CUSTOMS, EXCISE & SERVICE TAX APPELLATE TRIBUNAL
MUMBAI

REGIONAL BENCH

Excise Appeal No. 87222 of 2015

(Arising out of Order-in-Appeal No. 491 & 492/Bel/2014-15 dated 24/07/2015 passed by the Commissioner of Central Excise (Appeals), Mumbai Zone-II.)

M/s. Syndicate Wiper Systems Pvt. Ltd. ....Appellant
Plot No. A/416, TTC Industrial Area,
MIDC, Mahape, Navi Mumbai – 400 701

VERSUS

Commissioner of CGST and ....Respondent
Central Excise, Belapur
1st Floor C.G.O. Complex,
C.B.D. Belapur, Navi Mumbai – 400 614

WITH

(i) Excise Appeal No. 87223 of 2015 (M/s. Syndicate Wiper Systems Pvt. Ltd.); (ii) Excise Appeal No. 87224 of 2015 (M/s. Syndicate Wiper Systems Pvt. Ltd.); (iii) Excise Appeal No. 87225 of 2015 (M/s. Syndicate Wiper Systems Pvt. Ltd.); (iv) Excise Appeal No. 87226 of 2015 (M/s. Syndicate Wiper Systems Pvt. Ltd.); (v) Excise Appeal No. 87227 of 2015 (M/s. Syndicate Wiper Systems Pvt. Ltd.)

(Arising out of Order-in-Appeal No. 491 & 492/Bel/2014-15 dated 24/07/2015 passed by the Commissioner of Central Excise (Appeals), Mumbai Zone-II.)

APPERANCE:

None for the Appellant

Shri Dinesh Newal, Dy. Commissioner, Authorised Representative for the Respondent

CORAM:

HON'BLE DR. SUVENDU KUMAR PATI, MEMBER (JUDICIAL)
HON'BLE MR. ANIL G. SHAKKARWAR, MEMBER (TECHNICAL)

FINAL ORDER NO. 86134-86139/2024

Date of Hearing: 01.10.2024
Date of Decision: 01.10.2024

PER: BENCH

None for the Appellant.

2. Adjournment request is received from learned Counsel for the Appellant with his address at Pune seeking adjournment of hearing of the case today, on the ground that for administrative reasons he is unable to travel to Mumbai today.

3. As could be seen from the daily orders, on last two occasions i.e. on 07.06.2024 and 05.09.2024 adjournments were granted on his request. These appeals were instituted way back in 2015 and completed almost nine years. Expeditious disposal of the appeals would have helped the Appellant in getting the require justice from this Bench but repeated adjournment would not meet the purpose nor it would be in-conformity to the proviso to Section 35C(1A) of the Central Excise Act, 1944. We, therefore, dismiss these appeals for default and non-prosecution as per provision contained in Rule, 20 of the CESTAT (Procedure) Rules, 1982.

(Dictated and pronounced in the open court)

(Dr. Suvendu Kumar Pati)
Member (Judicial)

(Anil G. Shakkarwar)
Member (Technical)

Prasad