

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION

INCOME TAX APPEAL NO.787 OF 2018

Mauli Developers	..Appellant
Versus	
Income Tax Officer, Ward-3(4), Pune	..Respondent

Mr. Soumitra Gokhale i/by Mr. Rohan Deshpande, Advocate for the Appellant.

Mr. Sham Walve, Advocate for the Respondent.

CORAM : UJJAL BHUYAN &
MILIND N. JADHAV, JJ.
DATE : 8th MARCH, 2021

P.C.

Heard Mr. Soumitra Gokhale, learned counsel for the appellant and Mr. Sham Walve, learned counsel for the respondent.

2. This appeal has been preferred by the assessee as the appellant under section 260A of the Income Tax Act, 1961 against the order dated 05.07.2017 passed by the Income Tax Appellate Tribunal, "A" Bench, Mumbai in ITA No.2145/Pun/2016 for the assessment year 2010-11.

3. The appeal is pending for admission

4. Today the appeal is before us on a praecipe filed by learned counsel for the appellant.

(20) - ITXA-787-18.doc.

5. It is stated that Parliament has enacted the Direct Tax Vivad se Vishwas Act, 2020 providing for a scheme for resolution of tax disputes. In terms thereof, appellant has filed declaration under section 3 before the designated authority. Designated authority has issued certificate under section 5(1) on 04.01.2021. For passing of the final order under section 5(2), appellant is required to withdraw the appeal under section 4(3) and to furnish proof of withdrawal along with intimation of payment, if any, to the designated authority. Hence, prayer for withdrawal of the appeal.

6. Learned counsel for the respondent has no objection to the prayer made.

7. Having regard to the above, we allow withdrawal of the appeal.

8. Appeal is accordingly disposed of as withdrawn.

9. Refund as per rules.

Balaji
G.
Panchal
Digitally
signed by
Balaji G.
Panchal
Date:
2021.03.12
12:21:44
+0530

MILIND N. JADHAV, J

UJJAL BHUYAN, J