

\$~2

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

+ **W.P. (C) 4733/2020**

**HYOSUNG CORPORATION**

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr.Kamal Sawhney with Mr.Vipin  
Upadhyay, Mr.Arun Bhadauria and  
Mr.Prashant Meharchandani,  
Advocates.

versus

**UNION OF INDIA & ORS.**

..... Respondents

Through: Mr.Ravi Prakash with Mr.Farman Ali,  
Mr.Aman Malik and Mohammad  
Shahan Ulla, Advocates for UOI.  
Mr.Deepak Anand, Sr.Standing  
Counsel for Income Tax Deptt. with  
Mr.Vipul Agarwal.

%

Date of Decision: 30<sup>th</sup> July, 2020

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANMOHAN**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA**

### **J U D G M E N T**

**MANMOHAN, J: (Oral)**

**C.M.No.17059/2020**

Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

Accordingly, the present application stands disposed of.

**W.P.(C) No.4733/2020**

1. The petition has been listed before this Bench by the Registry in view of the urgency expressed therein. The same has been heard by way of video

conferencing.

2. Present writ petition has been filed seeking a direction to the respondent No.2 to dispose of the petitioner's rectification application for assessment year 2018-19 dated 18<sup>th</sup> March, 2020 and to allow the refund of Rs.2,49,07,000/- along with interest from 1<sup>st</sup> April, 2018 till the date of release of funds in accordance with Section 244A of the Income Tax Act, 1961 and/or any other provision.

3. Learned counsel for petitioner states that the inaction of the respondent no. 2 in disposing of the rectification application is contrary to and in violation of CBDT Circular No.3/2013 dated 5<sup>th</sup> July, 2013 which prescribes a period of two months to decide such applications from the end of the month in which they were received.

4. He states that the errors pointed out in the aforesaid rectification application are mere computation mistakes apparent on the record as provided under Section 154(1) of the Income Tax Act, 1961.

5. He further states that pursuant to petitioner's spin off and transfer of contracts, no operations are left with it and pending refund is the only reason because of which petitioner's office has not been closed.

6. Issue notice.

7. Mr.Deepak Anand, Advocate accepts notice on behalf of the respondents.

8. Keeping in view the limited prayer sought in the present writ petition, this Court disposes of the same by directing the respondent No.2 to decide petitioner's aforesaid rectification application within six weeks by way of a reasoned order and to make payment of refund, if any, in accordance with law. All the rights and contentions of the parties are left open.

9. The order be uploaded on the website forthwith. Copy of the order be also forwarded to the learned counsel through e-mail.

**MANMOHAN, J**

**SANJEEV NARULA, J**

**JULY 30, 2020**  
**KA**

