$~237

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

\+ ITA 738/2025, CM APPL. 77402/2025, CM APPL. 77403/2025

PR. COMMISSIONER OF INCOME TAX -7 .....Appellant

Through: Mr. Ruchir Bhatia, SSC with Mr. Praujal Singh, Adv.

versus

STAR WIRE INDIA LTD. .....Respondent

Through: Mr. Rohit Jain & Mr. Samarth Choudhari, Advs.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DINESH MEHTA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD KUMAR

O R D E R

% **04.02.2026**

1. In the appeal in hands relates to Assessment Years 2015-16, the Income Tax Appellate Tribunal, Bench "G" New Delhi (*hereinafter referred to as "the Tribunal"*), whereby the Tribunal has quashed the re-assessment proceedings vide the impugned order dated 31.12.2024 while holding that the ground for which the Assessing Officer *(hereinafter referred to as "AO")* had issued notice of re-assessment under Section 148 of the Income Tax Act, 1961 *(hereinafter referred to as "the Act of 1961")* no additions were made in the corresponding Assessment Order dated 29.05.2023.

2. The Tribunal relied upon the judgment of this Court rendered in the case of ***Ranbaxy Laboratories Ltd. v. CIT*** reported in ***[2011] 336 ITR 136 (Del)*** and ***ATS Infrastructure Ltd. & Ors. v. ACIT*** reported in ***[2025] 473 ITR 595 (Del),*** and held that since the reason for which the assessment was re-opened itself did not exist, the AO could not proceed further and assess

the other income of the respondent-assessee.

3. Mr. Rohit Jain, learned counsel for the respondent at the outset submitted that, since the notice under Section 148 was issued on 31.03.2021 and AY 2014-15, the notice was in any case time-barred, as has been held by Hon'ble the Supreme Court in the case of ***Union of India v. Rajeev Bansal*** reported in ***[2024] 469 ITR 46***.

4. Mr. Ruchir Bhatia, learned Senior Standing Counsel is not in a position to dispute this legal position.

5. We, therefore, affirm the order dated 31.12.2024 passed by the Tribunal as being covered by the judgment rendered in the case of ***Ranbaxy Laboratory (supra)***, so also hold that the proceedings are time barred and beyond jurisdiction in light of judgment of Hon'ble the Supreme Court rendered in the case of ***Rajeev Bansal (supra)***.

6. The appeals are therefore, dismissed.

7. Pending applications are also disposed of.

DINESH MEHTA, J.

VINOD KUMAR, J.

FEBRUARY 4, 2026/*sr*