

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

**ITA No. 208 of 2017 (O&M)
Decided on : 15.05.2017**

The Pr. Commissioner of Income Tax, Gurgaon

. . . Appellant

Versus

CEB India Pvt. Ltd.

. . . Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY KUMAR MITTAL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARINDER SINGH SIDHU**

PRESENT: Mr. Tajender K. Joshi, Advocate
for the appellant.

AJAY KUMAR MITTAL, J. (Oral)

The present appeal has been filed under Section 260A of the Income Tax Act, 1961 (in short 'the Act'), against the order dated 24.06.2016 (Annexure A-2), passed by the Income Tax Appellate Tribunal, Delhi Bench, "Friday 'G', New Delhi, claiming the following substantial questions of law:-

- “1. Whether the Hon'ble ITAT has acted in contravention of the Second Proviso of Section 254(2A) of the Income Tax Act, 1961, as the combined period of stay has exceeded 365 days.*
- 2. Whether the Hon'ble ITAT be treated as void-ab-initio in light of Third Proviso to Sec 254(2A) of the Income Tax Act, 1961, which provides that stay of demand stands vacated after expiry of a period of 365 days, even if delay in disposal of appeal is not attributable to the assessee.”*

2. It was not disputed by the learned counsel for the appellant-revenue that the matter in issue is no longer *res integra* and stands concluded by the decision of this Court in **ITA No.5 of 2016**, titled as **“Pr.**

Commissioner of Income Tax, Gurgaon Vs. M/s Carrier Air

Conditioning and Refigeration Ltd.”, decided on **25.04.2016**, whereby, identical question as claimed in the present appeal, has been held not to be substantial question of law.

3. For the reasons recorded in the aforementioned appeal, the present appeal is dismissed.

(AJAY KUMAR MITTAL)
JUDGE

(HARINDER SINGH SIDHU)
JUDGE

May 15, 2017

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned:
Whether Reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No