



\$~85

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(C) 6558/2024 & CM APPL. 27318/2024**
BALAR MARKETING PRIVATE LIMITED

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr Ruchesh Sinha and Ms Monalisa
Maity, Advocates.

versus

ASSISSTANT COMMISSIONER OF INCOME TAX
CENTAL CIRCLE-13 DELHI & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr Vipul Aggarwal, SSC, Ms Sakshi
Shairwal, and Mr Akshat Singh,
JSCs.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIBHU BAKHRU

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TEJAS KARIA

ORDER

01.05.2025

%

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition, *inter alia*, impugning the notice dated 30.03.2024 [**impugned notice**] issued under Section 148 of the Income Tax Act, 1961 [**the Act**] in respect of Assessment Year [**AY**] 2013-14.
2. On 23.03.2021, a search was conducted under Section 132 of the Act in the case of Sh. Parasmal Jain including the petitioner. It is the petitioner's contention that no incriminating material pertaining to the searched persons was found during the said search thus, no further proceedings were warranted.
3. However, subsequently, proceedings under Section 153A of the Act were initiated against the petitioner by issuance of a notice dated 07.12.2021 issued under Section 153A of the Act. Pursuant to the said notice, the petitioner had filed its return of income for AY 2012-13, declaring an



income of ₹1,12,39,280/-. The Assessing Officer [AO] proceeded with an assessment order dated 31.03.2022 passed under the Section 153A read with Section 143(3) of the Act. The petitioner contends that the assessment for the assessment year in question was a completed assessment and, in absence of any incriminating material found during the course of the search, the addition of ₹24,54,43,710/- made by the AO was without jurisdiction and contrary to settled legal principles.

4. Aggrieved by the assessment order dated 31.03.2022 passed by the AO, the petitioner preferred an appeal before the Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeals) [CIT(A)]. The CIT(A) deleted the addition made by the AO, by an order dated 11.08.2023. The CIT(A) relied upon the decision of the Supreme Court in **PCIT v. Abhisar Buildwell Pvt. Limited: (2024) 2 SCC 433**, and held that no addition was permissible in the absence of incriminating material, as the year in question was not an abated assessment year.

5. On 01.02.2024, relying on Section 150 of the Act and CBDT Instruction No. 1/2023 dated 23.08.2023, the AO issued a notice under Section 148A(b) of the Act requiring the petitioner to show cause why the assessment for the relevant assessment year [AY 2013-14] should not be reopened under Section 148 of the Act.

6. In response to the aforesaid notice, the petitioner filed a reply on 26.02.2024, challenging the initiation of the reassessment proceedings. The petitioner claimed that Section 150(1) of Act is inapplicable, as there was no direction from the Supreme Court to reopen the case, citing the rejection of such a prayer by the Revenue in the **PCIT v. Abhisar Buildwell Pvt. Ltd. (supra)**.



7. On 28.03.2024, the AO rejected the petitioner's reply, and passed an order under Section 148A(d) of the Act, deeming it a fit case for reopening and further issued a notice under Section 148 of the Act, asserting that the proceedings were within the limitation period by invoking Section 150 of the Act.

8. In ***ARN Infrastructures India Ltd. v. Assistant Commissioner of Income Tax Cental Circle-28 Delhi & Ors.: Neutral Citation No.:2024:DHC:7423-DB***, this court held as under:

“38. It is pertinent to note that a reference to Sections 147 and 148 of the Act in *Abhisar Buildwell* firstly appears in paragraph 33 of the report and where the Supreme Court observed that in cases where a search does not result in any incriminating material being found, the only remedy that would be available to the Revenue would be to resort to reassessment.

39. However, the Supreme Court caveated that observation by observing that the initiation of reassessment would be “.....subject to fulfilment of the conditions mentioned in Sections 147/148, as in such a situation, the Revenue cannot be left with no remedy”. This sentiment came to be reiterated with the Supreme Court observing that the power of the Revenue to initiate reassessment must be saved failing which it would be left with no remedy. It was thereafter observed in paragraph 36.4 of the report that insofar as completed or unabated assessments were concerned, they could be reopened by the AO by invocation of Sections 147/148 of the Act, subject to the fulfillment of the conditions “.....as envisaged/mentioned under Sections 147/148 of the Act and those powers are saved”.

40. It thus becomes apparent that the liberty which the Supreme Court accorded and the limited right inhering in the Revenue to initiate reassessment was subject to that power being otherwise compliant with the Chapter pertaining to reassessment as contained in the Act. The



observations of the Supreme Court cannot possibly be read or construed as a carte blanche enabling the respondents to overcome and override the restrictions that otherwise appear in Section 149 of the Act. The observations of the Supreme Court in *Abhisar Buildwell* were thus intended to merely convey that the annulment of the search assessments would not deprive or denude the Revenue of its power to reassess and which independently existed. However, the Supreme Court being mindful of the statutory prescriptions, which otherwise imbue the commencement of reassessment, qualified that observation by providing that such an action would have to be in accordance with law. This note of caution appears at more than one place in that judgment and is apparent from the Supreme Court observing that the power to reassess would be subject to the fulfilment of the conditions mentioned in Sections 147 and 148 of the Act.”

9. Plainly, the controversy involved in the present petition is covered by the decision of this court in *ARN Infrastructures India Ltd. v. Assistant Commissioner of Income Tax Cental Circle-28 Delhi & Ors. (supra)*. The contention that the time period as stipulated under Section 149 of the Act is not applicable, in the given facts, is erroneous and thus, rejected.

10. The petition is, accordingly, allowed and the impugned notice is set aside. The pending application is also disposed of.

VIBHU BAKHRU, J

TEJAS KARIA, J

MAY 01, 2025

M

[Click here to check corrigendum, if any](#)