Mohit Soni v. Income Tax Officer and another

CWP No.13486/2025 with CMP Nos.16721/2026 and 20262/2025

Supplied court judgment; no neutral citation stated | 2026-07-13

Earlier disposal recalled and original writ restored; interim protection against further assessment/reassessment proceedings pursuant to impugned notices extended, with four weeks for a reply and two weeks thereafter for a rejoinder, if any.

Division Bench | Vivek Singh Thakur | Ranjan Sharma

01 FACTS OF THE CASE

In CMP 16721/2026, the Court considered revival of CWP 13486/2025 after its disposal dated 22 August 2025. The appearances describe the taxpayer as non-applicant/petitioner and the departmental side as applicant/respondents. The source identifies the Supreme Court order dated 10 April 2026 in Income Tax Officer v. Tej Partap Singh, Civil Appeal 4716/2026, as Annexure A-2. It does not reproduce the earlier disposal's reasons or the impugned notices.

Source: PDF p.1

02 DISCUSSION BY THE HON'BLE COURT

For the reasons stated in the application and in view of the identified Supreme Court order, the Court recalled the earlier disposal and restored the writ and applications to their original status and number. In CMP 20262/2025, it reproduced paragraph 27 of the Supreme Court order and extended the stated interim protection in this case.

Source: PDF pp.1–2

03 JUDICIAL DECISION

The 22 August 2025 disposal was recalled and CWP 13486/2025 revived with its applications. Reply was directed within four weeks and a rejoinder, if any, within two weeks thereafter and consideration was listed for 17 August 2026. The Court extended the reproduced interim protection and disposed of CMP 16721/2026 and CMP 20262/2025.

Source: PDF pp.1–2

04 OUTCOME / IN WHOSE FAVOUR

The writ was restored for adjudication with the stated interim protection. The source does not finally allow its tax grounds, quash the impugned notices, determine taxable income or order a refund.

Source: PDF pp.1–2

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

05 EXPERT COMMENTS

Preserve the exact restoration and interim-application identities — The operative recall concerns CMP 16721/2026, the earlier disposal dated 22 August 2025 and the original CWP 13486/2025. The interim application is CMP 20262/2025. These identifiers distinguish this matter from other orders applying the same Supreme Court direction. The Court restores the existing writ and its applications; disposing of the recall and interim applications does not amount to finally disposing of the restored writ. The source gives no basis to create another petition number or to merge this taxpayer with a different same-date case. (Source: PDF pp.1–2).

The reproduced protection remains tied to the impugned notices and pending writ — The High Court extends paragraph 27's protection concerning further assessment/reassessment proceedings pursuant to the impugned notices during the pendency of the writ petitions, subject to High Court terms and conditions. This sheet prints assessment/reassessment; its actual wording is retained rather than replacing it with the repeated reassessment wording found in some other supplied sheets. The direction is interim and source-specific, not a final annulment of the notices or a prediction of how the writ will ultimately be decided. (Source: PDF pp.1–2).

The four-week reply and conditional rejoinder timetable is source-specific — The Court grants four weeks for a reply and two weeks thereafter for a rejoinder, if any. The reply is not recorded as already filed; the optional rejoinder qualification and sequential periods must be retained. The source does not establish whether later pleadings were filed. The listing date is 17 August 2026. These are historical directions in this particular writ; the source does not establish later compliance, the listed hearing's result or a new period beginning with publication of this note. (Source: PDF p.1).

The recorded applicant roles and source limits matter — The appearances describe the taxpayer as non-applicant/petitioner and the departmental side as applicant/respondents. Restoration must not be attributed to a taxpayer-filed recall application without the application itself. The Court identifies the 10 April 2026 Supreme Court order in Civil Appeal 4716/2026 and applies the reproduced paragraph. This note does not represent an independent review of the complete Supreme Court judgment, the application annexures or subsequent treatment. The coram is Vivek Singh Thakur and Ranjan Sharma. (Source: PDF pp.1–2).

Source: PDF pp.1–2

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.