

(9) - ITXA-1529-19 . doc.

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

INCOME TAX APPEAL NO.1529 OF 2019

Bhansali Metal and Alloys ..Appellant
Versus
Income Tax Officer-19(1)(2) Mumbai ..Respondent

Ms. Rutuja N. Pawar a/w Ms. Hetal Laghave, Advocates for the Appellant.
Mr. Sham Walve, Advocate for the Respondent.

CORAM : UJJAL BHUYAN &
MILIND N. JADHAV, JJ.
DATE : 2nd MARCH, 2021

P.C.

Heard Ms. Rutuja N. Pawar, 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
05.10.2018 passed by the Income Tax Appellate Tribunal, “SMC” Bench,
Mumbai in ITA No.4408/Mum/2018 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.

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

BGP.

terms thereof, appellant has filed declaration under section 3 before the designated authority. Designated authority has issued certificate under section 5(1). 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 Appeal is accordingly disposed of as withdrawn.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.

MILIND N. JADHAV, J

UJJAL BHUYAN, J