

2025:PHHC:097655-DB



CWP-21986-2025

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

115

CWP-21986-2025

Date of Decision: 01.08.2025

HARKIRAT SINGH PANNU

.....PETITIONER

Versus

INCOME TAX OFFICER WARD 2(1), CHANDIGARH AND OTHERS

.....RESPONDENTS

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK SIBAL
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE LAPITA BANERJI**

Present:- Mr. Kartik Bansal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Yogesh Putney, Sr. Standing Counsel with
Mr. Vaibhav Gupta, Jr. Standing Counsel and
Mr. Vidul Kapoor, Jr. Standing counsel
for the respondents.

DEEPAK SIBAL, J. (Oral)

1. Challenge made through the instant petition is to the notice dated 27.03.2025 (Annexure P-1) issued to the petitioner by the respondents under Section 148 of the Income Tax Act, 1961. The primary ground of challenge raised by the petitioner is that the impugned notice has been issued by the Jurisdictional Assessing Officer which could not have been done because in terms of the notification dated 29.03.2022 (Annexure P-2), issued by the Ministry of Finance, Government of India, the impugned notices could have been issued only by way of faceless assessment.

2. In support of his afore submission, learned counsel for the petitioner places reliance on the following two judgments of this Court:-



- i. CWP-15745-2024, titled **Jatinder Singh Bhangu** Vs. **Union of India and others**, decided on 19.07.2024; and
 - ii. CWP-21509-2023, titled **Jasjit Singh** Vs. **Union of India and others**, decided on 29.07.2024.
3. Learned counsel for the respondents does not dispute the fact that the case of the petitioner is covered in his favour by the law laid down through the aforesaid two judgments rendered by two different co-ordinate Benches of this Court in **Jatinder Singh Bhangu** and **Jasjit Singh** (*supra*).
4. In the light of the above, in terms of the law laid down in **Jatinder Singh Bhangu**'s and **Jasjit Singh**'s cases (*supra*), the impugned notice dated 27.03.2025 (Annexure P-1) issued by the Jurisdictional Assessing Officer, is hereby quashed with liberty to the respondents to proceed against the petitioner in accordance with law.
5. The petition is allowed in the above terms.

[DEEPAK SIBAL]
JUDGE

[LAPITA BANERJI]
JUDGE

01.08.2025

Prince

Whether speaking/reasoned:

Yes/No

Whether reportable:

Yes/No