

HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA : HYDERABAD

MAIN CASE NO: WRIT PETITION NO.13937 OF 2025

PROCEEDING SHEET

SL. NO	DATE	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE
1.	01.05.2024	<u>PSK,J & NNR,J</u> Mr. Rusheek Reddy K V, learned counsel for the petitioner. Mr. Dundu Sashank, learned counsel representing Mr. Dominic Fernandes, learned Senior Standing Counsel for the CBIC, for the respondents, who is present in the Court is directed to take notice and file counter within three weeks. Reply/rejoinder, if any, may be filed within two weeks therefrom. List on 19.06.2025 along with W.P.No.23508 of 2024. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the provisional assessment had taken place in June, 2015. The said provisional assessment was not finalized. The petitioner was put to personal hearing notice on 12.06.2024, 09.07.2024 and 16.07.2024. The delay is unreasonable and even assuming that there exists no statutory limitation for undertaking aforesaid exercise, such unreasonable delay itself is a ground for interference. Apart from this, what should be the reasonable amount of time cannot be gone into and decided by the departmental authorities/forum. Reliance is placed on 2007 (217) E.L.T. 325 (S.C.) State of Punjab	Transferred to IO Folder before corrections.

SL. NO	DATE	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE
		v. Bhatinda District Co-Op. Milk P. Union Ltd. Para 24 of the said judgment is highlighted for this purpose, which reads thus: “24. We are, however, not oblivious of the fact that ordinarily the writ court would not entertain the writ application questioning validity of a notice only, particularly, when the writ petitioner would have an effective remedy under the Act itself. This case, however, poses a different question. The Revisional Authority, being a creature of the statute, while exercising its revisional jurisdiction, would not be able to determine as to what would be the reasonable period for exercising the revisional jurisdiction in terms of Section 21(1) of the Act. The High Court, furthermore in its judgment, has referred to some binding precedents which have been operating in the field. The High Court, therefore, cannot be said to have committed any jurisdictional error in passing the impugned judgment.” In this view of the matter, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is able to cross the hurdle of “entertainability of the petition despite availability of the statutory appellate remedy”. Furthermore, learned counsel for the petitioner placed reliance on Para Nos.15 to 17 of the aforesaid judgment, which reads thus: “15. Sub-section (1) of Section 11 empowers the Commissioner to extend the period of three years for passing the order of assessment wherefor reasons are required to be recorded in writing subject, however, to the maximum period of five years. Ordinarily, therefore, a period of three years has been prescribed for completion of the assessment in terms of the provisions of the Act. We may also notice that in cases where an assessment order is to be reviewed, the same should be done within a period of one year. 16. A bare reading of Section 21 of the Act would reveal that although no period of limitation has been prescribed therefor, the same would not mean that the suo moto power	

SL. NO	DATE	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE
		can be exercised at any time. 17. It is trite that if no period of limitation has been prescribed, statutory authority must exercise its jurisdiction within a reasonable period. What, however, shall be the reasonable period would depend upon the nature of the statute, rights and liabilities thereunder and other relevant factors.” In this view of the matter, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that even if no statutory time limit was prescribed to undertake the aforesaid exercise of assessment, the exercise should have been completed within reasonable time. The period of nine years, by no stretch of imagination, can be said to be a reasonable period. While passing the impugned Order-in-Original (OIO), dated 04.01.2025, learned authority has not considered the petitioner’s objections in correct perspective and the aforesaid judgment of Punjab and Haryana High Court, relied upon by the petitioner, was not dealt with at all. Considering the aforesaid and subject to hearing the other side, no coercive action be taken against the petitioner pursuant to the impugned OIO, dated 04.01.2025. The question of maintainability/ limitation etc., will remain open. _____ PSK,J _____ NNR,J AQS	