$~33 to 35

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

\+ W.P.(C) 1883/2018 and C.M.No.8249/2018

MITSUI & COMPANY (INDIA) PVT. LTD. ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr.Piyush Kaushik, Advocate.

versus

PRINCIPAL COMMISSIONER OF INCOME TAX 6, NEW DELHI & ANR. ..... Respondents

Through: Mr.Ruchir Bhatia, Advocate.

\+ W.P.(C) 1900/2018 and C.M.No.8250/2018

MITSUI & COMPANY (INDIA) PVT. LTD. ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr.Piyush Kaushik, Advocate.

versus

PRINCIPAL COMMISSIONER OF INCOME TAX 6, NEW DELHI & ANR. ..... Respondents

Through: Mr.Ruchir Bhatia, Advocate.

\+ W.P.(C) 1901/2018 and C.M.No.8251/2018

MITSUI & COMPANY (INDIA) PVT. LTD. ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr.Piyush Kaushik, Advocate.

versus

ADDITIONAL COMMISSIONER OF INCOME TAX , SPECIAL RANGE 6, NEW DELHI ..... Respondents

Through: Mr.Ruchir Bhatia, Advocate.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S. RAVINDRA BHAT
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A. K. CHAWLA

ORDER

% **26.07.2018**

We have heard the learned counsel for the parties and are of the opinion that the appropriate order will be to direct the Commissioner, Income Tax (Appeals) to decide the appeals pertaining to Assessment Years 2009-10, 2013-14 and 2014-15 on the disputed issues pending before him.

Accordingly, the CIT (Appeals) is directed to decide the petitioner's appeals within three months after hearing its submissions on merits.

The interim order with respect to the deposit of disputed amount shall continue to bind the parties till the disposal of the appeals. All rights and contentions of the parties are reserved.

The writ petitions are disposed of in the above terms.

S. RAVINDRA BHAT, J

A. K. CHAWLA, J

JULY 26, 2018
'dc'