

jsn

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

CENRAL EXCISE APPEAL NO. 127 OF 2017

The Commissioner of Service Tax – VI, ... Appellant
Mumbai Commissionerate

Versus

M/s. Gupshup Technology India Pvt. Ltd. ... Respondent

Mr. M. Dwivedi with Ms. Ruju R. Thakker for the Appellant.
Mr. Rohan Deshpande, for Respondent.

**CORAM: M.S.SANKLECHA &
RIYAZ I. CHAGLA, JJ.**
DATED: 21ST AUGUST, 2018

PC:-

1. This Appeal under Section 35G of the Central Excise Act, 1944 (Act) is against order dated 6th September, 2016 of the Central Excise and Service Tax Appellate Tribunal (Tribunal).
2. The basic grievance of the Revenue is that the impugned order dated 6th September, 2016 rejecting the Revenue's stay application filed in its pending Appeal from the order dated 11th May, 2016 of the Commissioner (Appeals) of Service Tax – II, Mumbai is an order without reasons and therefore not sustainable.
3. The learned counsel for the parties state that the Appeal of the Revenue before the Tribunal from the order dated 11th May, 2016 of the Commissioner (Appeals) of Service Tax has been

Jitendra
Shankar
Nijasure

Digitally signed
by Jitendra
Shankar
Nijasure
Date:
2018.08.27
11:46:14 +0530

finally disposed of on 9th November, 2017. Thus the present Appeal is rendered infructuous.

4. Accordingly, this Appeal is dismissed as infructuous.

(RIYAZ I. CHAGLA J.)

(M.S.SANKLECHA, J.)