



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

Sr. No.140

CWP-28850-2025

Date of decision: 25.09.2025

Gaganjyot Singh Randhawa

....Petitioner

Versus

Income Tax Officer, Ward 2(1), Chandigarh and others

....Respondents

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

Present: Mr. Vishav Bharti Gupta, Advocate (through VC)
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vidul Kapoor, Jr. Standing Counsel, for the respondents.

* * *

DEEPAK SIBAL, J. (Oral)

1. The challenge made through the instant petition is to the notice dated 05.04.2024 (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 29.03.2022 (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.



CWP-28850-2025

-2-

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 05.04.2024 (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 disposed in the above terms.

(DEEPAK SIBAL)
JUDGE

(LAPITA BANERJI)
JUDGE

September 25, 2025

Jyoti 1

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No