraordinary delay of 1075 days in re-filing the appeals. The explanation offered is the standard one regarding the practice directions issued by this Court for e-filing of the appeals. As has already been observed by this Court in several orders, the practice directions were issued after

consultation with the bar and after giving sufficient time for the bar to get acquainted with the requirement of e-filing. Additionally, the Court has also provided scanning machines at the filing counter so that no difficulty is caused to the bar for switching over to the system of e-filing. In any event, the delay of over two years and nine months on this ground is wholly unacceptable. Consequently, the Court is not persuaded to condone the extraordinary delay of 1075 days in re-filing the appeals.

2. CM Nos.989-991/2016 are dismissed. Consequently, the appeals are dismissed.

S.MURALIDHAR, J

VIBHU BAKHRU, J

JANUARY 27, 2016
MK