CUSTOMS, EXCISE AND SERVICE TAX APPELLATE TRIBUNAL
CHENNAI

REGIONAL BENCH – COURT NO. I

Service Tax Appeal No. 40331 of 2017

(Arising out of Order-in-Appeal Nos. 210 to 217/2016 (STA-II) dated 18.11.2016 passed by the Commissioner of Service Tax (Appeals-II), Newry Towers, 3rd Floor, Plot No. 2054, I Block, II Avenue, Anna Nagar, Chennai – 600 040)

M/s. Kellogg and Andelson Management Service Pvt. Ltd., : **Appellant**
No. 702, MLS Business Centres,
No. 4, Kuppu Arcade, Venkatnarayana Road,
T. Nagar,
Chennai – 600

VERSUS

The Commissioner of G.S.T. & Central Excise, : **Respondent**
Chennai Outer Commissionerate,
Newry Towers, No. 2054/1, II Avenue,
12th Main Road, Anna Nagar,
Chennai – 600 040

WITH

Service Tax Appeal No. 40332 of 2017

(Arising out of Order-in-Appeal Nos. 210 to 217/2016 (STA-II) dated 18.11.2016 passed by the Commissioner of Service Tax (Appeals-II), Newry Towers, 3rd Floor, Plot No. 2054, I Block, II Avenue, Anna Nagar, Chennai – 600 040)

M/s. Kellogg and Andelson Management Service Pvt. Ltd., : **Appellant**
No. 702, MLS Business Centres,
No. 4, Kuppu Arcade, Venkatnarayana Road,
T. Nagar,
Chennai – 600

VERSUS

The Commissioner of G.S.T. & Central Excise, : **Respondent**
Chennai Outer Commissionerate,
Newry Towers, No. 2054/1, II Avenue,
12th Main Road, Anna Nagar,
Chennai – 600 040

APPEARANCE:

Ms. S. Sridevi, Advocate for the Appellant

Shri. S. Govindarajan, Authorized Representative for the Respondent

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. P. DINESHA, MEMBER (JUDICIAL)

FINAL ORDER NOs. 41697-41702/ 2018 dated 23.05.2018

READ WITH

FINAL ORDER NOs. 40948-40949 / 2019 dated 23.07.2019

DATE OF HEARING: 23.05.2018

CORRIGENDUM

When the case was called out today, Ms. S. Sridevi, Ld. Advocate appearing for the assessee-appellant submits that, in all, 8 appeals were clubbed together, heard and disposed of in Appeal Nos. ST/40329-40336/2017 vide Final Order Nos. 41697-41702/2018 dated 23.05.2018. However, she points out that while allotting the Final Order numbers, only 6 numbers have been given whereas 8 numbers should have been given by the Registry, in respect of each appeal.

1.2 Ld. Advocate submits that there is no other additional issue, more so because these appeals listed today were also heard and taken up for common disposal along with the other appeals.

2. The same view is supported by Shri. S. Govindarajan, Ld. AR appearing for the Revenue.

3. I find that the assertion of the Ld. Advocate for the appellant is correct as this is a mistake committed while allotting the Final Order numbers, since I find that the appeals do not survive otherwise. Therefore, the Registry is directed to allot additional Final Order numbers for the above two appeals. Directed accordingly.

(P. DINESHA)
MEMBER (JUDICIAL)

Sdd