$~69

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

\+ ITA 544/2018

PR. COMMISSIONER OF INCOME TAX-2 ..... Appellant
Through: Mr. Puneet Rai with Mr. Ruchir Bhatia, Advs.

versus

CASIO INDIA COMPANY PVT LTD ..... Respondent
Through: None.

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

<u>O R D E R</u>

% **07.05.2018**

The issue sought to be urged by the Revenue i.e. whether having regard to the language of Section 254 of the Income Tax Act, 1961 (hereafter referred to as 'the Act'), the Tribunal (ITAT) could have extended the interim order beyond the prescribed period is now answered against the authorities in the judgment reported as *Pepsi Foods Pvt. Ltd. v. ACIT* 376 ITR 87. The ITAT followed that judgment.

No substantial question of law therefore arises. The appeal is, accordingly, dismissed.

S. RAVINDRA BHAT, J

A. K. CHAWLA, J

MAY 07, 2018
kks