$~13

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

\+ W.P.(C) 6458/2017

GALAXY MOTORS ..... Petitioner

Through : Mr. Nitin Gulati, Advocate.

versus

COMMISSIONER, TRADE & TAXES & ANR...... Respondents

Through : Mr.Avtar Singh, Advocate.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV KHANNA
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE PRATHIBA M. SINGH

O R D E R

% 07.12.2017

Learned counsel for the petitioner accepts that the orders rejecting the refund were passed on 10^{th} February, 2012. He, however, points out that fresh orders have not been passed.

Learned counsel for the respondents states that in terms of Rule 34(4) of the Delhi Value Added Tax Rules the petitioner was required to furnish the certified copy of the orders passed by the authorities along with the relevant forms.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that orders passed would have been communicated to the VATO and hence, certified copy is not required to be furnished.

Without going into the said controversy, we would require the petitioner to furnish/file self certified copies of the orders along with the relevant forms to the VATO within a period of 10 days from today and thereafter, the VATO would pass appropriate order in accordance with law within a period of four weeks thereafter.

We are disposing of the writ petition with the hope and trust that the petitioner and the respondent-VATO will comply with the aforesaid directions. We give liberty to the petitioner to ask for revival of the writ petition in case of delay and non compliance. We clarify and observe that no direction or observation on merits has been made.

SANJIV KHANNA, J.

PRATHIBA M. SINGH, J.

DECEMBER 07, 2017

j