Veerendra Kumar Pathak v. Income Tax Officer, Ward-I, Katni & Ors.

W.P. No. 5596/2023

W.P. No. 5596/2023 (High Court of Madhya Pradesh, Jabalpur, order dated 2023-06-12) | 2023-06-12

Writ withdrawn at counsel's request; pending applications disposed of.

High Court of Madhya Pradesh | Division Bench | Chief Justice Ravi Malimath | Justice Vishal Mishra

Assessment years:

Scope of this order

No substantive tax ruling or express fresh-proceeding liberty was recorded.

01 FACTS OF THE CASE

Veerendra Kumar Pathak's petition came for admission and counsel requested withdrawal.

Source: PDF p. 2

02 DISCUSSION BY THE HON'BLE COURT

The Court recorded the request without discussing the underlying tax grounds.

Source: PDF p. 2

03 JUDICIAL DECISION

The petition was dismissed as withdrawn and pending interlocutory applications were disposed of.

Source: PDF p. 2

04 OUTCOME / IN WHOSE FAVOUR

No substantive tax ruling or express fresh-proceeding liberty was recorded.

Source: PDF p. 2

05 EXPERT COMMENTS

Use the operative page rather than the caption alone — The first page identifies the parties; the actual direction is on PDF page 2. Both pages are retained and the disposition is linked to its source page.

Do not infer a continuing interim order — Disposal of the interlocutory applications is expressly recorded. This short order does not grant or continue any stay.

Source: PDF p. 2

SOURCE & VERIFICATION

Primary High Court order - verified local repository copy

Complete 2-page source PDF; all pages read, including signature-only pages.

Complete source text and every original page visually reviewed; identity and SHA-256 checked. AI-assisted source analysis.

Open cited source rendition

All 2 physical source pages read and visually inspected. SHA-256: f1148fe68e04db035d5dc148cdd9a5f0dc4bb3af7a6bb7183399776 95c56178b.

STATUTORY SCOPE

No assessment year, tax amount or substantive Income-tax Act provision is identified or decided in this supplied short order.

LATER TREATMENT

Source checked 2026-10-21. Subsequent judicial treatment has not been independently verified.

AI DISCLOSURE

AI-assisted research checked against the identified source. Extraction, interpretation or omission errors remain possible. Source review does not mean independent approval by a practising professional. Verify every material statement against the complete original judgment.

PROFESSIONAL DISCLAIMER

General research information only; not legal or tax advice, a certified judgment or a substitute for the full order. Applicability depends on facts, assessment year, statutory version and jurisdiction. Subsequent treatment is unverified unless identified sources are expressly stated. Downloading does not create a professional engagement. Obtain case-specific advice before reliance.