$~33 to 35

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

\+ **ITA 1085/2017, C.M. APPL.43426/2017**

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

versus

GOODYEAR INDIA PVT. LTD. ..... Respondent

\+ **ITA 1086/2017, C.M. APPL.43427/2017**

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

versus

GIESECKE & DEVRIENT (INDIA) PVT. LTD. ..... Respondent

\+ **ITA 1087/2017, C.M. APPL.43428/2017**

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

versus

GIESECKE & DEVRIENT (INDIA) PVT. LTD. ..... Respondent

Through : Sh. Ruchir Bhatia, for the appellant, in Item Nos. 33 to 35.

Sh. Harpreet Singh Ajmani and Sh. Rohan Khare, Advocates, for respondent, in Item Nos. 34 and 35.

Sh. Neeraj Jain and Sh. Aniket. D. Agrawal, Advocates, for respondent, in Item No.33.

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

O R D E R

% 29.11.2017

The question raised by the Revenue in these appeals, viz., whether the Income Tax Appellate Tribunal (ITAT) can extend an interim order beyond the statutorily permissible limit of 365 days has been answered in the affirmative by this Court in *Pepsi Food Pvt. Ltd. v. ACIT* 2015 (376) ITR 87 (Del).

The appeals are accordingly dismissed.

S. RAVINDRA BHAT, J

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J

NOVEMBER 29, 2017/ajk