

\$~39 to 41

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

+ W.P.(C) 12301/2015

VODAFONE MOBILE SERVICES LIMITED (EARLIER KNOWN
AS VODAFONE DIGILINK LIMITED) Petitioner

Through: Ms. Manasvini Bajpai, Advocate.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondents

Through: Mr. Zoheb Hossain, Senior Standing
Counsel.

+ W.P.(C) 12303/2015

VODAFONE MOBILE SERVICES LIMITED Petitioner

Through: Ms. Manasvini Bajpai, Advocate.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondents

Through: Mr. Zoheb Hossain, Senior Standing
Counsel.
Mr. Rajesh Kumar, CGSC for UOI.

+ W.P.(C) 12307/2015

VODAFONE MOBILE SERVICES LIMITED (EARLIER KNOWN
AS M/S. VODAFONE SOUTH LIMITED) Petitioner

Through: Ms. Manasvini Bajpai, Advocate.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondents

Through: Mr. Zoheb Hossain, Senior Standing
Counsel.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIPIN SANGHI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER

%

25.11.2019

1. The matter has been placed before the Court pursuant to an office note pointing out that there is a typographical omission in our order dated 20.11.2019. It is urged by learned counsel for the parties that this Court had granted thirty days time to the Petitioner to prefer appeal before the ITAT. However, in the said order, the words “thirty days” has not been mentioned. We clarify that the Petitioner was permitted to file the appeal within thirty days and if so filed, the bar of limitation would not operate.
2. Learned counsel for the Petitioner has also urged that till the filing of the appeal, there should be a stay of the demand of tax. We are not inclined to entertain any such prayer, firstly for the reason that no such prayer was made or granted on 20.11.2019 when the matter was disposed of and even otherwise, there is no justification for us to grant the said relief.

VIPIN SANGHI, J

SANJEEV NARULA, J

NOVEMBER 25, 2019

nk