$~17

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

\+ ITA 226/2017

PR.COMMISSIONER OF INCOME TAX-4 ..... Appellant

Through: Mr. Ruchir Bhatia with Mr. Gaurav Khetarpal & Mr. Puneet Rai, Advs.

versus

GE MONEY FINANCIAL SERVICES PVT.LTD. ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Sachit Jolly, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S. RAVINDRA BHAT
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA

O R D E R

% **01.11.2017**

The question of law which the Revenue urges in its appeal is with respect to the treatment of Non-Performing Assets (NPA).

It is pointed out by the assessee, which is represented on advance notice, that for the years i.e. A.Y. 2006-07, 2007-08 and 2008-09, the Court had rejected the Revenue's appeal under Section 260A (ITA No.67-68 and 73/2017) while following the judgment in *Commissioner of Income Tax v. Vasisth Chay Vyapar Ltd.,* (2011) 330 ITR 440 (Delhi). ITAT had applied the principle in *Vasisth Chay Vyapar Ltd.* (supra). Following the decision of this Court in ITA No.67-68 and 73/2017, it is held that no substantial question of law arises.

Appeal is therefore dismissed.

S. RAVINDRA BHAT, J

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J

NOVEMBER 01, 2017/kks