CUSTOMS, EXCISE & SERVICE TAX APPELLATE TRIBUNAL
MUMBAI

REGIONAL BENCH

Excise Appeal No. 1134 of 2012

(Arising out of Order-in-Original No. 34/2012/C dated 30.04.2012 passed by the Commissioner of Central Excise & Customs, Nagpur.)

M/s. Nagpur Packaging Pvt. Ltd. ....Appellant
Plot No. N-44, MIDC Industrial Area,
Hingna Road, Nagpur – 440 016

VERSUS

Commissioner of Central Excise, Nagpur ....Respondent
GST Bhavan, Telangkhedi Road,
Civil Lines, Post Box No. 81,
Nagpur- 440 001

AND

Excise Appeal No. 1135 of 2012

(Arising out of Order-in-Original No. 34/2012/C dated 30.04.2012 passed by the Commissioner of Central Excise & Customs, Nagpur.)

Mr. Manish Tarsen Kumar Bansal ....Appellant
M/s. Nagpur Packaging Pvt. Ltd.
Plot No. N-44, MIDC Industrial Area,
Hingna Road, Nagpur – 440 016

VERSUS

Commissioner of Central Excise, Nagpur ....Respondent
GST Bhavan, Telangkhedi Road,
Civil Lines, Post Box No. 81,
Nagpur- 440 001

APPERANCE:

None for the Appellant

Shri Sanjay Hasija, Superintendent, Authorised Representative for the Respondent

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. SANJIV SRIVASTAVA, MEMBER (TECHNICAL)
HON'BLE DR. SUVENDU KUMAR PATI, MEMBER (JUDICIAL)

FINAL ORDER NO. A/85301-85302/2022

Date of Hearing: 30.03.2022
Date of Decision: 30.03.2022

PER: DR. SUVENDU KUMAR PATI

Appellants are absent today and no one represented them. Learned AR is present. On perusal of the case record it is observed that Appellants remained absent on last 3 consecutive dates posted for hearing of these appeals and as they remained absent on the first occasion posted for hearing i.e. on 23.12.2021, specific direction was given to the Registry to issue notice. Accordingly, notice was sent to the appellants for their appearance today i.e. on 30.03.2022 but they remain absent. It appears that after compliance of the order passed on dated 04.10.2012 for payment of Rs.25,00,000/- in lieu of pre-deposit that was complied on 23.11.2012 by post, they had not pursued the appeal further.

2. It seems that Appellants are no more interested for further prosecution of their appeal, for which they are not appearing on the hearing dates. Therefore, we dismiss the appeals for default and non-prosecution under Rule, 20 of the CESTAT (Procedure) Rules, 1982.

(Pronounced in open court)

(Dr. Suvendu Kumar Pati)
Member (Judicial)

(Sanjiv Srivastava)
Member (Technical)

Prasad