

\$~

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

37.

+

W.P.(C) 11695/2015

SHUBH STEEL

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr Vasdev Lalwani and Mr Rohit
Gautam, Advocates.

versus

COMMISSIONER OF VAT & ANR.

..... Respondents

Through: Mr Anuj Aggarwal, Additional Standing
Counsel, Advocate for Respondent Nos.1 & 2.

CORAM:

JUSTICE S.MURALIDHAR

JUSTICE VIBHU BAKHRU

ORDER

%

27.01.2016

1. Notice. Mr Anuj Aggarwal, learned Additional Standing Counsel ('ASC')
for Respondents No.1 & 2 accepts notice.

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 officials of the Enforcement Branch 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, M/s Shubh Steel (the Petitioner herein) and M/s. Surya Enterprises, all of whom had 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 today. 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 has directed de-sealing of the premises within 48 hours of the sealing.

5. Mr. Anuj Aggarwal, learned ASC, 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, 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. A copy of this order be given *dasti* to learned counsel for the parties.

S.MURALIDHAR, J

VIBHU BAKHRU, J

JANUARY 27, 2016/MK