

OD 6

ORDER SHEET
IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
Constitutional Writ Jurisdiction
ORIGINAL SIDE

WPO/2588/2022

AASTHVINAYAK VINCOM PVT. LTD.
VS
THE UNION OF INDIA AND ORS.

BEFORE:

The Hon'ble JUSTICE MD. NIZAMUDDIN

Date : 16th September, 2022.

Appearance:
Mr. Dharmendra Tiwari, Adv.
... for the petitioner.

Ms. Smita Das De, Adv.
..for the respondent..

The Court: Affidavit-of-service filed in Court be kept with the record.

Heard learned advocates appearing for the parties.

By this writ petition, petitioner has challenged the impugned notice dated 28th April, 2022 relating to assessment year 2015-16 under Section 148 of the Income Tax Act, 1961 in the name of transferor company on the ground that the noticee has already been amalgamated on 12th December, 2018 and the department has been intimated about this amalgamation which is matters of record and such notice in the name of a non-existing company is not tenable in the eye of law since information of such amalgamation has already given to the respondent on 6th February, 2019 and 31st August, 2021 yet the Respondent concerned has not withdrawn the impugned notice.

In support of his contention Mr. Tiwari, learned advocate appearing for the petitioner has relied on a decision of the Hon'ble Gujarat High Court in the case of **Takshashila Realities Pvt. Ltd. Versus Dy Commissioner of Income Tax** reported in 2016 SCC OnLine Guj 6462 and specifically relies on Paragraph 10 of the said judgment and also my own order dated 2nd August, 2021 in **WPA 1791 of 2020 (Brubeck Resources Pvt. Ltd. & Anr. Vs. Union of India & Ors.)**.

Considering the submissions of the parties, I am of the view that the impugned notice dated 25th May, 2022 (annexure P-8) and order under Section 148A(d) dated 24th July, 2022 (annexure P-9) to the writ petition are not tenable in the eye of law and all further steps pursuant to the said impugned notices/order also are not tenable in the eye of law and the same are quashed. The writ petition is allowed and the impugned notices are quashed solely on the ground that the impugned notices were issued in the name of non-existing company. However, quashing of this notice will not prevent the respondents from issuing fresh notice in accordance with law.

Since no affidavits have been called for, allegations made in the writ petition shall be deemed to have been denied by the respondents.

Accordingly, WPO 2588 of 2022 is disposed of.

(MD. NIZAMUDDIN, J.)