

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.4038 of 2019

SAJ Food Products Pvt. Ltd. a registered company having its registered office at Purna Bhaban, 5/1 Acharya Jagdish Chandra Bose Road, Kolkata- 700020 through its authorized representative namely Siddharth Ghosh male aged about 43 years, son of Mrinal Kanti Ghosh, resident of Phonetic Commercial Institute, Railway Institute Road, Dumariyatand, P.S. Dhansar, District-Dhanbad.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar and Ors through the Secretary cum Commissioner, Department of State Taxes, New Secretariat, Bailey Road, Patna.
2. The Secretary cum Commissioner, Department of State Taxes, New Secretariat, Bailey Road, Patna.
3. The Joint Commissioner of State Taxes Special Circle, Patna.
4. The Assistant Commissioner of Commercial Taxes Special Circle, Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Gautam Kumar Kejriwal, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Vikash Kumar, SC-11

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

and

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S. KUMAR

ORAL JUDGMENT

(Per: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE)

Date : 17-12-2020

The petitioner has prayed for following relief(s):

“1. (a) For issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari for quashing of the order of assessment dated 22.01.2019 and the consequent demand notice dated 28.01.2019 passed and issued by the respondent Joint Commissioner of State Taxes Special Circle Patna whereby demand of tax has been raised against the petitioner for financial year 2015-16 by reopening the assessment already concluded on the basis of mere change in opinion and no fresh



material in hands;

(b) For issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari for quashing of the order dt. 30.01.2019 and the consequent demand notice whereby penalty has been imposed upon the petitioner with respect to financial year 2015-16 U/s 31(2) of the Act on the basis of mere change in opinion;

(c) For holding and a declaration that the petitioner's case is covered by the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of Income Tax Officer Ward Number 16(2) Versus Techspan India Private Ltd And Another reported in 2018-6-SCC-685 and also the judgments of the this Hon'ble Court in the matter of Samsung Electronics India Ltd Vs The State of Bihar and Others and Reckitt Benckiser India Ltd versus the State of Bihar and Others;

(d) For holding and a declaration that once the petitioner has been reassessed under section 31 of the Bihar Value Added Tax Act, 2005 (hereinafter referred to as the Act for short) no further reassessment could be permissible within the same section by assessing authority in the same office on the basis of mere change in opinion over the same commodity, classification, rate of tax, tax assessment done by his predecessor in office vide order dated 10.09.2018 passed for the same financial year 2015-16;

(c) For holding and a declaration that such an exercise of reopening of a reassessment



order already passed under section 31 of the act would be barred by the principles of res judicata as the said exercise would be for the same set of facts, cause, figures and same financial year for which the predecessor in the office has already taken a view and decided the issue in a particular manner on the basis of his wisdom, opinion, rational and understanding;

(f) For holding and a declaration that classification of a particular commodity for the purpose of taxation and the rate of tax applicable there on is a pure issue of one's understanding, knowledge and satisfaction and any difference between one Assessing Authority and the other would be a mere change in opinion and will have no recognition in the eye of law for the purpose of reopening of the assessment order once passed by one particular authority;

(g) For holding and a declaration that the difference of opinion between one assessing authority of the respondent department and another cannot be form basis for imposition of penalty attracted U/s 31(2) of the act against the petitioner as the petitioner has not concealed any part of the turnover of the said financial year;

(h) For restraining the respondents from enforcing the impugned order of assessment and the consequent demand notice whereby the petitioner has been called upon to pay the demand tax liability raised by reopening the assessment order dated 26.07.2017 passed under section 31 of the act by the predecessor in



office;

(I) For grant of any other relief or reliefs
to which the petitioner is found entitled to in the
facts and circumstances of the case.”

Learned counsel for the petitioner seeks permission to
withdraw the instant petition for the reason that the matter
already stands settled and the same has become infructuous.

Permission granted.

The instant petition stands dismissed as withdrawn.

(Sanjay Karol, CJ)

(S. Kumar, J)

Amrendra/P.K.P/-

AFR/NAFR	
CAV DATE	
Uploading Date	21.12.2020
Transmission Date	

