



Priya Soparkar

1

69, 72, 73, 79, 82, 83 nma 1102-18 nad ors-o-s

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

**NOTICE OF MOTION NO.1102 OF 2018
IN
INCOME TAX APPEAL (L) NO.45 OF 2018**

**WITH
NOTICE OF MOTION NO.1105 OF 2018
IN
INCOME TAX APPEAL (L) NO.47 OF 2018**

**WITH
NOTICE OF MOTION NO.1106 OF 2018
IN
INCOME TAX APPEAL (L) NO.52 OF 2018**

**WITH
NOTICE OF MOTION NO.1112 OF 2018
IN
INCOME TAX APPEAL (L) NO.57 OF 2018**

**WITH
NOTICE OF MOTION NO.1115 OF 2018
IN
INCOME TAX APPEAL (L) NO.44 OF 2018**

**WITH
NOTICE OF MOTION NO.1116 OF 2018
IN
INCOME TAX APPEAL (L) NO.43 OF 2018**

The Commissioner of Income Tax

... Applicant/
Appellant

V/s.

M/s International Global Networks BV

... Respondent

Mr.P.A.Narayanan for the Applicant/Appellant.
Mr.Atul Jasani for the Respondent.

**CORAM : AKIL KURESHI AND
M.S.SANKLECHA, JJ.
DATE : JANUARY 18, 2019.**

P.C.:-

1. These applications seek condonation of 48 days delay in taking out these notices of motion for setting aside the order dated 2nd August, 2018 passed by the Prothonotary and Senior Master, High Court, Mumbai. The impugned order rejected applicant's appeal for non-removal of office objections in terms of Rule 986 of the Bombay High Court, Original Sides Rules.

2. We have perused the affidavits-in-support and are satisfied with the reasons indicated therein for the delay for taking out application as well as for not removing the office objections within the time limit provided by the Prothonotary and Senior Master.

3. In the above view, the notices of motion are allowed in

terms of prayer clauses (a) and (b).

4. Needless to say, if the office objections are not removed within four weeks from today, the appeals would stand dismissed without further reference to the court.

(M.S.SANKLECHA,J.)

(AKIL KURESHI,J.)

....