Court No. - 34

Case: - WRIT TAX No. - 805 of 2013

Petitioner: Shreemati Devi

Respondent :- The Commissioner Of Income Tax (Central) And Another

Counsel for Petitioner: - Amit Mahjan, Gaurav Mahajan

Counsel for Respondent :- C.S.C, Ashok Kumar, C.S.C. (I.T.D)

Hon'ble Sudhir Agarwal, J.

Hon'ble Dr. Kaushal Jayendra Thaker, J.

1. Heard Sri Gaurav Mahajan, Advocate assisted by Sri Amit Mahajan, learned

counsel for petitioner and Sri Ashok Kumar, learned counsel for respondent.

2. Petitioner has sought a writ of mandamus commanding respondent to release

all FDR's in the name of petitioner and her children and also to return back the

sum of Rs.4,50,000 which was withdrawn from the petitioner's Punjab National

Bank, Bighapur account No. 1674 along with interest.

3. It is not in dispute that pursuant to search and seizure conducted on

1.3.2001, aforesaid FDRs etc. were seized. Block Assessment was made by

order dated 30th April, 2002 but on petitioner's appeal, same was set aside by

Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeals), Kanpur, vide order dated 21.2.2008

and that order was confirmed by Tribunal by rejecting Revenue's appeals.

Tribunal also relied on this Court's judgment in Income Tax Appeal No. 506 of

2008 filed by Revenue which was dismissed.

4. The contention on behalf of petitioner is that entire seizure is wholly illegal

and respondents have no authority to retain above mentioned item and,

therefore, FDRs and Rs.4,50,000/- seized in cash should be returned to

petitioner and her children forthwith.

5. Learned counsel appearing for respondents could not dispute that block

assessment was set aside by Commissioner of Income Tax and Revenue lost the

matter before Tribunal also.

6. Before this Court also he could not show under what authority respondents

have continued to withhold aforesaid FDRs and cash of Rs.4,50,000/-. Aforesaid

attitude on the part of respondents is clearly arbitrary and shows: an attituden ble.org

undue harassment to petitioner in the garb of public Revenue. Interest of public

revenue does not authorize Revenue Authorities to work without any authority

and create or cause all kinds of harassment to innocent people on the pretext of

statutory authority, Revenue Authorities cannot claim liberty/privilege so as to

deprive an individual, his property and that too in a manner, which has been

found quite unreasonable and wholly without jurisdiction.

7. In view thereof, we find that petitioner has been unduly harassed and

withholding by Revenue is illegal, therefore, petitioner is entitled to refund of

FDRs and cash amount seized, petitioner also withdrawn unlawfully by

respondents from the Bank.

8. In the result, writ petition is allowed. Respondents are directed to release all

FDRs seized during seizure and also refund the amount in question, if not

already released or refunded. In case FDRs and amount in question are not

returned or refunded so far, they shall be returned / refunded forthwith without

any further delay alongwith interest @ 18% per annum from the date of seizure

till the date of actual returned / refund. Respondents shall be at liberty to recover

the said amount of interest from the official(s) concerned who is/are found

responsible for such negligence and illegal act, after making enquiry as

permissible under law. Petitioner shall also be entitled to cost which we quantify

to Rs.25,000/-.

Order Date :- 14.9.2016/Mukesh