



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

Sr. No.126

CWP-21641-2025

Date of decision : 30.07.2025

Ranjit Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

Union of India and others

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK SIBAL
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE LAPITA BANERJI

Present : Mr. M. S. Kanda, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Yogesh Putney, Senior Standing Counsel, with
Mr. Vidul Kapoor, Junior Sanding Counsel and
Mr. Vaibhav Gupta, Junior Standing Counsel,
for the Income Tax Department.

* * * * *

DEEPAK SIBAL, J. (Oral)

1. Challenge made through the instant petition is to the notice dated 21.03.2025 (Annexure P-1) issued to the petitioner by the respondents under Section 148 of the Income Tax Act, 1961. The primary ground of challenge raised by the petitioner is that the impugned notice has been issued by the Jurisdictional Assessing Officer which could have not been done because in terms of the notification dated 28.03.2022 (Annexure P-2) issued by the Ministry of Finance, Government of India, the impugned notice could have been issued only by way of faceless assessment.

2. In support of his afore submission, learned counsel for the petitioner places reliance on the following two judgments of this Court:-

(i) CWP-15745-2024, titled *Jatinder Singh Bhangu vs. Union of India and others*, decided on 19.07.2024; and

(ii) CWP-21509-2023, titled *Jasjit Singh vs. Union of India and others*, decided on 29.07.2024.

3. Learned counsel for the respondents does not dispute the fact that the case of the petitioner is covered in his favour by the law laid down through the



aforesaid two judgments rendered by two different co-ordinate Benches of this Court in the cases of *Jatinder Singh Bhangu* and *Jasjit Singh* (supra).

4. In the light of the above, in terms of the law laid down in the cases of *Jatinder Singh Bhangu* and *Jasjit Singh* (supra), the impugned notice dated 21.03.2025 (Annexure P-1) issued by the Jurisdictional Assessing Officer, is hereby quashed with liberty to the respondents to proceed against the petitioner in accordance with law.

5. The petition is allowed in the above terms.

[DEEPAK SIBAL]
JUDGE

30.07.2025

shamsher

[LAPITA BANERJI]
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes / No
Whether reportable : Yes / No