IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION

NOTICE OF MOTION NO. 1021 OF 2016
IN
CENTRAL EXCISE APPEAL (L) NO. 199 OF 2015

The Commissioner of Central }
Excise, Customs and Service }
Tax Vapi } Applicant
versus
M/s. Hindustan Unilever Ltd. } Respondent

WITH
NOTICE OF MOTION NO. 1377 OF 2016
IN
CENTRAL EXCISE APPEAL (L) NO. 296 OF 2015

Commissioner of Central }
Excise and Service Tax } Applicant
versus
Atco Industries Ltd. } Respondent

WITH
NOTICE OF MOTION NO. 1380 OF 2016
IN
CENTRAL EXCISE APPEAL (L) NO. 238 OF 2015

Commissioner of Central }
Excise and Service Tax } Applicant
versus
Hardik Industrial }
Corporation } Respondent

WITH
NOTICE OF MOTION NO. 1631 OF 2016
IN
CENTRAL EXCISE APPEAL (L) NO. 316 OF 2015

WITH
NOTICE OF MOTION NO. 1633 OF 2016
IN
CENTRAL EXCISE APPEAL (L) NO. 315 OF 2015

The Commissioner of Service	}	
Tax-I, Mumbai	}	Applicant
versus		
AMP Capital Advisors (I)	}	
Pvt. Ltd.	}	Respondent

WITH
NOTICE OF MOTION NO. 1634 OF 2016
IN
CENTRAL EXCISE APPEAL (L) NO. 185 OF 2015

Commissioner of Central	}	
Excise, Pune-I	}	Applicant
versus		
M/s. Enerson Onnovation	}	
Center	}	Respondent

WITH
NOTICE OF MOTION NO. 1636 OF 2016
IN
CENTRAL EXCISE APPEAL (L) NO. 317 OF 2015

The Commissioner of Service	}	
Tax-I	}	Applicant
versus		
AMP Capital Advisors (I)	}	
Pvt. Ltd.	}	Respondent

WITH
NOTICE OF MOTION NO. 1639 OF 2016
IN
CENTRAL EXCISE APPEAL (L) NO. 70 OF 2015

Commissioner of Service	}	
Tax-I, Pune	}	Applicant
versus		
M/s. Balaji Society	}	Respondent

WITH
NOTICE OF MOTION NO. 1640 OF 2016
IN
CENTRAL EXCISE APPEAL (L) NO. 318 OF 2015

The Commissioner of Service	}	
Tax-I, Mumbai	}	Applicant

versus
M/s. AMP Capital Advisors }
(I) Pvt. Ltd. } Respondent

WITH
NOTICE OF MOTION NO. 1761 OF 2016
IN
CENTRAL EXCISE APPEAL (L) NO. 134 OF 2016

The Commissioner of Service }
Tax, Mumbai-III } Applicant
versus
M/s. Reliance Telecom Ltd. } Respondent

WITH
NOTICE OF MOTION NO. 1928 OF 2016
IN
CENTRAL EXCISE APPEAL (L) NO. 130 OF 2016

The Commissioner of Central }
Excise, Mumbai-III } Applicant
versus
Simac Group Ltd. } Respondent

WITH
NOTICE OF MOTION NO. 2053 OF 2016
IN
REVIEW PETITION (L) NO. 63 OF 2015
IN
CENTRAL EXCISE APPEAL NO. 139 OF 2014

Commissioner of Central }
Excise, Thane-I } Applicant
versus
Venus International } Respondent

WITH
NOTICE OF MOTION NO. 2144 OF 2016
IN
CENTRAL EXCISE APPEAL (L) NO. 55 OF 2016

The Commissioner of Service }
Tax, Mumbai-III } Applicant

versus

M/s. Tata AIG Life Insurance }
Co. Ltd. } Respondent

WITH
NOTICE OF NOTION NO. 2147 OF 2016
IN
CENTRAL EXCISE APPEAL (L) NO. 170 OF 2016

The Commissioner of Service }
Tax } Applicant
versus
M/s. Tata Teleservices }
(Maharashtra) Ltd. } Respondent

WITH
NOTICE OF MOTION NO. 2148 OF 2016
IN
CENTRAL EXCISE APPEAL (L) NO. 150 OF 2016

The Commissioner of Service }
Tax, Mumbai-VII } Applicant
versus
M/s. Tata Teleservices }
(Maharashtra) Ltd. } Respondent

Mr. A. S. Rao for the applicant in NMA/1021/2016.

Mr. Swapnil Bangur with Mr. Vipul A. Bajpayee for the applicant in NMA/1377/2016.

Mr. M. Dwivedi with Mr. Pradeep S. Jetly for the applicant in NMA/1380/2016.

Ms. P. S. Cardozo with Mr. Vipul A. bajpayee for the applicants in NMA Nos. 1633//2016, 1636/2016, 1928/2016, 2053/2016.

Mr. Swapnil Bangur i/b. Ms. Shalaka Gujar-Karande for the applicant in NMA/1634/2016.

Mr. Swapnil Bangur with Mr. Sham V. Walve for the applicant in NMA/1639/2016.

Ms. P. S. Cardozo for the applicant in NMA/1640/2016.

Ms. P. S. Cardozo with Mr. Joel J. Carlos for the applicants in NMA Nos. 1761/2016 and 2144/2016.

Ms. P. S. Cardozo with Mr. Jitendra B. Mishra for the applicants in NMA Nos. 2147/2016 and 2148/2016.

Ms. Padmavati Patil for the respondent in NMA/1021/2016.

Mr. Chirag Shetty with Mr. Jitendra Motwani i/b. M/s. Economic Laws Practice for the respondent in NMA/1761/2016.

Mr. Jas Sanghavi i/b. M/s. PDS Legal for the respondent in NMA/2053/2016.

CORAM :- S. C. DHARMADHIKARI &
B. P. COLABAWALLA, JJ.

DATED :- MARCH 20, 2017

P.C. :-

1. In all these matters, the office has reported that the advocates are not co-operating and have never appeared before them to report compliance with the procedural rules. Some of the procedural rules and which require compliance are of provision of adequate copies for service of the copy of the application for condonation of delay in filing of the appeal or application for

restoration of the appeal on the opponents. If private service is effected, then, proof of the same on affidavit. Such a simple office objection has not been complied with by the concerned advocates and particularly the advocates appearing for the Revenue.

2. We direct that if, within a period of four weeks, such compliance is not reported in each of these matters, then, they would stand dismissed without any further reference to this court. They would stand dismissed for want of prosecution.

(B.P.COLABAWALLA, J.) (S.C.DHARMADHIKARI, J.)