

- Chitra Sonawane

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

(406) WRIT PETITION NO.1742/2022

Mukeshkumar V. Mardia

.. Petitioner.

Vs.

Union of India & Anr.

.. Respondent.

.....

Mr. Rajendra for petitioner.

Mr. Akhileshwar Sharma, for respondents-Revenue.

CORAM : K. R. SHRIRAM &
N.R. BORKAR, J.J.

DATED : 11TH APRIL, 2022.

CHITRA
SANJAY
SONAWANE

Digitally signed
by CHITRA
SANJAY
SONAWANE
Date:
2022.04.18
18:51:51 +0530

P.C.

1. In this case the notice issued under Section 148 of the Income Tax Act, 1961 (the Act) is dated 28.4.2021 but the procedure followed is the old procedure which came to be replaced by the Finance Act, 2021 with effect from 1st April 2021.
2. Mr. Rajendra states that he does not have any instructions of any assessment order having been communicated to petitioner.
Statement accepted.

Even if the assessment order is passed, still it will be non-est as the notice issued under Section 148 of the Act itself is being set aside.

3. We have already held in *Tata Communications Transformation*

Services Limited Vs. Assistant Commissioner of Income Tax 14(1)
& Ors.¹ that such notices are bad in law and have to be quashed.
Accordingly, notice impugned in this petition is hereby quashed
and set aside.

4. Petition disposed accordingly.

(N.R. BORKAR, J.)

(K.R. SHRIRAM, J.)

1 Writ Petition No.1334 of 2021 dated 29th March,2022