$~73

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

\+ W.P.(CRL) 2134/2016 & Crl.M.A.11137/2016

NIRANJAN SINGH ..... Petitioner

Through : Counsel (appearance not given)

versus

THE DIRECTOR OF INCOME TAX & ORS ..... Respondents

Through : Mr. Rahul Kaushik, Senior Standing Counsel for Income Tax with Mr. Dhanesh Kumar, Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.K. PATHAK

ORDER

% **25.07.2016**

By this petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, 1950, petitioner has prayed that the respondents (Income Tax Department) be directed to investigate the matter in terms of the representation dated 27th June, 2011 and 29th January, 2016 of the petitioner. It may be noted that petitioner is a resident of Village Karkardooma. He alleged in the representation that one Shri Jagdish Singh was getting ₹2,00,000/- as rent from the property bearing no.301, Karkardooma Village, Delhi-110092 but had not shown in his returns. He was evading tax. Further that Shri Jagdish Singh was having another property bearing no.219, Village Karkardooma, Delhi and had spent about ₹20,00,000/- in the year 2011 to construct the same. He was also getting rent of ₹40,000/- from the said property. Beside this, he was also having one House No.256, Village Karkardooma, Delhi and had spent about ₹20,00,000/- on its construction. He was generating rent from this property as well. Shri Jagdish Singh was owner of properties bearing nos.105 & 231, Village Karkardooma, Delhi, which have also not been disclosed to Income Tax Department. Although, certain documents have been annexed which indicate that Income Tax Officer is ceased of the matter. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that status of the proceedings has not been apprised to the petitioner. In my view, writ jurisdiction cannot be used by the petitioner to make fishing and roving enquiry. I am not inclined to entertain this writ petition on the above facts.

Writ petition is dismissed. Miscellaneous application is disposed of as infructuous.

A.K. PATHAK, J.

JULY 25, 2016/dk