

**IN THE INCOME TAX APPELLATE TRIBUNAL “D”, BENCH KOLKATA
BEFORE SHRI S.S. VISWANETHRA RAVI, JM & DR. A.L. SAINI, AM**

ITA No.1948/Kol/2017
(Assessment Year: 2012-13)

Collate Barter Pvt. Ltd. 4B Nalini Seth Road, Kolkata – 700 007.	Vs.	ITO, Ward-9(3), Kolkata 54/1, Rafi Ahmed Kidwai Road, 5 th Floor, Kolkata – 700 016.
स्थायी लेखा सं./जीआइआर सं./PAN/GIR No. : AA ECC 7559 H		
(अपीलार्थी /Appellant)	..	(प्रत्यर्थी / Respondent)

Appellant by : None
Revenue by : Shri R. Shyam, CIT(DR)

सुनवाई की तारीख / **Date of Hearing :** 12/11/2018
घोषणा की तारीख/**Date of Pronouncement:** 22/11/2018

आदेश / O R D E R

Per Dr. Arjun Lal Saini, AM:

The captioned appeal filed by the assessee, pertaining to assessment year 2012-13, is directed against the order passed by Id. Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeals)-16, Kolkata dated 27.03.2017.

2. Notice of hearing of this appeal was sent to the assessee at the address given by the assessee in Form No.36. The said notice has not been returned unserved. This appeal was listed for hearing before the Tribunal on 12.11.2018. Today i.e. on 12.11.2018 when the case was called for hearing, none appeared on behalf of the assessee nor any request for adjournment was made. Earlier said appeal was fixed for hearing on 07.08.18 and 13.09.18 but none appeared on behalf of assessee. It means that assessee is not interested in prosecuting this appeal. Hence the appeal filed by the assessee is liable to be dismissed for non prosecution. For this view we find support from the following decisions :-

(1). In the case of CIT vs B.N.Bhattachrgee and another, reported in 118 ITR 461 [relevant pages 477 & 478] wherein their Lordships have held that :

“The appeal does not mean merely filing of the appeal but effectively pursuing it.”

(2). In the case of Estate of late Tukojiro Holkar vs CWT; 223 ITR 480 (MP) while dismissing the reference made at the instance of the assessee in default made following observation in their order :

“If the party, at whose instance the reference is made, fails to appear at the hearing, or fails in taking steps for preparation of the paper books so as to enable hearing of the reference, the court is not bound to answer the reference.”

(3). In the case of Commissioner of Income-tax vs Multiplan India (P) Ltd.: 38 ITD 320(Del), the appeal filed by the revenue before the Tribunal, which was fixed for hearing. But on the date of hearing nobody represented the revenue/appellant nor any communication for adjournment was received. There was no communication or information as to why the revenue chose to remain absent on that date. The Tribunal on the basis of inherent powers, treated the appeal filed by the revenue as unadmitted in view of the provisions of Rule 19 of the Appellate Tribunal Rules, 1963.

3. The law assists those who are vigilant and not those who sleep over their rights; i.e. *“vigilantibus non dormientibus, jura subveniunt”*.
4. In the result, the appeal of the assessee is dismissed for non-prosecution.

Order pronounced in the open court on this 22/11/2018.

Sd/-

(S.S. Viswanethra Ravi)

न्यायिक सदस्य / JUDICIAL MEMBER

कोलकाता /Kolkata;

Dated:22/11/2018

RS, Sr.PS

आदेश की प्रतिलिपि अग्रेषित/Copy of the Order forwarded to :

1. अपीलार्थी / The Appellant- Collate Barter Pvt. Ltd.
2. प्रत्यर्थी / The Respondent.- ITO, Ward-9(3), Kolkata
3. आयकर आयुक्त(अपील) / The CIT(A),
4. आयकर आयुक्त / CIT
5. विभागीय प्रतिनिधि, आयकर अपीलीय अधिकरण, कोलकाता / DR, ITAT, Kolkata
6. गार्ड फाईल / Guard file.

//True Copy//

By Order

Assistant Registrar
I.T.A.T, Kolkata Benches,
Kolkata.

Sd/-

(A. L. Saini)

लेखा सदस्य / ACCOUNTANT MEMBER