



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

WRIT PETITION NO. 7736 OF 2025

Balasaheb Balwant Pawar

.. Petitioner

Versus

Income-tax Officer, Ward - 2(1),
Nashik & Ors.

.. Respondents

*Adv. Rutuja Pawar (through V. C.), a/w Adv. Hetal Laghave
and Adv. Sneha More, for the Petitioner.*

Adv. A. K. Saxena for the Respondents-Revenue.

**CORAM: B. P. COLABAWALLA &
FIRDOSH P. POONIWALLA, JJ.**
**DATE: NOVEMBER 25, 2025
(In Chamber)**

P. C.

1. The above Petition has been moved in the Chamber before us by the Registry for speaking to the minutes of the order dated 22nd July 2025. The correction sought is in the cause title of the order.

2. We accordingly direct that the word “**Pandharpur**” appearing in the cause title of the order shall be replaced with the word “**Nashik**”.

3. No other correction is sought. The correction shall be carried out in the original order as well as in the copy uploaded on the server.

4. This order will be digitally signed by the Private Secretary/ Personal Assistant of this Court. All concerned will act on production by fax or email of a digitally signed copy of this order.

[FIRDOSH P. POONIWALLA, J.]

[B. P. COLABAWALLA, J.]

For the sake of convenience the order dated 22nd July 2025

(as corrected) is reproduced hereunder:-

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

WRIT PETITION NO. 7736 OF 2025

Balasaheb Balwant Pawar

.. Petitioner

Versus

Income Tax Officer Ward 2(1),
Nashik & Ors.

.. Respondents

Adv. Rutuja N. Pawar (Through V. C.) a/w Adv. Hetal Laghave and Adv. Sneha More, for the Petitioner.

Adv. A. k. Saxena for the Respondents.

**CORAM: B. P. COLABAWALLA &
FIRDOSH P. POONIWALLA, JJ.**
DATE: JULY 22, 2025

P. C.

1. In the above Petition Rule was issued on 17 June 2025 and interim relief was also granted *interalia* staying the Notice issued under Section 148 of the Income Tax Act, 1961. Today, though the matter has come up under the caption “for directions”, we have, with the consent of parties, heard it finally.

2. The above Writ Petition *interalia* challenges the Notice issued under Section 148 of the Income Tax Act, 1961 on various grounds. One of the grounds is that the Notice has been issued by the Jurisdictional Assessing Officer when the law mandates that it has to be issued by the Faceless Assessing Officer. This is a fatal defect and therefore the Notice has to be quashed, is the argument of the Petitioner.

3. It is the Petitioners’ contention that this issue is squarely covered by a decision of a Division Bench of this Court in the case of ***Hexaware Technologies Ltd. V/S Assistant Commissioner of Income-tax, Circle 15(1)(2) [(2024) 162 taxmann.com 225 (Bombay)]***.

4. On the other hand, the learned advocate appearing on behalf of the Revenue stated that though it is true that this issue is concluded by the decision in *Hexaware Technologies Ltd (supra)*, the said decision has been challenged before the Hon'ble Supreme Court, and the Hon'ble Supreme Court is likely to take up the matter immediately on re-opening. He has fairly stated that there is no stay to the judgment in *Hexaware Technologies Ltd (supra)*.

5. Considering these facts, we do not propose to keep the matter pending in this Court. Once it is fully covered by the decision in *Hexaware Technologies Ltd (supra)* we are bound to follow it.

6. We accordingly set aside the impugned Notice issued under Section 148 and all other proceedings/orders emanating therefrom.

7. We however grant liberty to the Revenue to revive the above Writ Petition in the event the decision in *Hexaware Technologies Ltd (supra)* is set aside by the Hon'ble Supreme Court on this issue. We make it clear that it will not be necessary for the Revenue to file a separate Interim Application to seek a revival of this Petition and the same can be done simply by moving a Praecipe before this Court. It is needless to clarify that if the Hon'ble

Supreme Court dismisses the SLP challenging the decision in *Hexaware Technologies Ltd (Supra)*, there would be no question of any revival.

8. We also make it clear that once the Petition is revived and restored, the same would have to be decided on its own merits considering that several other issues are also raised challenging the Notice issued under Section 148.

9. Rule is accordingly made absolute and the Writ Petition is also disposed of in terms thereof. However, there shall be no order as to costs.

10. This order will be digitally signed by the Private Secretary/ Personal Assistant of this Court. All concerned will act on production by fax or email of a digitally signed copy of this order.

[FIRDOSH P. POONIWALLA, J.]

[B. P. COLABAWALLA, J.]