

\$~42 & 43

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

+ W.P.(C) 8044/2018

RADHIKA ROY

..... Petitioner

versus

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER OF INCOME TAX, & ANR.

..... Respondent

+ W.P.(C) 8045/2018

DR. PRANNOY ROY

..... Petitioner

versus

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER OF INCOME TAX & ANR.

..... Respondent

Counsel for the petitioner:

Mr. Mr. Sachit Jolly, Mr. Rohit Garg, Mr.
Siddharth Joshi, Mr. Aarush Bhatia, Advocates in
Item 42 and 43.

Counsel for the respondent:

Mr. Zoheb Hossai, Senior Standing Counsel for
Revenue and Mr. N.P. Sahni, Advocate

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S. RAVINDRA BHAT

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A. K. CHAWLA

ORDER

%

03.08.2018

The petitioner's grievance in these proceedings is with respect to the order of the Tribunal. It is submitted that the order setting down the appeals for hearing and refusing accommodation at least on one date to the assessee and seeking undertaking that it would never seek adjournment in the future on one hand and granting accommodation

to the Revenue counsel on the other hand, leads to reasonable apprehension about its ability to hear the appeals objectively.

We have heard learned counsel for the parties and are of the opinion that since the appeals are listed on Monday, (06.08.2018) or any other date the Bench may fix for hearing at its earliest convenience, the ITAT will not accommodate counsel for either party and proceed to hear the appeals (since in its opinion they warranted an early hearing and disposal). It is clarified that the request for adjournment by either party would be rejected. All rights and contentions of the parties to urge their submissions on merit of the appeal are reserved.

The writ petitions are disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

Order *dasti*.

S. RAVINDRA BHAT, J

A. K. CHAWLA, J

AUGUST 03, 2018

pkb