Rajeev Chauhan v. Income Tax Officer and another

CWP No.10887 of 2025 with CMP No.15446 of 2025

Supplied court judgment; no neutral citation stated | 2025-09-15

Reply to be taken on record after removal of objections, rejoinder permitted within four weeks, and consideration listed for 21 November 2025; no merits disposal.

Division Bench | Vivek Singh Thakur | Sushil Kukreja

01 FACTS OF THE CASE

In CWP 10887/2025 with CMP 15446/2025, the respondents' reply was stated to have been filed but was not on record. The source does not reproduce the reply or identify the underlying tax notice, assessment year or dispute amount.

Source: PDF p.1

02 DISCUSSION BY THE HON'BLE COURT

The Court addressed completion of pleadings: the reply was to be taken on record after removal of objections, if any, and the requested rejoinder was permitted within four weeks. The tax merits were not examined.

Source: PDF p.1

03 JUDICIAL DECISION

The Court directed the reply to be taken on record subject to removal of objections, allowed four weeks for rejoinder, and listed the matter for consideration on 21 November 2025.

Source: PDF p.1

04 OUTCOME / IN WHOSE FAVOUR

The proceeding continued through pleadings and listing directions. The petition and application were not finally allowed or dismissed, and the source grants no fresh stay or substantive tax relief.

Source: PDF p.1

©AKHB & Associates | AKHB commentary/design only; no claim over reproduced statutes or judgments.

05 EXPERT COMMENTS

A filing statement and admission to the record are different events — The order records that counsel said a reply had been filed, while the reply was not on the record before the Court. The direction to take it on record remains subject to removal of objections, if any. It would overstate this source to report that every filing defect had already been cured or that the Court had accepted the reply's factual assertions. The order supplies neither the objections nor the contents of the reply. (Source: PDF p.1).

The rejoinder period and listing date are historical procedural directions — Four weeks were allowed for a rejoinder, and consideration was fixed for 21 November 2025. Neither direction decides the petition's tax grounds. The source does not say a rejoinder was later filed, that the listed hearing actually occurred, or that a particular interim order continued. Those developments require later court records; they cannot be inferred from the future listing stated here. (Source: PDF p.1).

Use the consistent printed order date rather than the supplied filename — Both the heading and signed date identify 15 September 2025. The supplied repository filename begins 4 August 2025, which is inconsistent with the actual sheet. This publication uses the printed 15 September date, retains the original filename and unchanged PDF bytes in its provenance, and does not create a separate 4 August judgment. The caption and CWP 10887/2025 with CMP 15446/2025 identify this order before Vivek Singh Thakur and Sushil Kukreja. (Source: PDF p.1).

Source: PDF pp.1–1

SOURCE & VERIFICATION

Original court judgment / order

Full original read; every original page visually inspected.

STATUTORY SCOPE

Provisions and historical figures are recorded only as addressed in this judgment. No current statutory position or subsequent-treatment clearance is represented.

LATER TREATMENT

Appeal, review, recall and stay status has not been independently confirmed.

©AKHB & Associates | AKHB commentary/design only; no claim over reproduced statutes or judgments.