

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

INCOME TAX APPEAL NO. 96 OF 2016

Pr. Commissioner of Income Tax-24,
Mumbai

.. Appellant

v/s.

Shri Divesh Agarwal

..Respondent

Mr. Ashok Kotangale i/b Padma Divakar for the appellant
Ms. Neha Achliya i/b Agrud Partners for the respondent

**CORAM : M.S. SANKLECHA &
ANUJA PRABHUDESSAI, J.J.**

DATED : 4th MAY, 2018.

PC.

1. This Appeal relates to Assessment Year 2004-05.
2. Mr. Kotangale, learned Counsel appearing for the Revenue invited our attention to Circular No.21 of 2015 issued by the Central Board for Direct Tax dated 10th December, 2015. In particular, our attention is invited to paragraphs 3 and 10 therein which read as under:-

“3:- *Henceforth, appeals/SLPs shall not be filed in cases where the tax effect does not exceed the monetary limits given hereunder:-*

S. No.	Appeals in Income Tax matters	Monetary Limit (in Rs.)
1	Before Appellate Tribunal	10,00,000/-
2	Before High Court	20,00,000/-
3	Before Supreme Court	25,00,000/-

It is clarified that an appeal should not be filed merely because the tax effect in a case exceeds the monetary limits prescribed above. Filing of appeal in such cases is to be decided on merits of the case.”

“10:- This instruction will apply retrospectively to pending appeals and appeals to be filed henceforth in High Courts/ Tribunals. Pending appeals below the specified tax limits in para 3 above may be withdrawn/not pressed. Appeals before the Supreme Court will be governed by the instructions on this subject, operative at the time when such appeal was filed.”

3. In the present case, the tax effect is Rs. 12.21 lakhs as mentioned in paragraph 11.1 of the Appeal Memo.
4. In view of the above, Mr. Kotangale, learned Counsel appearing for the Revenue on instructions does not press the present Appeal.
5. Accordingly, **Appeal is dismissed**, as not pressed.
6. Refund of Court Fees, as per Rules.

(ANUJA PRABHUDESSAI, J.)

(M.S. SANKLECHA, J.)