

**IN THE ISLAMABAD HIGH COURT, ISLAMABAD**

JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT

08 APR 2022

M(LW)

8510 / Writ  
21-Mar-2022

From,

Chief (L-1)  
S-LJ(SC) The Deputy Registrar(Judicial),  
S-LJ(A) Islamabad High Court,  
S-LJ(A) Islamabad.

Chief (L-II)  
S-LJ(HC) ✓  
S(TOP) ✓  
S(L-IDT) ✓  
Chief (L-III) CHAIRMAN FBR, CONST. AVENUE, ISLAMABAD

S(PA) 2 3. COMMISSIONER IR, ENFORCEMENT ZONE 4  
S(TO-I) LTO, ISLAMABAD  
S(TO-II)  
PS

Subject: W.P. 1768/2021 Tax & Banking Tax (SB)  
M/s Telenor Pakistan Pvt Ltd-VS-FOP, etc

Dear Sir,

I am directed to forward for information and immediate compliance a copy of this Court's order dated 21-02-2022 passed by Hon'ble The Honorable Chief Justice in the above noted case.

Yours Faithfully,

Assistant Registrar (Writ)

For Deputy Registrar (Judicial)



Decided Matter

FBR e-Dox No  
Received in M(L) Office on 11 APR 2022

64403R  
FBR e-DOX Dy No  
Received in Chairman's Sectt  
on 08 APR 2022

①

IN THE ISLAMABAD HIGH COURT, ISLAMABAD

W.P. No. 1768 /2021

M/s Telenor Pakistan (Pvt.) Limited, Plot No. 55, River View Avenue, Block B,  
Gulberg Greens, Islamabad.

... **Petitioner**


**Versus**

- 1 Federation of Pakistan, through Ministry of Finance, Constitutional Avenue,  
Islamabad.
- 2 Federal Board of Revenue, through its Chairman, Constitutional Avenue,  
Islamabad.
- 3 Commissioner Inland Revenue, Enforcement Zone-4, LTO, Islamabad.
- 4 Additional Commissioner Inland Revenue, (Enforcement) Audit Range-7, Zone -  
4, LTO, G/9 Mauve Area, Islamabad.
- 5 Deputy Commissioner (Enforcement) Inland Revenue, Unit 7, LTO, Islamabad,  
G/9 Mauve Area, Islamabad.

... **Respondents**

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 199 OF THE CONSTITUTION  
OF ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF PAKISTAN, 1973.

It is respectfully submitted as under:



That the Petitioner is a private limited company engaged in providing telecommunication services. This petition is being filed through Mr. Jahanzeb Ali Choudhry, who is Senior

Manager Legal Department of the company and is fully authorized to institute this petition

and is also well conversant with the facts and circumstances of the case (Copy of

Memorandum and Articles as well as Board Resolution is attached herewith as Annex-

The brief facts giving rise to the instant petition are that the Petitioner submitted its Income

Tax Return for the Tax Year 2015 under Section 114 of the Income Tax Ordinance, 2001

(the Ordinance). The said return is fictitiously treated to be an assessment order passed by

the Respondent No.3 under section 120 of the Ordinance. Thereafter, the Petitioner

received a show cause notice dated 22.04.2016 under Section 122(5A) of the Ordinance

**TRUE COPY**


**26 MAR 2022**

**Examiner**

**Copy Supply Section**

**Islamabad High Court**

**Islamabad**



Form No: HCJD/C-121

JUDGMENT SHEET

IN THE ISLAMABAD HIGH COURT, ISLAMABAD  
(JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT)

W.P. No.1768/2021

M/s Telenor Pakistan (Pvt) Limited

Versus

Federation of Pakistan  
through Ministry of Finance & 4 others

Petitioners by : Mr. Ali Sibtain Fazli, ASC.  
Mr. Naeem Ahmed Awan, AHC.  
Mr. Abad Ur Rehman, AHC.

Respondents by : Syed Muhammad Tayyab, Dy. Attorney General.  
Syed Ishfaq Hussain Naqvi, ASC.  
Mr Ahmad Shakeel Babar, Deputy Commissioner  
Inland Revenue.

Dates of Hearings : 01-07-2021, 11-11-2021

**ATHAR MINALLAH, C.J.-** M/s Telenor Pakistan (Pvt.)

Limited, (*hereinafter referred to as the 'petitioner Company'*), has invoked the jurisdiction of this Court under Article 199 of the Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, 1973 (*hereinafter referred to as the 'Constitution'*) assailing recovery notice, dated 07-05-2021 issued under section 138 of the Income Tax Ordinance, 2001 (*hereinafter referred to as the 'Ordinance of 2001'*).

**TRUE COPY**

26 MAR 2022

Examiner  
Copy Supply Section  
Islamabad High Court  
Islamabad

The petitioner Company is an incorporated juridical person engaged in rendering telecommunication services. The competent authority, i.e. the Pakistan Telecommunication Authority,

has granted a licence to enable the petitioner Company to render its services. The impugned notice was issued under section 138 of the Ordinance of 2001 in relation to recovery of the tax due pursuant to two orders passed by the competent authority. The liability for tax had arisen out of two distinct proceedings. It is noted that the petitioner Company had voluntarily requested that its case be referred under section 134 A of the Ordinance of 2001 for resolution of the dispute through the mechanism of 'alternate dispute resolution'. The committee constituted for resolving the controversy was chaired by a former Judge of the august Supreme Court. After extensive deliberations, the committee forwarded its recommendations and they were accepted by the Federal Board of Revenue. The petitioner Company had also accepted recommendations which had been formulated by the committee. The alternate dispute resolution proceedings were initiated after the appeal effect proceedings under section 124 of the Ordinance of 2001 had been finalized vide order, dated 11-05-2018. The Federal Board of Revenue, vide Order No. 05 of 2018, dated 22-06-2018, accepted the recommendations of the committee in exercise of powers vested under section 134 A (4) of the Ordinance of 2001 read with the Income Tax Rules, 2002. This was followed by the passing of an order under section 124 of the Ordinance of 2001. The total tax due, pursuant to completion of the proceedings under section 134 A of the Ordinance of 2001, was Rs. 3.8 billion. The impugned notice was for the recovery of the tax liability adjudged and given effect to under section 124 of the Ordinance of 2001.

TRUE COPY  
26 MAR 2022

Exam Section  
Copy Supply Section  
Islamabad High Court  
Islamabad

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner Company has argued that; the appeal effect order, dated 25-09-2018, had been superseded pursuant to the passing of order, dated 15-02-2021, by the learned Tribunal; the respondents were required to calculate and determine the tax due keeping in view section 57 of the Ordinance of 2001; all orders passed by various forums have to be taken into account before initiating recovery proceedings; the respondents could not have issued the impugned recovery notice without giving appeal effect to the order, dated 15-02-2021, passed by the learned Tribunal; recovery proceedings could not have been initiated unless appeal effect orders under section 124 were issued in each case; sections 57 and 124 are to be read together; reliance was placed on the judgment of the learned Sindh High Court reported as "*China Harbour Engineering Company Ltd. through Liu Ce v. Pakistan through Secretary Revenue Division and 3 others*" [2017 PTD 1852].

4. The learned counsel for the respondent Department has argued that; recovery proceedings were initiated after appeal effect orders were passed under section 124 of the Ordinance of 2001; section 57 has no relevance with the recovery proceedings; the order under section 134 A was passed after the petitioner Company had explicitly requested and consented to alternate dispute resolution; the judgment relied upon by the learned counsel for the petitioner Company was distinguishable.

5. The learned counsels have been heard and the record used with their able assistance.

**TRUE COPY**  
26 MAR 2022  
Examiner  
Copy Supply Section  
Islamabad High Court  
Islamabad

6. It is not disputed that the impugned notice, dated 07-05-2021, was issued for the recovery of the tax liability adjudged by the competent forums, pursuant to the conclusion of proceedings in two distinct matters. In both the proceedings, the respective assessment orders were followed by passing of separate orders under section 124 of the Ordinance of 2001. In a nutshell, it is the stance of the petitioner Company that recovery proceedings could not have been resorted to unless a consolidated determination regarding all the adjudged matters had been concluded. The argument in essence is that recovery proceedings in the case of each adjudged tax liability cannot be initiated unless the total tax liability of a taxpayer has been determined. This argument is supported on the ground that if the tax liability related to all the adjudicated matters are determined then it may reduce the liability or could even end up in refund of tax. As a corollary, according to the stance of the petitioner Company, the order passed under section 134 A of the Ordinance of 2001 was not recoverable because appeal effect orders relating to some other adjudicated matters had not been passed. The learned counsel for the petitioner Company has strenuously argued that unless orders are passed in all other adjudicated cases, recovery proceedings under section 138 could not be initiated. The learned counsel has emphasized that this was necessary because of the likelihood of reduction of the tax liability. The question that has to be answered by the Court, therefore, is whether the initiation of recovery proceedings contemplated under section 138 of the Ordinance of 2001 are subject

to the passing of orders under section 124 in all the cases

TRUE COPY  
26 MAR 2022  
Examiner  
Copy Supply Secy  
Islamabad High Court  
Islamabad

adjudicated by the competent forums or whether the recovery proceedings and issuance of a notice under section 138 was relatable to a particular determination of tax liability notwithstanding that other adjudicated liabilities against the tax payer have also been determined.

7. In order to answer the question, it would be beneficial to examine the scheme of the Ordinance of 2001. The Ordinance of 2001 has been divided into separate chapters. Different categories such as levy, charge of tax, different kinds of income for the purposes of assessment, mode and procedure for assessment and amendment or revision, remedies against amendment of assessment or revision have been dealt with under separate chapters.

8. The expressions "Commissioner" and "Commissioner (Appeals)" have been defined under clauses (13) and (13A) respectively of section 2. "Tax" has been defined under section 2(63) as meaning 'any tax imposed under Chapter II and includes any penalty, fee or other charge or any sum or amount leviable or payable under the Ordinance of 2001'. The mode of assessment under the Ordinance of 2001 is based on the principle of self-assessment. A taxpayer is required, under section 120, to furnish a complete return of income and if it is so furnished within the prescribed time, then the Commissioner is taken to have made an assessment of taxable income for the relevant year. Clause (a) of section 120(1) explicitly provides that the tax due is required to be specified in the return. The return is taken for all purposes of the

**TRUE COPY**  
**26 MAR 2022**  
**Examiner**  
**Copy Supply Section**  
**Islamabad High Court**  
**Islamabad**

Ordinance of 2001 to be an assessment order issued to the taxpayer by the Commissioner on the day the return has been furnished. It is noted that payment of the tax due is mandatory. Section 122 empowers the taxation officers to amend the assessment orders in the manner and subject to the fulfillment of the requirements described therein. A statutory right of appeal has been provided under section 127 to the Commissioner (Appeals), which has been confined to orders passed under sections 121, 122, 143, 144, 162, 170, 182 and 205. It is significant to note that no right of appeal has been provided against an order passed under section 124 and the reason will be discussed latter. Section 137 describes the due date for payment of the tax. Sub section (1) provides that the tax payable on the taxable income of the taxpayer, including tax payable under section 113, 113A for a tax year, shall be due on the due date for furnishing the taxpayer's return of income for that year. Sub section (2) of section 137 provides that where any tax is payable under an assessment order or an amended assessment order, or any other order issued by the Commissioner under the Ordinance of 2001, a notice shall be served upon the taxpayer in the prescribed form specifying the amount payable and, thereupon, the sum so specified shall be paid within thirty days from the date of service of the notice. Sub section (4) has empowered the Commissioner to grant the taxpayer an extension of time for the payment of tax due or to allow the taxpayer to pay such tax in installments of equal or varying amounts, as the Commissioner may determine, having regard to the circumstances of the case. Sub section (5) of section 137 provides

that in case of default in payment of any installment, the whole

26 MAR 2022

Examiner

Copy Supply Section

Islamabad

Islamabad

**TRUE COPY**



balance of tax outstanding will become immediately payable. Sub section (2) of section 127 starts with a negative expression and unambiguously provides that no appeal shall be made to the Commissioner (Appeals) against an order of assessment unless the amount of tax due under sub section (1) of section 137 has been paid. The limitation period for preferring an appeal has been provided under section 127(5). Sub section (1) and (1A) empowers the Commissioner (Appeals) to stay the recovery of tax due or to grant an extension. An order passed by the Commissioner (Appeals) is appealable under section 131 before the Appellate Tribunal. Sub section (5) of section 131 provides another statutory remedy to an aggrieved person against an order passed by the Appellate Tribunal. This remedy is by way of filing of a reference before a High Court in respect of any question of law arising out of an order passed by the Appellate Tribunal. Sub section (7) of section 133 provides that where the recovery of tax has been stayed by the High Court by an order, such order shall cease to have effect on the expiration of a period of six months following the day on which it was made unless the reference is decided or such order is withdrawn by the High Court earlier. Section 124 does not supersede nor overrides the aforementioned statutory provisions. Sub section (1) applies when in consequence to or to give effect to any finding or direction in any order made under Part III of Chapter-X by the Commissioner (Appeals), Appellate Tribunal, High Court or the Supreme Court an assessment order or amended assessment order is to be issued to

any person, then in such an eventuality the Commissioner is required to issue the order within two years from the end of the financial year.

**TRUE COPY**

26 MAR 2022

Exam  
Copy Supply Section  
Islamabad High Court  
Islamabad

Sub section (2) of section 124 provides that in case an order passed by the Appellate Tribunal, High Court or the Supreme Court, the assessment order has been set aside wholly or partly and the Commissioner or Commissioner (Appeals), as the case may be, is directed to pass a new assessment order, then the Commissioner or Commissioner (Appeals), as the case may be, shall pass the order within one year from the end of the financial year.

9. The Ordinance of 2001 is a complete and self-contained statute relating to income tax and all matters ancillary or connected therewith. A cumulative reading of the above provisions unambiguously shows that liability to pay the tax is relatable to the assessment order or an order passed under any other provision. The liability of tax due, once created, has to be discharged immediately unless it has been stayed or allowed to be paid in a particular manner e.g in installments. The provision of section 124 does not have an overriding effect nor contemplates that all the orders passed by the competent forums have to be dealt with together so that a consolidated order is passed to determine the total tax profile liability of the taxpayer. If this argument of the petitioner Company is accepted, then no recovery pursuant to passing of any order would be effected unless a consolidated order under section 124 has been passed. It would also give an overriding effect to section 124 over the other provisions which explicitly declares a tax liability becoming immediately payable unless stayed by the competent forum. The

reliance of the learned counsel for the petitioner Company on section 57 of the Ordinance of 2001 is also misplaced because its purpose

**TIQUE COPY**  
**26 MAR 2022**  
**Examiner**  
**Copy Supply Section**  
**Isrobad High Court**  
**Isrobad**


and object has no relevance with the recovery of a tax that has become due. Section 57 falls under Chapter III of the Ordinance of 2001 which deals with and describes the categories of incomes and the fundamental principles and methodologies on the basis whereof the accounting and assessment is to take place. Section 57, therefore, has no nexus whatsoever with the scheme of collection and recovery of the adjudged/determined tax described under Part IV of Chapter X of the Ordinance of 2001. Accepting the arguments advanced by the learned counsel for the petitioner Company would amount to reading in the Ordinance of 2001 something not provided therein. The Ordinance of 2001 is a fiscal statute. The settled principles of interpretation of a fiscal statute are that the provisions are required to be interpreted literally and equity or presumption are alien thereto; if a provision of a taxing statute can have two reasonable explanations then one which is favourable to the taxpayer has to be accepted; any ambiguity is required to be resolved in favour of the tax payer. Likewise, redundancy cannot be attributed to the lawmaker. Every word and part of the statute has to be given meaning and effect. It is always presumed that the legislature has used every word in a context and for a purpose. The statute has to be read as a whole and the intention of the legislature has to be discovered by paying attention to what has been said. It is settled law that while interpreting fiscal statutes the Court looks at what is clearly said; there is no room for any intendment; nor is there any equity about a tax; there is no presumption as to tax; nothing was to

be read in or implied and one could only look fairly at the language used. Reliance is placed on the cases of *'Federation of Pakistan*

**TRUE COPY**  
**26 MAR 2022**  
**Examiner**  
**Copy Supply Section**  
**Islamabad High Court**  
**Islamabad**


through Secretary Ministry of Finance and others v. Haji Muhammad Sadiq and others' [PLD 2007 SC 133], 'Aslam Industries Ltd., Khanpur v. Pakistan Edible Corporation of Pakistan and others' [1993 SCMR 683], 'Collector of Customs (Appraisement), Karachi and others v. Messrs Abdul Majeed Khan and others' [1977 SCMR 371], and 'Messrs Hirjina & Co. (Pakistan) Ltd., Karachi v. Commissioner of Sales Tax Central Karachi' [1971 SCMR 128].

10. For the above reasons, this petition is without merit and, therefore, accordingly **dismissed**. The respondent/tax authorities shall, therefore, be at liberty to proceed strictly in accordance with the law pursuant to the issuance of the impugned notice, dated 07-05-2021. Likewise, the petitioner Company would also be entitled to apply to the competent authority, if so advised, to allow payment of the outstanding amount in installments.



(CHIEF JUSTICE)

Announced in the open Court on 21-02-2022.



(CHIEF JUSTICE)

**TRUE COPY**  
26 MAR 2022  
Examiner  
Copy Supply Section  
Islamabad High Court  
Islamabad

