

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION
NOTICE OF MOTION NO.1069 OF 2016
IN
CROSS OBJECTION [L] NO.11 OF 2009
IN
CENTRAL EXCISE APPEAL NO.47 OF 2009

Ispat Industries Ltd.	 Applicant
<i>In the matter between</i>	
Ispat Industries Ltd. (Now known as JSW Steel Ltd.)	 Cross Objectionist
Vs.	
Commissioner of Central Excise, Raigad Commissionerate	 Respondent

AND
NOTICE OF MOTION NO.2205 OF 2016
IN
CUSTOMS APPEAL [L] NO.100 OF 2015

AND
NOTICE OF MOTION NO.2276 OF 2016
IN
CENTRAL EXCISE APPEAL [L] NO.248 OF 2015

AND
NOTICE OF MOTION NO.2277 OF 2016
IN
CENTRAL EXCISE APPEAL [L] NO.215 OF 2015

AND
NOTICE OF MOTION NO.2278 OF 2016
IN
CENTRAL EXCISE APPEAL [L] NO.246 OF 2015

AND
NOTICE OF MOTION NO.2280 OF 2016
IN
CENTRAL EXCISE APPEAL [L] NO.44 OF 2016

AND
NOTICE OF MOTION NO.2281 OF 2016
IN
CENTRAL EXCISE APPEAL [L] NO.216 OF 2015

AND
NOTICE OF MOTION NO.2282 OF 2016
IN
CENTRAL EXCISE APPEAL [L] NO.241 OF 2015

AND
NOTICE OF MOTION NO.2283 OF 2016
IN
CENTRAL EXCISE APPEAL [L] NO.261 OF 2015

AND
NOTICE OF MOTION NO.2284 OF 2016
IN
CENTRAL EXCISE APPEAL [L] NO.49 OF 2016

AND
NOTICE OF MOTION NO.2477 OF 2016
IN
CUSTOMS APPEAL [L] NO.89 OF 2014

AND
NOTICE OF MOTION NO.2619 OF 2016
NOTICE OF MOTION NO.973 OF 2015
IN
CENTRAL EXCISE APPEAL [L] NO.71 OF 2015

AND
NOTICE OF MOTION NO.2632 OF 2016
IN
CENTRAL EXCISE APPEAL [L] NO.11 OF 2016

AND
NOTICE OF MOTION NO.2633 OF 2016
IN
CENTRAL EXCISE APPEAL [L] NO.10 OF 2016

Mr. P.K. Shetty with Mr. Ashutosh Mishra & Mr. Vipin Kumar Jain for the Applicant/Appellant in NMA-1069/2016.

Mr. A.S. Rao for the Applicant/Appellant in NMA-Nos.2276, 2277, 2278, 2280, 2281, 2282, 2283, 2284, 2632 and 2633 of 2016.

Ms P.S. Cardozo with Mr. Vipul A. Bajpayee for the Applicant/Appellant in NMA-2619/2016.

**CORAM: S.C. DHARMADHIKARI &
PRAKASH D. NAIK, JJ.**

DATE : APRIL 17, 2017

P.C:

1. In all these matters, the Registry has reported that the applicants/appellants have not complied with the procedural requirement, particularly of placing on record the proof of service of the notice of motion on the other side.

2. Let such proof be placed in all such matters within four weeks, failing which each of these motions would stand

suresh

9-22-NMAG-1069.2016.doc

dismissed for want of prosecution without further reference to
Court.

(PRAKASH D. NAIK, J.)

(S.C. DHARMADHIKARI, J.)