

CUSTOMS, EXCISE & SERVICE TAX APPELLATE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH, WEST BLOCK No.2, R.K.PURAM, NEW DELHI - 110066
SINGLE MEMBER APPEAL, BRANCH

Appeal No. E/1814/2006-SM[BR]

Date 28/01/2008

Assistant Registrar
C.E.S.T.A.T, New Delhi

To : THE GENERAL MANAGER
M/S KISAN SAHKARI CHINI MILLS LTD
THE GENERAL MANAGER, THE KISAN SAHKARI
CHINI MILLS LTD, SEMIKHERA, DISTT. BAREILLY

M/S KISAN SAHKARI CHINI MILLS LTD

THE COMMISSIONER OF CENTRAL EXCISE
MEERUT-II

Appellant
Vs
Respondent

I am directed to transmit herewith a certified copy of Final order No.191/2008-SM[BR] dated 23.1.2008
passed by the Tribunal under Section 35-C(1) of Central Excises Act, 1944


Assistant Registrar
(SM Appeal Branch)

Copy to :

1. Respondent
THE COMMISSIONER OF CENTRAL EXCISE
MEERUT-II
DELHI ROAD, MEERUT-II
2. Adv. / Consult
MR.KAPIL VAISH
B-51, BUTLER PLAZA, 95, CIVIL LINES, BAREILLY.
3. S.D.R.
4. ~~J.C.D.R.~~
5. Bar association, CESTAT, New Delhi
6. M/s. Deeparchi Publications, M-93, marg. 43, saket, New
7. M/s Centax Publications (P) Ltd., 1512-E, Bhishm Pitamah
8. Excise & Customs cases, B-37, Sector -1, NOIDA - 201301
9. R.Venkatraman Constt. 44-B, S.Suncity, Ghaziabad -
10. Nidheshak publications, I.P.Estate, new Delhi
11. Taxmann Allied Service Pvt Ltd., 21/35, West Punjabi Bagh,
12. Co, Law Institution
13. TAX INDIA, B-XI/8183, Vasant Kunj, New Delhi - 110070
14. Office Copy
15. Guard file


Assistant Registrar
(SM Appeal Branch)

CUSTOMS, EXCISE & SERVICE TAX APPELLATE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI
COURT NO.II

E/Appeal No.1814/2006-SM

(Arising out of order in appeal No.129/CE/MRT.II/05 dated 30.6.2005
passed by the Commissioner (Appeals), Central Excise, Meerut-II)

M/s Kisan Sahkari Chini Mills Ltd

Appellant
(Rep. by none)

Vs

CCE, Meerut-II

Respondent
(Rep. by Shri S.L. Meena, DR)

Coram: Hon'ble Mr P.K. Das, Member(Judicial)

Date of Hearing: 23.1.2008

Final Order No. 191/08 SM (BR)

Per P.K. Das:

None appeared on behalf of the appellants. By letter dated 21.1.2008, the appellants have requested for adjournment on the ground that their Counsel is pre-occupied on a family function.

2. I find that this is not sufficient ground for adjournment of hearing. It seems that the applicant is not interested to proceed in the matter. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed for non-prosecution.

MPS*

(P.K. Das)
Member(Judicial)