THE ITR'S TRIBUNAL TAX REPORTS

A JOURNAL DEDICATED TO ORDERS OF THE INCOME-TAX APPELLATE TRIBUNAL

Editors:

T. A. RAMAKRISHNAN, B.Sc., B.L. Advocate, High Court, Madras.

AMBUJAM VENKATARAMAN, M.A., LL.B. Advocate, High Court, Madras.

T. N. CHANDRASHEKAR, B.Sc., B.L., M.B.A. Advocate, High Court, Madras.

LAKSHMI R. SUNDARESAN, M.A., B.A.L.

MODE OF CITATION

 Statutes
 : [2020] 79 ITR (Trib) (St.)

 Reports
 : [2020] 79 ITR (Trib)

 Short Notes
 : [2020] 79 ITR (Trib) (S.N.)

VOLUME 79 2020

COMPANY LAW INSTITUTE OF INDIA PRIVATE LTD., 2, VAITHYARAM STREET, CHENNAI-600 017.



Disclaimer: While every effort has been made to ensure that this journal/book is free from errors or omissions, the authors, editors, publishers, printers, the company and/or its directors and other officers, shall not be liable in any manner whatsoever for any action taken or omitted to be taken, opinions expressed, advice rendered or accepted based on any materials or information published in this journal/book.

Views expressed by the editors in the notes and comments and by authors in the articles published in the Journal section are exclusively their own.

CONTENTS

			PAGES
1.	TABLE OF SHORT NOTES CASES REPORTED		i — iii
2.	TABLE OF CASES JUDICIALLY NOTICED SHORT NOTES CASES		iv — v
3.	TABLE OF CASES REPORTED		vi — viii
4.	TABLE OF CASES CITED		ix — xxviii
5.	REPORTS OF SHORT NOTES CASES		1 — 48
6.	REPORTS OF CASES		1 — 712
7.	SUBJECT INDEX OF SHORT NOTES CASES		i — x
8.	SECTIONWISE INDEX OF SHORT NOTES CASES		xi — xvi
9.	SUBJECT INDEX	• • •	xvii — xxxviii
10.	SECTIONWISE INDEX		xxxix — lii



Published by S. Ayyappan on behalf of Company Law Institute of India Pvt. Ltd., No. 2 (old No. 36), Vaithyaram Street, T. Nagar, Chennai-600 017 and printed by him at Company Law Institute Press, No. 2 (old No. 36), Vaithyaram Street, T. Nagar, Chennai-600 017.

ITR'S TRIBUNAL TAX REPORTS

VOLUME 79 — 2020 SHORT NOTES

TABLE OF CASES REPORTED

			PAGE
Ajay Narendra Bansal v. Deputy	CIT	(Mumbai)	8
Anil Dye Chem Industries Pvt. I	Ltd. v. Asst. CIT	(Ahmedabad)	30
Awas Nivas Foundation v. ITO		(Bangalore)	26
Bharat Sons (HUF) v. Asst. CIT		(Delhi)	29
Commissioner of Income-tax (I tions) v. Cargo Handling Priva Trust	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	(Visakhapatnam)	38
Deverasetty Venkata Subba Rao	(Late) v. ITO	(Visakhapatnam)	6
Essentra (India) Pvt. Ltd. v. ITO		(Bangalore)	22
Frontier Business Systems P. Ltd	d. v. ITO	(Bangalore)	34
Honey Rahulan (Smt.) v. ITO		(Cochin)	41
Income-tax Officer v. Jasmin Mu	ılraj Mehta	(Mumbai)	9

ii	ITR's Tribunal Ta	x Reports	[Vo	DL. 79
]	PAGE
Jasmin Mulraj Meht	a v. ITO		(Mumbai)	9
Keshavlal Somnath	Panchal (late) v. ITO		(Ahd)	15
Mewar Hospital Pvt	. Ltd. v. Asst. CIT		(Jodhpur)	12
Mihir Bipin Parekh	v. Deputy CIT		(Mumbai)	5
Mohanrao Vishwana	ath Gaikwad v. ITO		(Pune)	42
Neelam Pachisia (Si	mt.) v. Deputy CIT (C	CPC)	(Bang)	14
Prakash Ramachand	lra Prabhu <i>v.</i> ITO		(Bangalore)	27
Rajan Roy (Late) v.	Asst. CIT		(Delhi)	3
C V Minarala Hand	dling D. Itd. 71 Aget	CIT.	(C. 11, 1)	10
	dling P. Ltd. v. Asst.	CH	(Cuttack)	18
Sahoo (R. N.) v. De			(Cuttack)	20
Sangeeth Nursing F			(Cochin)	36
Sanghamitra Pattna			(Cuttack)	46
Shree Shree Mohan ITO (Exemption)	ananda Samaj Seva S	amity <i>v</i> .	(Kolkata)	43
Sumesh Kumar v. I	ГО		(Delhi)	2
The Ayalur Service (Co-operative Bank Ltd	d. <i>v.</i> ITO	(Cochin)	17
The Sholayoor Servi	ice Co-operative Banl	k Ltd. v.	(Cochin)	32
	P. Ltd. v. Asst. CIT, T	DS	(Cochin)	37

2020] Table of Cases Reported (Short Notes)	iii
	PAGE
Unique Ways Management Service P. Ltd. v. Asst. CIT (Indore)	11
Varusai Mohammed Rowther Kazakamal v. ITO (Chennai)	1
Vijaya Bhavani Constructions P. Ltd. v. ITO (Hyderabad)	24
Vimalaben B. Patel (Smt.) v. ITO (Pune)	25
Vodafone Idea Ltd. v. Asst. CIT (TDS) (Cuttack)	44

TABLE OF CASES JUDICIALLY NOTICED (SHORT NOTES CASES)

	PAGE
Aemala Venkateswara Rao v. ITO (I. T. A. No. 227/Vizag/2017 dated March 3, 2019) followed	6
Ajay Bansal v. Asst. CIT (I. T. A. No. 4946/Mumbai/2018 dated August 20, 2019) followed	8
Bharti Airtel Ltd. v. Dy. CIT [2015] 372 ITR 33 (Karn) followed	44
CIT v. Birla Cotton Spinning and Weaving Mills Ltd. [1971] 82 ITR 166 (SC) followed	5
CIT v. Reliance Petroproducts P. Ltd. [2010] 322 ITR 158 (SC) applied	34
CIT v. Shree Krishna Gaynoday Sugar Ltd. [1986] 186 ITR 541 (Cal) followed	5
CIT v. Trustee of H. E. H. the Nizam's Supplemental Religious Endowment Trust [1981] 127 ITR 378 (AP) relied on	38
Flint Group (India) Pvt. Ltd. (I. T. (TP) A. No. 3285/Bang/2018 dated October 31, 2019) followed	22
IKA (India) Pvt. Ltd. v. Dy. CIT [2018] 98 taxmann.com 312 (Bang) followed	22
Marudhar Hotels Pvt. Ltd v. Addl. CIT [2013] 40 taxmann.com 161 (Jodhpur) <i>followed</i>	30
Nand Lal Popil v. Dy. CIT (I. T. A. Nos. 1161 and 1162/Chd/2013 dated June 14, 2016) <i>followed</i>	41
Pirce Waterhouse Coopers P. Ltd. v. CIT [2012] 348 ITR 306 (SC) applied	34
Sarala Memorial Hospital v. ITO (TDS) (W. P. (C) No. 37775 of 2018 dated December 18, 2018 (Ker)) relied on	37
Tanguturi Venkata Subbayya (Late) v. ITO (I. T. A No. 226/Vizag/ 2018 dated June 28, 2019) followed	6

2020] TABLE OF CASES JUDICIALLY NOTICED (SHORT NOTES CASES)	v
P	AGE
Tanushree Basu v. Asst. CIT (I. T. A. No. 2922/Mum/2012, dated May 25, 2013) followed	34
Tata Teleservices Ltd. v. ITO [2015] 42 ITR (Trib) 121 (Jaipur) fol- lowed	44
Thomas Eapen v. ITO (I. T. A. No. 451/Cochin/2019 dated November 19, 2019) followed	41
Union of India v. Hari Singh [2020] 15 ITR-OL 347 (SC) applied	2
Vodafone Cellular Ltd. v. Dy. CIT [2017] 53 ITR (Trib) (S.N.) 113 (Mumbai) followed	44

ITR'S TRIBUNAL TAX REPORTS

VOLUME 79 — 2020

TABLE OF CASES REPORTED **PAGE** Arihant Technology P. Ltd. v. Principal CIT (Delhi) 119 Bajaj Parivahan P. Ltd. v. ITO (Kolkata) 705 Bhagwant Merchants P. Ltd. v. ITO (Kolkata) 595 Commissioner of Income-tax (Deputy) v. Asianet (Cochin) 695 Satellite Communications Ltd. CIT (Deputy) v. Coffee Day Global Ltd. (Bang) 322 CIT (Asst.) v. Feroke Boards Ltd. (Cochin) 22 CIT (Deputy) v. Hind Industries Ltd. (Delhi) 1 CIT (Deputy) v. International Land and Developers P. Ltd. (Delhi) 441 CIT (Deputy) v. ISW Ltd. (Mumbai) 585 CIT (Joint) v. Karnataka Vikas Grameena Bank (Bang) 207 CIT (Joint) (OSD) (Exemptions) v. Kurukshetra (Chandigarh) Development Board 31 CIT (Asst.) v. NIIT Technologies Ltd. (Delhi) 60 CIT (Deputy) v. Phoenix Lamps Ltd. 276 (Delhi) CIT (Deputy) v. Prakash Chand Sharma (Jaipur) 386 CIT (Deputy) v. Shewale and Sons (Pune) 310 CIT (Deputy) v. Varun Beverages Ltd. (Delhi) 133

2020]	Table of Cases Repo	PRTED	vii
			PAGE
Devender Kumar v. I	ГО	(Delhi)	419
Digjam Ltd. v. Asst. (CIT	(Rajkot)	263
Essar Shipping Ltd. v	. Asst. CIT Fechnology Pvt. Ltd. v. D	(Mumbai)	555
uty CIT	echnology I vt. Ltd. <i>v.</i> L	(Pune)	364
FIS Solutions (India)	P. Ltd. v. Deputy CIT	(Pune)	656
Income-tax Officer v.	Shihabudeen (A.)	(Cochin)	280
JCDecaux S. A. v. Ass	st./Deputy CIT	(Delhi)	222
Jindal Steel and Powe	er Ltd. v. Principal CIT	(Delhi)	636
Karnataka Vikas Gran	neena Bank v. Joint CIT	(Bang)	207
Keshav Industries Pvt	. Ltd. v. ITO (TDS)	(Indore)	426
Lotus Labs P. Ltd. v.	Deputy CIT	(Bang)	295
Madhur Mittal v. Dep	outy CIT	(Delhi)	607
Manoj Kumar v. Asst.	CIT	(Delhi)	158
NIIT Technologies Ltd	d. v. Asst. CIT	(Delhi)	60
Oswal Computers and v. ITO (TDS)	I AMP Consultants Pvt.	Ltd. (Indore)	426
Pabitra Banerjee v. IT	O	(Cuttack)	480

viii	ITR's Tribunal Ta	x Repor	rs [Ve	OL. 79
				PAGE
Padmavati Retail	India Pvt. Ltd. v. ITO (TDS)	(Indore)	426
Panchshil Exim P	. Ltd. v. Deputy CIT		(Rajkot)	472
PIK Studios P. Lt	d. v. Deputy CIT		(Mumbai)	533
Rajendra Kumar S	Sahoo v. Asst. CIT	16	(Cuttack)	10
Renu Jain v. ITO			(Jaipur)	621
Sanjeeva Reddy F	Paga v. ITO		(Hyderabad)	439
Satern Griha Nirr	nan P. Ltd. v. ITO		(Kolkata)	359
Snowhill Agencie	s P. Ltd. v. Principal CI	Т	(Ahd)	176
Sofina S. A. v. As	st. CIT (International Ta	axation)	(Mumbai)	489
Sreenivasa Reddy	Cheemalamarri v. ITO		(Hyderabad)	465
Sri Parameswari l	Projects P. Ltd. v. ITO		(Visakhapatnam)	529
Sudha Agro Oil a Addl. CIT	and Chemical Industries	s Ltd. v.	(Visakhapatnam)	520
Summit Mittal v.	Denuty CIT		(Delhi)	607
	P.) Ltd. v. Principal CIT		(Delhi)	193
ournay Cotspin (i	.) Ltd. v. 1 interpar Cir		(Denn)	193
Vithal Baban Ban	gar v. ITO		(Mum)	55
Volkswagen Finar			(Mumbai)	447
			(ividiiibai)	11/

TABLE OF CASES CITED

	PAGE
3DPLM Software Solutions Ltd. v. Dy. CIT [2014] 3 ITR (Trib)-OL	
305 (Bang)	656
3F Industries Ltd. v. Jt. CIT [2014] 63 SOT 314 (Vizag) followed	555
A. T. & S India (P.) Ltd., In re [2006] 287 ITR 421 (AAR)	222
ACB India Ltd. v. Asst. CIT [2015] 374 ITR 108 (Delhi) followed	60
ACG Associated Capsules Pvt. Ltd. v. CIT [2012] 343 ITR 89 (SC) followed	359
Adaptec (India) P. Ltd. v. Asst. CIT (I. T. A. No. 206/Hyd/2014 dated March 25, 2015)	656
Aegis Ltd v. Addl. CIT (I. T. A. No. 1213/Mum/2014 dated July 27, 2015)	555
Agilis Information Technologies India (P.) Ltd. v. Asst. CIT [2018] 89 taxmann.com 440 (Delhi-Trib.)	656
Ahmedabad Electricity Co. Ltd. v. CIT [1993] 199 ITR 351 (Bom) [FB]	447
Airports Authority of India, In re [2008] 299 ITR 102 (AAR)	222
Ajay Loknath Lohia v. ITO (I. T. A. No. 2998/Mum/2017 dated October 5, 2018)	419
Alcatel-Lucent India Ltd. v. Addl. CIT (I. T. A. No. 6979/Delhi/ 2017) followed	656
Amalgamated Bean Coffee Trading Co. Ltd. v. Asst. CIT (I. T. A. Nos. 1501 and 1586/Bang/2013 dated June 21, 2017)	322
Ambica Quarry Works v. State of Gujarat [1987] AIR 1987 SC 1073	222
Ameriprise India Pvt. Ltd. v. Asst. CIT (2015- TII-347-ITAT-DEL-	
TP)	295
Anil Rai v. State of Bihar [2002] 3 BCR 360 (SC)	585
Aruna Jain (Mrs.) v. Dy. CIT [2008] 21 SOT 218 (Delhi)	60
Ashok Pai (T.) v. CIT [2007] 292 ITR 11 (SC)	386
Ashwin Vanaspati Industries v. CIT [2002] 255 ITR 26 (Guj)	533
Asoka Buildcon Ltd. v. Asst. CIT [2010] 325 ITR 574 (Bom)	636
Aspinwall and Co. Ltd. v. CIT [2001] 251 ITR 323 (SC)	322
Attar Singh Gurmukh Singh v. ITO [1991] 191 ITR 667 (SC)	10
Avada Trading Co. (P.) Ltd. v. Asst. CIT [2006] 100 ITD 131 (Mum) [SB] followed	656

x	ITR's Tribunal Tax Reports	[Vol. 79
		PAGE
Avaya India (P.) Lto (Delhi) followed	d. v. Addl. CIT [2019] 112 taxmann.com 301	656
Avenue Asia Adviso (Delhi)	ors Pvt. Ltd. v. Dy. CIT [2017] 398 ITR 120	295
Avion Systems Inc.	v. Dy. DIT (IT) [2012] 138 ITD 57 (Mumbai)	222
Awadhesh Pratap Si ITR 406 (All) <i>relia</i>	ngh Abdul Rehman and Bros. v. CIT [1994] 210 ed on	472
Bahii Mathew 71 Ass	st. CIT [2018] TaxPub (DT) 6676 (Cochin)	280
Baby Memorial Hosp	pital Ltd. v. Asst. CIT [2020] 77 ITR (Trib) 484	
(Cochin)	rice Put 1td 7 Third ITO [1004] 40 ITD 177	322
(Mum)	ries Pvt. Ltd. v. Third ITO [1994] 49 ITD 177	1
	al and Oncology Research Centre Ltd v. Asst.	322
	v. Dy. CIT [2016] 66 taxmann.com 6 (Delhi)	295
	Addl. CIT [2014] 2 ITR (Trib)-OL 475 (Delhi)	555
	anghvi v. Dy. CIT (I. T. A. No. 15/Indore/ 2018	426
	O [2010] 127 ITD 286 (Pune)	310
Cambay Electric Sup	ply Industrial Co. Ltd. v. CIT [1978] 113 ITR 84	60
Canara Bank (I. T. A	A. No. 58/Bang/2004 dated June 9, 2006)	207
Cash Edge India (P.) September 23, 20) Ltd. v. ITO (I. T. A. No. 64/Delhi/2015 dated 015)	656
CBDT v. Oberoi Hot lowed	tels (India) P. Ltd. [1998] 231 ITR 148 (SC) fol-	222
	nore P. Ltd. [2014] 364 ITR 336 (Delhi) con- 371 ITR (St.) 373 (SC)	222
	998] 233 ITR 50 (SC)	322
Ceva Asia Pacific Ho Delhi/2014 dated	oldings Co. P. Ltd. v. Dy. DIT (I. T. A. No. 1503/ January 8, 2018)	222
	stems and Management Consultants Pvt. Ltd. 8] 94 taxmann.com 97	656
	v. ITO (I. T. A. No. 1053/Mum/2014)	555
· ·	ologies (P.) Ltd. v. Asst. CIT [2008] 119 TTJ 18	60

2020] TABLE OF CASES CITED	xi
	PAGE
Cheminvest Ltd. v. CIT [2015] 378 ITR 33 (Delhi)	322
do. v. do.	relied on 1,585
Cheminvest Ltd. v. ITO [2009] 317 ITR (AT) 86 (Delhi)	[SB] 60, 585
Chennakesava Pharmaceuticals v. CIT [2012] 349 ITR 1 Chitra Publicity Co. P. Ltd. v. Asst. CIT [2010] 4 ITR	
(Ahd) (TM)	533
Cloth Traders P. Ltd. v. Addl. CIT [1979] 118 ITR 243 (
Commissioner of Income-tax <i>v.</i> Abhinandan Invest [2016] 6 ITR-OL 139 (Delhi)	ment Ltd. 555
CIT v. Agnity India Technologies (P.) Ltd. [2013] 219 7. (Delhi)	Faxman 26 656
CIT v. Alagappa Cotton Mills [1984] 149 ITR 640 (Mad	533
CIT v. Alagendran Finance Ltd. [2007] 293 ITR 1 (SC)	
CIT v. Alembic Glass Industries Ltd. [1976] 103 ITR 71	5 (Guj) 322
CIT v. Apsara Talkies [1985] 155 ITR 303 (Mad)	280
CIT (Dy.) v. Arabian Exports Ltd. [2007] 109 TTJ 440 (N	Mum) 60
CIT v. Arthusa Offshore Co. [2008] 216 CTR 86 (Uttara	khand) 222
CIT v. Arun Malhotra [2014] 363 ITR 195 (Delhi)	1
CIT v. Atul Jain [2008] 299 ITR 383 (Delhi)	595
CIT v. Aurionpro Solutions Ltd. (I. T. A. No. 1869 Bombay) followed	of 2014— 555
CIT v. Autometers Ltd. [2007] 292 ITR 345 (Delhi)	60
CIT v. B. V. Ramachandrappa and Sons [1991] 191 ITR	34 (Karn) 322
CIT (Pr.) v. Ballarpur Industries Ltd. (I. T. A. No 51 of 2 October 13, 2016)	2016 dated 585
CIT (Pr.) v. Basti Sugar Mills Co. Ltd. [2018] 408 ITR 18	
CIT (Dy.) v. Bengal Beverages (P.) Ltd. [2017] 60 ITR (I	Trib) (S.N.)
49 (Kol)	322
CIT v. Bharat Commercial Corpn. [1997] 226 ITR 242 (I	<i>'</i>
CIT v. Bharati Airtel Ltd. [2013] 218 Taxman 112 (Delh	e e
CIT v. Bhatia (K. S.) [2004] 269 ITR 577 (P&H) applied	
CIT (Pr.) v. Bikram Singh [2017] 399 ITR 407 (Delhi)	06 (16-11
CIT (Dy.) v. BOC Group Ltd. [2015] 64 taxmann.com 3 tta-Trib)	86 (Kolka- 222
CIT v. Bombay Dyeing and Manufacturing Co. Ltd. [199 521 (SC) distinguished	[6] 219 ITR 60
CIT v. Canara Workshops (P.) Ltd. [1986] 161 ITR 320	(SC) 60

xii ITR's Tribunal Tax Reports	[Vol. 79
	PAGE
CIT (Pr.) v. Caraf Builders and Constructions (P.) Ltd. [2019] 417 ITR (St.) 58 (SC)	322
CIT (Pr.) <i>v.</i> Cashedge India Pvt. Ltd. (I. T. A. No. 279 of 2016 dated May 4, 2016)	364
CIT (Addl.) v. Cloth Traders [1974] 97 ITR 140 (Guj)	60
CIT v. Colgate Palmolive (India) Ltd. [2015] 370 ITR 728 (Bom) followed	555
CIT (Dy.) v. Core Health Care Ltd. [2008] 298 ITR 194 (SC)	322
CIT v. Corrtech Energy (P.) Ltd. [2015] 372 ITR 97 (Guj)	585
CIT v. Cotton Naturals (I.) (P.) Ltd. [2015] 5 ITR-OL 1 (Delhi) followed	
	555
CIT v. Cotton Naturals (I.) Pvt. Ltd. [2015] 276 CTR 445 (Delhi)	295
CIT (Dy.) v. Datacraft India Ltd. [2011] 9 ITR (Trib) 712 (Mumbai) [SB] followed	695
CIT (Pr.) v. Delhi Airport Metro Express (P.) Ltd. [2017] 398 ITR 8 (Delhi)	119
CIT v. Dewan Kraft System (P.) Ltd. [2008] 297 ITR 305 (Delhi)	60
CIT v. Dimension Apparels Pvt. Ltd. [2015] 370 ITR 288 (Delhi)	176
CIT v. DLF Ltd. [2013] 350 ITR 555 (Delhi)	119
CIT v. EKL Appliances Ltd. [2012] 345 ITR 241 (Delhi)	555
CIT v. Escorts Finance Ltd. [2006] 155 Taxman 559 (Delhi)	322
CIT v. Eurasia Publishing House (P.) Ltd. [1998] 232 ITR 381 (Delhi) distinguished	263
CIT v. Excel Industries Ltd. [2013] 358 ITR 295 (SC)	555
CIT v. Fusion Software Engg. Pvt. Ltd. (I. T. A. Nos. 952 and 953 of	
2006—Karn)	60
CIT (Pr.) v. G and G Pharma India Ltd. [2016] 384 ITR 147 (Delhi)	595
CIT v. G. M. Mittal Stainless Steel (P.) Ltd. [2003] 263 ITR 255 (SC)	119
CIT v. Gabriel India Ltd. [1993] 203 ITR 108 (Bom)	193
CIT (Asst.) v. Gamma Pizzakraft (P.) Ltd. [2015] 39 ITR (Trib) 567 (Delhi)	322
CIT v. Gangadhar Banerjee and Co. (P.) Ltd. [1965] 57 ITR 176 (SC)	621
CIT v. Gautam Sarabhai Trust [1988] 173 ITR 216 (Guj)	60
CIT (Dy.) (Jt.)(OSD) v. Gebbs Infotech Ltd. (I. T. A. No. 3370/Mum/ 2007 dated October 13, 2010)	60
CIT v. Gedore Tools (India) P. Ltd. [1980] 126 ITR 673 (Delhi)	60
CIT v. Gem Plus Jewellery India Ltd. [2011] 330 ITR 175 (Bom)	295
CIT v. Gemini Arts (P.) Ltd. [2002] 254 ITR 201 (Mad)	60

2020]	TABLE OF CASES CITED	xiii
		PAGE
CIT v. Golani Brothers [2018] 300 CTR 245 (Bom)	1
CIT v. Gopal (M. R.) [19	965] 58 ITR 598 (Mad)	322
CIT v. Gotan Lime Khan	ij Udhyog [2002] 256 ITR 243 (Raj) applied	133
CIT v. Gotla (J. H.) [198	5] 156 ITR 323 (SC)	621
CIT v. Gurvinder Transp	ort [2013] 215 Taxman 593 (Guj)	207
CIT v. H. M. T. Ltd. (No	o. 3) [1993] 203 ITR 820 (Karn)	60
CIT v. HEDE Consultano	cy (P.) Ltd. [2002] 258 ITR 380 (Bom)	322
CIT v. Hero Cycles Ltd.	[2010] 323 ITR 518 (P&H)	585
CIT v. Himatasingike Se	ide Ltd. [2006] 286 ITR 255 (Karn)	60
CIT v. Hindustan Samul	n Awas Ltd. [2015] 377 ITR 150 (Bom)	310
CIT v. Holcim India (P.)	Ltd. [2015] 57 taxmann.com 28 (Delhi)	585
CIT v. ICICI Bank Ltd. [636
CIT (Pr.) v. IL and FS Ene 483 (Delhi)	ergy Developments Co. Ltd. [2017] 399 ITR	322
CIT v. Insecticides (India	a) Ltd. [2013] 357 ITR 330 (Delhi)	595
	India P. Ltd. [2016] 380 ITR 272 (Karn)	176
CIT v. Investa Industrial lowed	Corpn. Ltd. [1979] 119 ITR 380 (Bom) fol-	555
CIT v. Jagriti Aggarwal ((Ms.) [2011] 339 ITR 610 (P&H)	621
	wla [2013] 33 taxmann.com 38; 215 Tax-	621
	d Kashmir Bank Ltd. [2013] 152 TTJ 522	
(Amritsar)		60
CIT (Dy.) v. JSW Ltd. [2	.020] 79 ITR (Trib) 585 (Mumbai)	595, 705
	s Manufacturers P. Ltd. [1977] 109 ITR 333	
(Bom)		322
	th Care Pvt. Ltd. [2017] 398 ITR 66 (Delhi)	295
CIT v. La Medica [2001]		1
	ng Inc. [2015] 4 ITR-OL 246 (P&H)	585
	td. [2014] 368 ITR 655 (Bom)	636
• •	2.) Ltd. [2009] 319 ITR (St.) 5 (Delhi)	119
	vice Pvt. Ltd. [1998] 233 1TR 468 (SC)	60
	td. [2008] 216 CTR 148 (Delhi)	60
<u> </u>	nt Ltd. [2017] 398 ITR 621 (Raj)	322
(Karn)	al Learning Pvt. Ltd. [2013] 359 ITR 369	533

I—ii

xiv	ITR's Tribunal Tax Reports	[Vol. 79
		PAGE
	atha Cotton and Ginning Factory [2013] 359 ITR 565	
(Karn)		280, 386
	ngineering Works [1980] 122 ITR 306 (Guj)	386
	aruti Suzuki India Ltd. [2019] 416 ITR 613 (SC)	176
	lia Ltd. (No. 1) [2016] 388 ITR 74 (P&H)	322
followed	rld Publications (P.) Ltd. [2011] 337 ITR 178 (Delhi)	22
CIT v. Messers	. Harveys Ltd. [1940] 8 ITR 307 (Mad)	533
CIT v. Micra Ir	ndia (P.) Ltd. [2015] 231 Taxman 809 (Delhi)	176
	ficrosoft Corporation India Pvt. Ltd. [2011] 9 tax- 253 (Delhi Trib.)	695
	Steels P. Ltd. [2015] 372 ITR 386 (Delhi)	176
	im Ltd. [2013] 359 ITR 70 (Delhi)	533
	hammad Haji Adam and Co. (I. T. A. No. 1004/2016 ary 11, 2019)	1
	med Kunhi [1973] 87 ITR 189 (Ker)	280
	n Educational Society [2016] 387 ITR 416 (Delhi)	119
	Industries Ltd. [2013] 350 ITR 304 (SC)	322
	VIIT Technologies Ltd. (I. T. A. No. 3076/Delhi/2012 ary 27, 2019)	60
	udharaja and Co. [1993] 204 ITR 412 (SC)	322
CIT v. Nirav M	Iodi [2017] 390 ITR 292 (Bom)	193
CIT v. Noorjah	an (P. K.) (Smt.) [1999] 237 ITR 570 (SC)	1
CIT v. Noorjeh	an (P. K.) (Smt.) [1980] 123 ITR 3 (Ker)	1
	romoters and Finlease P. Ltd. [2012] 342 ITR 169	110 (2)
(Delhi)	omputer Systems Ltd. [2013] 1 ITR-OL 146 (Bom)	119, 636 295
	etroleum India International [2012] 27 taxmann.com	293
325 (Mum)	etroleum meta merrational [2012] 27 taxinami.com	222
	eporation Ltd. [2011] 244 CTR 226 (Bom) followed	555
CIT (Pr.) v. Pin uary 8, 2020	aki D. Panani (I. T. A. No. 1543 of 2017 dated Jan- (Bom))	1
-	amal Glass Ltd. (I. T. A. No 566 of 2017 dated June	
11, 2019) (B		555
CIT v. Prabhuc ITR 568 (Gu	das Kishordas Tobacco Products P. Ltd. [2006] 282 ij)	322
CIT (Asst.) v. P	rakash L. Shah [2008] 306 ITR (A.T.) 1 (Mum) [SB]	364
CIT v. R. D. Ag	ggarwal and Co. [1965] 56 ITR 20 (SC)	447

2020]	TABLE OF CASES CITED	XV
		PAGE
CIT (Dy.) v. R.	R. Holidays Homes (P.) Ltd. (I. T. A. No. 513/	
Cochin/2019	dated November 8, 2019) followed	280
CIT v. Radio Too	day Broadcasting Ltd. [2016] 382 ITR 42 (Delhi)	322
CIT v. Rai Bahad (SC)	dur Hardutroy Motilal Chamaria [1967] 66 ITR 443	263
CIT v. Rajasthan	Bereweries Ltd. (I. T. A. No. 889 of 2009)	60
CIT v. Rajendra	Prasad Moody [1978] 115 ITR 519 (SC)	585
CIT v. Rajesh Kı	ımar Jalan [2006] 286 ITR 274 (Gauhati)	621
CIT v. Ram Com	mercial Enterprises Ltd. [2000] 246 ITR 568 (Delhi)	386
CIT (Pr.) v. Rama	a Shankar Yadav [2017] 85 taxmann.com 173 (All)	1
CIT (Pr.) v. Reek	ook India Co. [2018] 409 ITR 587 (Delhi)	555
CIT v. Reliance	Industries Ltd. [2019] 410 ITR 466 (SC)	322
CIT v. Reliance	Petroproductes P. Ltd. [2010] 322 ITR 158 (SC)	386
	Utilities and Power Ltd. [2009] 313 ITR 340 (Bom)	60
	es [1984] 148 ITR 560 (Karn)	322
CIT (Pr.) v. Risha	abdev Technocable Ltd. (I. T. A. No. 1330 of 2017 ry 10, 2020 (Bom)	1
	smissions Ltd. [2013] 359 ITR 673 (Mad) followed	555
	nini Builders [2002] 256 ITR 360 (Guj) relied on	705
-	gars Ltd. [2011] 339 ITR 400 (Mad)	322
	Perinchery [2017] 392 ITR 4 (Bom)	386
	ilders [2015] 375 ITR 392 (SC)	310
CIT v. Satish Ba	ala Malhotra (Smt.) (No. 1) [2016] 387 ITR 403	
(P&H)	The Part of South Conference of the Conference o	322
	o India P. Ltd. [2017] 397 ITR 160 (Delhi)	656
mann.com 29	agram Manufacturing Pvt. Ltd. [2017] 78 tax-3 (Delhi)	322
CIT (Pr.) v. Sesa	Resources Ltd. [2018] 404 ITR 707 (Bom)	555
CIT (Pr.) v. Sha relied on	nkar Lal Saini [2018] 89 taxmann.com 235 (Raj)	621
	Л. К.) [2008] 307 ITR 147 (Delhi)—an appeal [2008]	
306 ITR (St.)		386
CIT v. Shivam M	Motors (P.) Ltd. [2015] 230 Taxman 63 (All)	585
	nreyas Shipping Logistics Ltd. (I. T. A. No. 7406/ ated August 3, 2016)	555
	veni Foods [2015] 59 taxmann.com 292 (HP)	322

xvi	ITR's Tribunal Tax Reports	[Vol. 79
		PAGE
CIT v. Shri Goverd	lhan Ltd. [1968] 69 ITR 675 (SC)	656
CIT (Asst.) v. SIL I	nvestment Ltd. [2012] 148 TTJ 213 (Delhi)	60
CIT v. Siemens Akt	tiongesellschaft [2009] 310 ITR 320 (Bom) relied	
on		489
	onsultants [2012] 341 ITR 240 (Delhi)	119
	ruction [2013] 359 ITR 532 (Delhi)	607
1	ninment Ltd. [2018] 12 ITR-OL 134 (SC)	176
	nterprises [2014] 44 taxmann.com 442 (Karn)	280
	nba Transport Co. [2015] 379 ITR 129 (Karn)	207
CIT v. Sri Shanmuş	ga Ginning Factory [2013] 355 ITR 96 (Mad)	10
	prises [1991] 192 ITR 165 (Karn)	555
	neering Construction Co. Ltd. [2011] 330 ITR 568	(2)
(Mad)	11.14 1 [0015] 11 TM 1/00 (7/) [0017]	636
73 taxmann.com	ald Meadows [2015] 11 TMI 1620 (Karn); [2016]	280, 386
CIT v. SSA's Emera	ald Meadows [2016] 386 ITR (St.) 13 (SC)	280, 386
CIT v. Sun Enginee	ering Works Pvt. Ltd. [1992] 198 ITR 297 (SC)	447, 533
CIT v. Sunil Kumai	r Goel [2009] 315 ITR 163 (P&H) distinguished	520
CIT v. Supriya Gill	(Smt.) [2013] 31 taxmann.com 69 (HP)	322
CIT (Asst.) v. Surat	t City Gymkhana [2008] 300 ITR 214 (SC)	31
CIT v. Suretech Ho 53 (Bom)	ospital and Research Centre Ltd. [2007] 293 ITR	60
CIT (Dy.) v. Suyash (Mum) (Trib)	n Laboratories Ltd. [2016] 65 taxmann.com 217	533
	ram Iyengar and Sons (P.) Ltd. [1975] 101 ITR	333
764 (SC)	rain lychgar and sons (1.) Etd. [1975] 101 11K	621
	ed India P. Ltd. [2013] 351 ITR 57 (Delhi)	60
CIT v. The Mazaga	ion Dock Co. Ltd. [1938] 6 ITR 124 (Bom)	533
	Shipping Services (P.) Ltd. [2016] 385 ITR 637	
(SC)		555
	td. [2014] 2 ITR-OL 366 (Guj)	60
	anbhai Mankad [2013] 1 ITR-OL 405 (Guj)	207
	nship Pvt. Ltd. [2014] 367 ITR 466 (SC)	426
CIT v. Vatika Town September 10, 2	nships P. Ltd. (I. T. A. No. 1329 of 2010 dated	607
	roducts Ltd. [1973] 88 ITR 192 (SC)	426
CII V. VEGETADIE I	10ddcto Etd. [1775] 00 11K 172 (0C)	420

CIT (Pr.) v. Vijay Pataka Synthetics [2015] 63 taxmann.com 214 (Guj) 322 CIT (Dy.) v. Viraj Profiles Ltd. [2016] 46 ITR (Trib) 626 (Mum) 585 CIT (Asst.) v. Vireet Investment (P.) Ltd. [2017] 58 ITR (Trib) 313 (Delhi) [SB] 60 CIT v. Virgin Securities and Credits (P.) Ltd. [2011] 332 ITR 396 (Delhi) 60 CIT v. Virgo Marketing P. Ltd. [2008] 171 Taxman 156 (Delhi) 386 CIT v. Virnda P. Issac (Smt.) [2012] 24 taxmann.com 131 ; [2013] 212 Taxman 101 (Mag.) (Karn) 621 CIT v. Winsome Textile Industries Ltd. [2009] 319 ITR 204 (P&H) 585 CIT v. Woodward Governor India P. Ltd. [2009] 312 ITR 254 (SC) 322 CIT (Asst.) v. Yokogawa India Ltd. [2007] 111 TTJ 548 (Bang) 60 CIT v. Yokogawa India Ltd. [2012] 341 ITR 385 (Karn) 60 CST v. Jagannath Cotton Co. [1995] 99 STC 83 (SC) 322 CST v. Sukh Deo (Dr.) [1969] 23 STC 385 (SC) 322 CST v. Sukh Deo (Dr.) [1969] 23 STC 385 (SC) 322 Continental Construction Ltd. v. CIT [1992] 195 ITR 81 (SC) 222 Cygnus Investments and Finance Pvt. Ltd. v. Asst. CIT (I. T. A. No. 117/Kolkata/2018 dated May 18, 2018) followed 595 D. J. Stone Crusher v. CIT [2010] 229 CTR 195 (HP) 322 Daimler India Commercial Vehicles P. Ltd. v. Dy. CIT [2019] 416 ITR 343 (Mad) 322 De Nora India Ltd. v. CIT [2015] 370 ITR 391 (Delhi) 533 Deepa Kumar Patwari v. Asst. CIT (I. T. A. Nos. 616 to 618/Kolkata/ 2013 dated February 3, 2016) 386
(Guj) 322 CIT (Dy.) v. Viraj Profiles Ltd. [2016] 46 ITR (Trib) 626 (Mum) 585 CIT (Asst.) v. Vireet Investment (P.) Ltd. [2017] 58 ITR (Trib) 313
(Guj) 322 CIT (Dy.) v. Viraj Profiles Ltd. [2016] 46 ITR (Trib) 626 (Mum) 585 CIT (Asst.) v. Vireet Investment (P.) Ltd. [2017] 58 ITR (Trib) 313
CIT (Asst.) v. Vireet Investment (P.) Ltd. [2017] 58 ITR (Trib) 313 (Delhi) [SB] 60 CIT v. Virgin Securities and Credits (P.) Ltd. [2011] 332 ITR 396 (Delhi) 60 CIT v. Virgo Marketing P. Ltd. [2008] 171 Taxman 156 (Delhi) 386 CIT v. Virida P. Issac (Smt.) [2012] 24 taxmann.com 131; [2013] 212 Taxman 101 (Mag.) (Karn) 621 CIT v. Winsome Textile Industries Ltd. [2009] 319 ITR 204 (P&H) 585 CIT v. Woodward Governor India P. Ltd. [2009] 312 ITR 254 (SC) 322 CIT (Asst.) v. Yokogawa India Ltd. [2007] 111 TTJ 548 (Bang) 60 CIT v. Yokogawa India Ltd. [2012] 341 ITR 385 (Karn) 60 CST v. Jagannath Cotton Co. [1995] 99 STC 83 (SC) 322 CST v. Sukh Deo (Dr.) [1969] 23 STC 385 (SC) 322 Continental Construction Ltd. v. CIT [1992] 195 ITR 81 (SC) 222 Cygnus Investments and Finance Pvt. Ltd. v. Asst. CIT (I. T. A. No. 117/Kolkata/2018 dated May 18, 2018) followed 595 D. J. Stone Crusher v. CIT [2010] 229 CTR 195 (HP) 322 Daimler India Commercial Vehicles P. Ltd. v. Dy. CIT [2019] 416 ITR 343 (Mad) 322 De Nora India Ltd. v. CIT [2015] 370 ITR 391 (Delhi) 533 Deepa Kumar Patwari v. Asst. CIT (I. T. A. Nos. 616 to 618/Kolkata/ 2013 dated February 3, 2016) 386
(Delhi) [SB] 60 CIT v. Virgin Securities and Credits (P.) Ltd. [2011] 332 ITR 396 (Delhi) 60 CIT v. Virgo Marketing P. Ltd. [2008] 171 Taxman 156 (Delhi) 386 CIT v. Vrinda P. Issac (Smt.) [2012] 24 taxmann.com 131 ; [2013] 212 Taxman 101 (Mag.) (Karn) 621 CIT v. Winsome Textile Industries Ltd. [2009] 319 ITR 204 (P&H) 585 CIT v. Woodward Governor India P. Ltd. [2009] 312 ITR 254 (SC) 322 CIT (Asst.) v. Yokogawa India Ltd. [2007] 111 TTJ 548 (Bang) 60 CIT v. Yokogawa India Ltd. [2012] 341 ITR 385 (Karn) 60 CST v. Jagannath Cotton Co. [1995] 99 STC 83 (SC) 322 CST v. Sukh Deo (Dr.) [1969] 23 STC 385 (SC) 322 Continental Construction Ltd. v. CIT [1992] 195 ITR 81 (SC) 222 Cygnus Investments and Finance Pvt. Ltd. v. Asst. CIT (I. T. A. No. 117/Kolkata/2018 dated May 18, 2018) followed 595 D. J. Stone Crusher v. CIT [2010] 229 CTR 195 (HP) 322 Daimler India Commercial Vehicles P. Ltd. v. Dy. CIT [2019] 416 ITR 343 (Mad) 322 De Nora India Ltd. v. CIT [2015] 370 ITR 391 (Delhi) 533 Deepa Kumar Patwari v. Asst. CIT (I. T. A. Nos. 616 to 618/Kolkata/2013 dated February 3, 2016) 386
(Delhi) 60 CIT v. Virgo Marketing P. Ltd. [2008] 171 Taxman 156 (Delhi) 386 CIT v. Vrinda P. Issac (Smt.) [2012] 24 taxmann.com 131; [2013] 212 Taxman 101 (Mag.) (Karn) 621 CIT v. Winsome Textile Industries Ltd. [2009] 319 ITR 204 (P&H) 585 CIT v. Woodward Governor India P. Ltd. [2009] 312 ITR 254 (SC) 322 CIT (Asst.) v. Yokogawa India Ltd. [2007] 111 TTJ 548 (Bang) 60 CIT v. Yokogawa India Ltd. [2012] 341 ITR 385 (Karn) 60 CST v. Jagannath Cotton Co. [1995] 99 STC 83 (SC) 322 CST v. Sukh Deo (Dr.) [1969] 23 STC 385 (SC) 322 Continental Construction Ltd. v. CIT [1992] 195 ITR 81 (SC) 222 Cygnus Investments and Finance Pvt. Ltd. v. Asst. CIT (I. T. A. No. 117/Kolkata/2018 dated May 18, 2018) followed 595 D. J. Stone Crusher v. CIT [2010] 229 CTR 195 (HP) 322 Daimler India Commercial Vehicles P. Ltd. v. Dy. CIT [2019] 416 ITR 343 (Mad) 322 De Nora India Ltd. v. CIT [2015] 370 ITR 391 (Delhi) 533 Deepa Kumar Patwari v. Asst. CIT (I. T. A. Nos. 616 to 618/Kolkata/2013 dated February 3, 2016) 386
CIT v. Virgo Marketing P. Ltd. [2008] 171 Taxman 156 (Delhi) CIT v. Vrinda P. Issac (Smt.) [2012] 24 taxmann.com 131; [2013] 212 Taxman 101 (Mag.) (Karn) CIT v. Winsome Textile Industries Ltd. [2009] 319 ITR 204 (P&H) S85 CIT v. Woodward Governor India P. Ltd. [2009] 312 ITR 254 (SC) 222 CIT (Asst.) v. Yokogawa India Ltd. [2007] 111 TTJ 548 (Bang) 60 CIT v. Yokogawa India Ltd. [2012] 341 ITR 385 (Karn) 60 CST v. Jagannath Cotton Co. [1995] 99 STC 83 (SC) CST v. Sukh Deo (Dr.) [1969] 23 STC 385 (SC) Continental Construction Ltd. v. CIT [1992] 195 ITR 81 (SC) Cygnus Investments and Finance Pvt. Ltd. v. Asst. CIT (I. T. A. No. 117/Kolkata/2018 dated May 18, 2018) followed D. J. Stone Crusher v. CIT [2010] 229 CTR 195 (HP) Daimler India Commercial Vehicles P. Ltd. v. Dy. CIT [2019] 416 ITR 343 (Mad) De Nora India Ltd. v. CIT [2015] 370 ITR 391 (Delhi) Deepa Kumar Patwari v. Asst. CIT (I. T. A. Nos. 616 to 618/Kolkata/ 2013 dated February 3, 2016)
CIT v. Vrinda P. Issac (Smt.) [2012] 24 taxmann.com 131; [2013] 212 Taxman 101 (Mag.) (Karn) 621 CIT v. Winsome Textile Industries Ltd. [2009] 319 ITR 204 (P&H) 585 CIT v. Woodward Governor India P. Ltd. [2009] 312 ITR 254 (SC) 322 CIT (Asst.) v. Yokogawa India Ltd. [2007] 111 TTJ 548 (Bang) 60 CIT v. Yokogawa India Ltd. [2012] 341 ITR 385 (Karn) 60 CST v. Jagannath Cotton Co. [1995] 99 STC 83 (SC) 322 CST v. Sukh Deo (Dr.) [1969] 23 STC 385 (SC) 322 Continental Construction Ltd. v. CIT [1992] 195 ITR 81 (SC) 222 Cygnus Investments and Finance Pvt. Ltd. v. Asst. CIT (I. T. A. No. 117/Kolkata/2018 dated May 18, 2018) followed 595 D. J. Stone Crusher v. CIT [2010] 229 CTR 195 (HP) 322 Daimler India Commercial Vehicles P. Ltd. v. Dy. CIT [2019] 416 ITR 343 (Mad) 322 De Nora India Ltd. v. CIT [2015] 370 ITR 391 (Delhi) 533 Deepa Kumar Patwari v. Asst. CIT (I. T. A. Nos. 616 to 618/Kolkata/2013 dated February 3, 2016) 386
CIT v. Winsome Textile Industries Ltd. [2009] 319 ITR 204 (P&H) 585 CIT v. Woodward Governor India P. Ltd. [2009] 312 ITR 254 (SC) 322 CIT (Asst.) v. Yokogawa India Ltd. [2007] 111 TTJ 548 (Bang) 60 CIT v. Yokogawa India Ltd. [2012] 341 ITR 385 (Karn) 60 CST v. Jagannath Cotton Co. [1995] 99 STC 83 (SC) 322 CST v. Sukh Deo (Dr.) [1969] 23 STC 385 (SC) 322 Continental Construction Ltd. v. CIT [1992] 195 ITR 81 (SC) 222 Cygnus Investments and Finance Pvt. Ltd. v. Asst. CIT (I. T. A. No. 117/Kolkata/2018 dated May 18, 2018) followed 595 D. J. Stone Crusher v. CIT [2010] 229 CTR 195 (HP) 322 Daimler India Commercial Vehicles P. Ltd. v. Dy. CIT [2019] 416 ITR 343 (Mad) 322 De Nora India Ltd. v. CIT [2015] 370 ITR 391 (Delhi) 533 Deepa Kumar Patwari v. Asst. CIT (I. T. A. Nos. 616 to 618/Kolkata/2013 dated February 3, 2016) 386
CIT v. Woodward Governor India P. Ltd. [2009] 312 ITR 254 (SC) CIT (Asst.) v. Yokogawa India Ltd. [2007] 111 TTJ 548 (Bang) CIT v. Yokogawa India Ltd. [2012] 341 ITR 385 (Karn) 60 CST v. Jagannath Cotton Co. [1995] 99 STC 83 (SC) CST v. Sukh Deo (Dr.) [1969] 23 STC 385 (SC) Continental Construction Ltd. v. CIT [1992] 195 ITR 81 (SC) Cygnus Investments and Finance Pvt. Ltd. v. Asst. CIT (I. T. A. No. 117/Kolkata/2018 dated May 18, 2018) followed D. J. Stone Crusher v. CIT [2010] 229 CTR 195 (HP) Daimler India Commercial Vehicles P. Ltd. v. Dy. CIT [2019] 416 ITR 343 (Mad) De Nora India Ltd. v. CIT [2015] 370 ITR 391 (Delhi) Deepa Kumar Patwari v. Asst. CIT (I. T. A. Nos. 616 to 618/Kolkata/2013 dated February 3, 2016)
CIT (Asst.) v. Yokogawa India Ltd. [2007] 111 TTJ 548 (Bang) 60 CIT v. Yokogawa India Ltd. [2012] 341 ITR 385 (Karn) 60 CST v. Jagannath Cotton Co. [1995] 99 STC 83 (SC) 322 CST v. Sukh Deo (Dr.) [1969] 23 STC 385 (SC) 322 Continental Construction Ltd. v. CIT [1992] 195 ITR 81 (SC) 222 Cygnus Investments and Finance Pvt. Ltd. v. Asst. CIT (I. T. A. No. 117/Kolkata/2018 dated May 18, 2018) followed 595 D. J. Stone Crusher v. CIT [2010] 229 CTR 195 (HP) 322 Daimler India Commercial Vehicles P. Ltd. v. Dy. CIT [2019] 416 ITR 343 (Mad) 322 De Nora India Ltd. v. CIT [2015] 370 ITR 391 (Delhi) 533 Deepa Kumar Patwari v. Asst. CIT (I. T. A. Nos. 616 to 618/Kolkata/2013 dated February 3, 2016) 386
CIT v. Yokogawa India Ltd. [2012] 341 ITR 385 (Karn) 60 CST v. Jagannath Cotton Co. [1995] 99 STC 83 (SC) 322 CST v. Sukh Deo (Dr.) [1969] 23 STC 385 (SC) 322 Continental Construction Ltd. v. CIT [1992] 195 ITR 81 (SC) 222 Cygnus Investments and Finance Pvt. Ltd. v. Asst. CIT (I. T. A. No. 117/Kolkata/2018 dated May 18, 2018) followed 595 D. J. Stone Crusher v. CIT [2010] 229 CTR 195 (HP) 322 Daimler India Commercial Vehicles P. Ltd. v. Dy. CIT [2019] 416 ITR 343 (Mad) 322 De Nora India Ltd. v. CIT [2015] 370 ITR 391 (Delhi) 533 Deepa Kumar Patwari v. Asst. CIT (I. T. A. Nos. 616 to 618/Kolkata/2013 dated February 3, 2016) 386
CST v. Jagannath Cotton Co. [1995] 99 STC 83 (SC) 322 CST v. Sukh Deo (Dr.) [1969] 23 STC 385 (SC) 322 Continental Construction Ltd. v. CIT [1992] 195 ITR 81 (SC) 222 Cygnus Investments and Finance Pvt. Ltd. v. Asst. CIT (I. T. A. No. 117/Kolkata/2018 dated May 18, 2018) followed 595 D. J. Stone Crusher v. CIT [2010] 229 CTR 195 (HP) 322 Daimler India Commercial Vehicles P. Ltd. v. Dy. CIT [2019] 416 ITR 343 (Mad) 322 De Nora India Ltd. v. CIT [2015] 370 ITR 391 (Delhi) 533 Deepa Kumar Patwari v. Asst. CIT (I. T. A. Nos. 616 to 618/Kolkata/2013 dated February 3, 2016) 386
CST v. Sukh Deo (Dr.) [1969] 23 STC 385 (SC) 322 Continental Construction Ltd. v. CIT [1992] 195 ITR 81 (SC) 222 Cygnus Investments and Finance Pvt. Ltd. v. Asst. CIT (I. T. A. No. 117/Kolkata/2018 dated May 18, 2018) followed 595 D. J. Stone Crusher v. CIT [2010] 229 CTR 195 (HP) 322 Daimler India Commercial Vehicles P. Ltd. v. Dy. CIT [2019] 416 ITR 343 (Mad) 322 De Nora India Ltd. v. CIT [2015] 370 ITR 391 (Delhi) 533 Deepa Kumar Patwari v. Asst. CIT (I. T. A. Nos. 616 to 618/Kolkata/2013 dated February 3, 2016) 386
Continental Construction Ltd. v. CIT [1992] 195 ITR 81 (SC) Cygnus Investments and Finance Pvt. Ltd. v. Asst. CIT (I. T. A. No. 117/Kolkata/2018 dated May 18, 2018) followed 595 D. J. Stone Crusher v. CIT [2010] 229 CTR 195 (HP) Daimler India Commercial Vehicles P. Ltd. v. Dy. CIT [2019] 416 ITR 343 (Mad) De Nora India Ltd. v. CIT [2015] 370 ITR 391 (Delhi) 533 Deepa Kumar Patwari v. Asst. CIT (I. T. A. Nos. 616 to 618/Kolkata/2013 dated February 3, 2016)
Cygnus Investments and Finance Pvt. Ltd. v. Asst. CIT (I. T. A. No. 117/Kolkata/2018 dated May 18, 2018) followed 595 D. J. Stone Crusher v. CIT [2010] 229 CTR 195 (HP) 322 Daimler India Commercial Vehicles P. Ltd. v. Dy. CIT [2019] 416 ITR 343 (Mad) 322 De Nora India Ltd. v. CIT [2015] 370 ITR 391 (Delhi) 533 Deepa Kumar Patwari v. Asst. CIT (I. T. A. Nos. 616 to 618/Kolkata/2013 dated February 3, 2016) 386
117/Kolkata/2018 dated May 18, 2018) followed 595 D. J. Stone Crusher v. CIT [2010] 229 CTR 195 (HP) 322 Daimler India Commercial Vehicles P. Ltd. v. Dy. CIT [2019] 416 ITR 343 (Mad) 322 De Nora India Ltd. v. CIT [2015] 370 ITR 391 (Delhi) 533 Deepa Kumar Patwari v. Asst. CIT (I. T. A. Nos. 616 to 618/Kolkata/2013 dated February 3, 2016) 386
Daimler India Commercial Vehicles P. Ltd. v. Dy. CIT [2019] 416 322 ITR 343 (Mad) 322 De Nora India Ltd. v. CIT [2015] 370 ITR 391 (Delhi) 533 Deepa Kumar Patwari v. Asst. CIT (I. T. A. Nos. 616 to 618/Kolkata/2013 dated February 3, 2016) 386
Daimler India Commercial Vehicles P. Ltd. v. Dy. CIT [2019] 416 322 ITR 343 (Mad) 322 De Nora India Ltd. v. CIT [2015] 370 ITR 391 (Delhi) 533 Deepa Kumar Patwari v. Asst. CIT (I. T. A. Nos. 616 to 618/Kolkata/2013 dated February 3, 2016) 386
ITR 343 (Mad) 322 De Nora India Ltd. v. CIT [2015] 370 ITR 391 (Delhi) 533 Deepa Kumar Patwari v. Asst. CIT (I. T. A. Nos. 616 to 618/Kolkata/2013 dated February 3, 2016) 386
De Nora India Ltd. <i>v.</i> CIT [2015] 370 ITR 391 (Delhi) 533 Deepa Kumar Patwari <i>v.</i> Asst. CIT (I. T. A. Nos. 616 to 618/Kolkata/ 2013 dated February 3, 2016) 386
Deepa Kumar Patwari v. Asst. CIT (I. T. A. Nos. 616 to 618/Kolkata/ 2013 dated February 3, 2016) 386
Devi Dass Gopal Krishnan v. State of Punjab [1967] 20 S1C 430
(SC) 322
Dewanchand Ramsaran Industries P. Ltd. v. Asst. CIT [2016] 47 ITR (Trib) 687 (Mum) 322
Dhadda Exports v. ITO [2015] 377 ITR 347 (Raj) 533
DIC Asia Pacific Pte. Ltd. v. Asst DIT, International Taxation [2012] 52 SOT 447 (Kolkata) 222
Digital Equipment India Ltd. v. Dy. CIT [2006] 103 TTJ 329 (Bang-ITAT) 322
Dilip N. Shroff v. Jt. CIT [2007] 291 ITR 519 (SC) 386
Dinamalar v. ITO [2016] 389 ITR 94 (Mad) 695

xviii	ITR's Tribunal Tax Reports	[Vol. 79
		PAGE
	x (International Taxation) v. Besix Kier Dab-	EEE
hol SA [2012] 210	P India [2014] 64 SOT 290 (Mumbai)	555 222
•	ellite BV [2016] 382 ITR 114 (Delhi) relied on	489
	xation) v. Prahlad Vijendra Rao [2011] 239	465
Distributors (Baroda) I (SC) relied on	P. Ltd. v. Union of India [1985] 155 ITR 120	60
Doshi (P. V.) v. CIT [1978] 113 ITR 22 (Guj)	176
	ansthan v. Union of India [2015] 63 tax-	426
mann.com 243 (Ra)) D [1997] 63 ITD 1 (Patna)	60
	P. Ltd. v. CIT [2019] 109 taxmann.com 5	00
(Delhi) followed	11. Eta. V. CII [2017] 107 taxintamicom 9	119
East India Pharmaceu	tical Works Ltd. v. CIT [1997] 224 ITR 627	
(SC)		60
*	rd. v. IAC [1988] 26 ITD 236 (Delhi)	60
	ervices India P. Ltd. v. Jt. CIT (I. T. (T.P.) A. 8, dated December 18, 2019)	656
Emdee Apparels v. As	sst. CIT [2012] 19 ITR (Trib) 623 (Bang)	322
Emerald Co. Ltd. v. I	TO [2016] 46 ITR (Trib) 619 (Kol)	176
	(India) Pvt. Ltd. v. Asst. CIT dated June 14,	264
2019 Empire Jute Co. Ltd.:	v. CIT [1980] 124 ITR 1 (SC)	364 60
•	CIT [1980] 124 ITC 1 (SC) CIT [2007] 104 ITD 427 (Delhi)	555
	est. CIT (I. T. A. No. 4444/Mum/2017 dated	333
June 26, 2019) follo		555
	er Ltd. v. Asst. CIT (LTU) (I. T. A. No. 7073/	
Mum/2012 dated S	eptember 25, 2014) followed	555
Fatheraj Singhvi v. Ur	nion of India [2017] 10 ITR-OL 509 (Karn)	426
Fathima Bai v. ITO [2	009] 32 DTR 243 (Karn)	621
Fition Hotel v. ITO (2	.008 40-A BCA) 293 - ITAT- Mumbai)	322
Food World Superma (Bang)	arkets Ltd. v. Dy. DIT TS-629-ITAT-2015	222
Ganesh Dass Piara La	al Jain v. ITO [2016] 49 ITR (Trib) 36 (Chd)	1

2020]	Table of Cases Cited	xix
		PAGE
Gee Vee Enterprises v.	Addl. CIT [1975] 99 ITR 375 (Delhi)	636
1	s Co. Ltd. v. CIT [2002] 253 ITR 454 (Guj)	607
	Co. Ltd. v. Dy. CIT [2010] 328 ITR 81 (Bom)	60
Goverdhan Singh Shek	chawat v. ITO [2019] 102 taxmann.com 50	(24
(Jaipur)		621
(AAR)	rnational Ltd., <i>In re</i> [2015] 378 ITR 465	222
Gurdas Garg v. CIT (Ap	ppeals) [2015] 63 taxmann.com 289 (P&H)	10
GXS India Technology 1444/Bang/2012 date	Centre P. Ltd. v. ITO (I. T. (T.P.) A No. ed July 31, 2015)	656
Haridas Parilch 71 ITO	[2008] 113 TTJ 274 (Jodhpur)	472
		472
November 11, 2013)	T (I. T. A. No. 280 of 2013 (P&H), dated	636
	acturing Co. v. CIT [2009] 308 ITR 38 (Delhi)	
relied on	returns control (2 cm)	705
Hero Cycles P. Ltd. v.	CIT [2015] 379 ITR 347 (SC)	555
Hinduja Global Solution (Mum) <i>followed</i>	ons Ltd. v. Addl. CIT [2013] 145 ITD 361	555
•	. R. B. Wadkar, Asst. CIT (No. 1) [2004] 268	705
	Ltd. v. Asst. CIT [2007] 109 ITD 1 (Delhi)	322
	2. Asst. CIT [2012] 16 ITR (Trib) 614 (Mum)	60
o de la companya de l	[1985] 152 ITR 218 (Karn)	295
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	d. v. Asst. CIT [2018] 169 DTR 1 (Amritsar)	386
	I. v. CIT [1967] 63 ITR 232 (SC)	447
	Engineering P. Ltd. v. Dy. CIT (I. T. A. No.	
255/Hyd/2014 dated		656
ICICI Bank Ltd. v. K. J	. Rao [2004] 268 ITR 203 (Bom) relied on	705
Idandas v. Anant Ram	Chandra Phadke [1982] AIR 1982 SC 127	322
Income-tax Officer v. D ITR (AT) 1 (Mum)	aga Capital Management P. Ltd. [2009] 312	60
	. A. No. 5697/Mum/2010 dated February 22,	
2013)		1
ITO v. Gebbs Infotech	Ltd. (I. T. A. No. 3370/Mum/2007 dated	
October 13, 2010)		60
ITO v. J. M. P. Enterpr	ises [2006] 101 ITD 324 (Asr)	555

xx	ITR's Tribunal Tax Reports	[Vol. 79
		PAGE
	Development Corporation Ltd. (I. T. A. ated October 3, 2018) <i>followed</i>	No. 695
	xation) v. M Far Hotels Ltd. (I. T. A. Nos. dated April 5, 2013)	430 222
ITO v. Rajan Kalimuth 22, 2019)	nu (I. T. A. No. 2900/Chennai/2018 dated	May 386
ITO v. Satyanarayan F 111 (Pune)	Ramswaroop Agarwal [2014] 50 taxmann.	com 310
ITO (OSD) v. Sicgil In nai)	ndia Pvt. Ltd. [2010] 1 ITR (Trib) 749 (Ch	nen- 695
ITO (International Ta SOT 356 (Ahd)	xation) v. Sunil Chitranjan Muncif [2013	5] 58 465
	[2015] 61 taxmann.com 358 (AhdTrib) Services Ltd. v. Dy. CIT [2017] 395 ITR	
(Delhi) relied on		60
Indian Hotels Co. Ltd	d v. ITO [2000] 245 ITR 538 (SC)	322
	r. CIT [2018] 12 ITR-OL 413 (Mad) <i>relied</i> al Work (I. T. A. No. 117 of 2019 dated l	
ruary 20, 2020) foli	lowed	426
	pn. Ltd. <i>v.</i> Dy. DIT (I. T. A. Nos. 1548 2009 dated July 15, 2016)	and 295
Intoto Software India dated December 9,	P. Ltd. v. ITO (I. T. A. No. 1810/Hyd/2, 2015)	2012 656
ION Trading India P dated December 7,	² . Ltd. v. ITO (I. T. A. No. 1035/Delhi/2 , 2015)	2015 656
ITC Ltd. v. CCE [200-	4] 3 RC 337 ; [2004] 7 SCC 591	621
J. P. Distilleries v. ITO 2018)	O (I. T. A. No. 470/Bang/2018 dated June	e 29, 322
Jagan Nath Singh Lo (Mag)	odha v. ITO [2005] 148 Taxman 1 (Jodh	pur) 621
Jammu Development dated July 21, 2014	Authority v. CIT (S. L. P. No. (S) 4990 of 2 4) distinguished	2014 31
Jaswant Sugar Mills I	Ltd. v. ITO [1973] Tax LR 1336 (All)	533
Jeypore Timber and V (Gauhati)	eneer Mills (P.) Ltd. <i>v.</i> CIT [1982] 137 ITR	. 415 447
Jindal Steel and Pow 2014, dated April 2	er Ltd. v. Asst. CIT (I. T. A. No. 893/De 29, 2019)	elhi/ 636
=	. CIT [1965] 55 ITR 89 (Cal)	533

2020]	Table of Cases Cited	xxi
		PAGE
John Deere India Pvt. I dated April 25, 2019	.td. v. Asst. CIT (I. T. A. No. 518/Pune/2015	656
•	re [1939] 7 ITR 374 (All)	533
Karnataka Vikas Gramo 2014 dated April 25,	eena Bank v. Jt. CIT (I. T. A. No. 684/Bang/ , 2018)	207
	eena Bank v. Jt. CIT (I. T. A. Nos. 673 and d April 25, 2018) followed	207
· ·	CIT (I. T. A. No. 378/Amritsar/2015 dated	426
Kedarnath Jute Manufa	acturing Co. Ltd. v. CIT [1971] 82 ITR 363	
(SC)	v. CIT [1990] 183 ITR 1 (SC)	322, 656 621
1	(Mrs.) v. ITO [2006] 101 TTJ 1095 (Mum)	176
	neering (P.) Ltd. v. Dy. CIT [2018] 90 tax-	170
mann.com 56 (Bom)		1
Kores India Ltd. v. CC	E [2004] 174 ELT 7 (SC)	322
KPIT Cummins Infosy [2008] 26 SOT 529	rstems (Bangalore) (P.) Ltd. v. Asst. CIT (Bang)	60
Kungundi Industrial W (AP)	Vorks (Pvt.) Ltd. v. CIT [1965] 57 ITR 540	533
Kusum Healthcare Pvt. (Delhi)	Ltd v. Asst. CIT [2015] 62 taxmann.com 79	295
I.C. Flacture in India F) [1] D CIT [2017] 200 ITD 125 (All)	
relied on	P. Ltd. v. Pr. CIT [2016] 388 ITR 135 (All)	636
	as v. CIT [2002] 254 ITR 799 (SC)	695
Lakshmiji Sugar Mills	Co. P. Ltd. v. CIT [1971] 82 ITR 376 (SC)	60
Lam Research (India) 1385/Bang/2014)	P. Ltd. v. Dy. CIT (I. T. A. Nos. 1437 and	656
Laxmi Narayan Jewello dated May 13, 2019	ery v. ITO (I. T. A. No. 250/Cuttack/2018	10
LG Software India Pvt. 2018 dated May 28,	Ltd. v. Dy. CIT (I. T. (TP) A. No. 3122/Bang/ 2019)	656
	. v. Addl. CIT [2016] 50 ITR (Trib) (S.N.) 94	322
	Ltd. v. ITO [2019] 101 taxmann.com 201	656
	. v. CIT [2000] 245 ITR 830 (SC)	322

xxii	ITR's Tribunal Tax Reports	[Vol. 79
		PAGE
•	sh Power Transmission Ltd. v. Dy. CIT [2019] 69 ITR	
	Indore) followed	426
	Sugar Mills Co. v. CIT [1980] 123 ITR 429 (SC) u Parab v. ITO (I. T. A. No. 8833/Mum/2010 dated	695 55
•	n Kang v. CIT [2012] 344 ITR 358 (P&H)	636
,	trial Co. Ltd. v. CIT [2000] 243 ITR 83 (SC)	176
	an Jagannath v. Asst. CIT [2009] 316 ITR 120 (Raj)	472
	Spinning Mills v. Asst. CIT [2004] 89 ITD 65 (Chd)	555
	Asst. CIT (I. T. A. No. 8858/Mum/2011 dated May 18,	555
Marwell India	Pvt. Ltd. v. Dy. CIT (I. T. (T.P.) A. No. 3082/Bang/ October 23, 2019)	656
	Tools and Forgings (P.) Ltd. v. ITO [1987] 23 ITD	533
Massachusetts	v. United States 333 US 611	60
	ntegrated Circuit Design Pvt. Ltd. v. Dy. CIT (I. T. A. ng/2014 dated July 6, 2019)	322
Maxopp Invest	ment Ltd. v. CIT [2012] 347 ITR 272 (Delhi)	60
Maxopp Invest	ment Ltd. v. CIT [2018] 402 ITR 640 (SC)	585
Mentor India 1 December 1	Ltd. v. Dy. CIT (I. T. A. No. 738/Jaipur/2016 dated 6, 2016)	426
	z Research and Development P. Ltd. v. Dy. CIT (I. T. o. 1645/Bang/2016)	656
Merilyn Shippi (Vizak) [SB]	ing and Transports v. Addl. CIT [2012] 136 ITD 23	207
	nfotech (India) Pvt. Ltd. v. Dy. CIT (I. T. (TP) A. Nos. 735/Bang/2017 dated February 27, 2019)	656
	and Resorts Ltd. v. Asst. CIT [2019] 105 tax- 335 (Cochin-Trib.)	322
Micro Ink Ltd.	v. Addl. CIT [2016] 157 ITD 132 (Ahd)	555
Micro Inks Ltd	l. v. Pr. CIT [2018] 407 ITR 681 (Guj)	193
	earch Lab India Pvt. Ltd. v. Dy. CIT (I.T. (TP) A. No. 2018 dated February 5, 2020) followed	656
Modular Infote	ech (P.) Ltd. v. Dy. CIT [2010] 131 TTJ (Pune) (Trib)	533

2020]	Table of Cases Cited	xxiii
		PAGE
Mumbai Kamgar Sabha v. SC 1455	. Abdulbahi Faizullabhai [1976] AIR 1976	4.47
	Iemon v. ITO [2018] 408 ITR 268 (Guj)	447 595
•	T (I. T. A. No. 334/Jaipur/2015)	386
Triaramar Trincar V. Dy. Cr	(i. 1. 1i. 1vo. 66 ii)aipai/2016)	500
N. K. Industries Ltd. v. D	y. CIT [2017] 8 ITR-OL 336 (Guj)	1
N. K. Proteins Ltd. v. CIT	Γ (Deputy) [2017] 421 ITR (St.) 15 (SC)	1
	O (OSD) [2016] 389 ITR 541 (Guj)	1
Nagammal Cotton Mills (I	Pvt.) Ltd. v. CIT [2002] 258 ITR 390 (Mad)	533
	[2016] 70 taxmann.com 227 (Mum-Trib)	636
Narayana Heights and Todated February 20, 201	wers v. ITO (I. T. A. No. 1033/Jaipur/2016 7)	386
National Thermal Power	Co. Ltd. v. CIT [1998] 229 ITR 383 (SC)	364
Nectar Beverages Pvt. Ltd	d. v. Dy. CIT [2009] 314 ITR 314 (SC)	60
NXP India P. Ltd. v. Asst. February 28, 2019) follows:	. CIT (I. T. A. No. 5140/Delhi/2018 dated	656
Tebruary 20, 2019) Jour	ошен	030
Olive Bar and Kitchen (P.) 98 (Mum-Trib.)	Ltd. v. Dy. CIT [2019] 102 taxmann.com	322
	[2007] 294 ITR 599 (Jharkhand)	520
Orange Business Services	India Solutions Pvt. Ltd. v. Dy. CIT (I.T.A. ated February 15, 2018)	295
	at Pte. Ltd v. Dy. DIT [2012] 17 ITR (Trib)	222
	2. CIT [1963] 49 ITR 723 (Bom)	705
o de la companya de l	ce v. Addl. CIT [2018] 401 ITR 65 (Delhi)	119
	g Corporation v. CIT [1999] 237 ITR 589	
(SC)	- Andreite Metal Described Corie	60
[1960] 39 ITR 210 (HL	s) v. Australian Mutual Provident Society)	60
Otters Club v. DIT (E) [20	017] 392 ITR 244 (Bom)	585
Oxford University Press v	o. CIT [2001] 247 ITR 658 (SC)	621
7026/Mum/2013 dated	vest Pvt. Ltd. v. Addl. CIT (I. T. A. No. December 4, 2015)	555
	O [2000] 68 TTJ 722 (Rajkot)	60
	v. Asst. CIT [2014] 41 taxmann.com 193	
(Mumbai Trib)		222

xxiv	ITR's Tribunal Tax Reports	[Vol. 79
		PAGE
Patil Vijaykumar v	. Union of India [1985] 151 ITR 48 (Karn)	207
	ce Pvt. Ltd. v. Dy. CIT (I. T. A. Nos. 2957 to 2963/	426
	Holding B.V., In re [2012] 342 ITR 200 (AAR)	222
	nand v. CIT [1966] 62 ITR 232 (All)	447
Poabs Rock Produ 302 (Cochin-Tri	cts (P.) Ltd. v. Asst. CIT [2013] 40 taxmann.com	322
	atch Factory v. CIT [1963] 50 ITR 495 (Mad)	656
	(Smt.) v. CIT [1998] 231 ITR 1 (Bom)	60
Prakash Chand Sh Jaipur/2016 and	arma v. Asst. CIT (I. T. A. Nos. 922, 923 and 924/ I. T. A. Nos. 935, 936 and 937/Jaipur/2016 dated	
July 30, 2017) f		386
	ills P. Ltd. v. CIT [1993] 201 ITR 684 (SC)	695
_	Ltd. v. CIT (Appeals) [2018] 11 ITR-OL 216 (All)	1
) Ltd. v. CIT [2018] 406 ITR (St.) 7 (SC)	1
1 0	ITO [2005] 94 ITD 79 (Amritsar)	60
-	Union of India [2017] 83 taxmann.com 137 (Guj)	426
	raogi v. CIT [1968] 67 ITR 84 (SC)	636
Ramsukh Propertion July 25, 2012)	es v. Dy. CIT (I. T. A. No. 84/Pune/2011 dated	310
	l Co. Ltd v. Pr. CIT (I. T. A. No. 2251/Mum/2015 r 22, 2016) (Mum-Trib.) followed	555
Rashmikant Kunda	alia v. Union of India [2015] 373 ITR 268 (Bom)	426
Raymond Ltd. v. I	Dy. CIT [2003] 86 ITD 791 (Mum)	222
Reliable Finhold L	td. v. Union of India [2014] 369 ITR 419 (All)	533
	Ltd. v. Dy. CIT [2016] 6 ITR (Trib)-OL 151	
(Mum)		322
•	Ltd. v. ITO [2010] 125 ITD 101 (Bang)	60
Ryatar Sahakari Sa ITR 561 (Karn)	akkare Karkane Niyamit v. Asst. CIT [2016] 383	207
S. A. Builders Ltd.	v. CIT (Appeals) [2007] 288 ITR 1 (SC)	555
	ruction v. Addl. CIT (I. T. A. Nos. 994 and 995/ ed March 11, 2016)	386
Sanchita Marine F (Mum)	Products P. Ltd. v. Dy. CIT [2007] 15 SOT 280	1
Sandeep Jhanwar	Advisory Services Pvt. Ltd. v. ITO, TDS CPC and 723/Jaipur/2016)	426

2020]	TABLE	of Cases Cite	D	xxv
				PAGE
Sanghavi Savala (Commodity Brok	ers P. Ltd. v. Asst	. CIT (I. T. A.	
No. 1746/Mum	/2011 dated Dec	cember 22, 2015)		386
Sanjay Olicake In	dustries v. CIT [2009] 316 ITR 274	(Guj)	1
Sanjeev Lal v. CI	Γ [2014] 365 ITR	389 (SC)		621
Sanjog Tarachand 2014 dated Au		I. T. A. Nos. 688 a	and 689/Pune/	386
Sanofi Pasteur Ho ITR 316 (AP) a		partment of Reven	ue [2013] 354	489
do.	v.	do.	relied on	489
SAP Labs India 1 (Bang)	Pvt. Ltd. v. Asst	t. CIT [2012] 15 I	TR (Trib) 506	364
	al Syndicate Ltd	. v. CIT [1990] 186	ITR 278 (SC)	176
		ddl. DIT (I.T.) [201		
(Mumbai)			,,	222
Satish P. Malhott November 29,		A. No. 6877/Mur	m/2014, dated	621
	· ·	T. A. No. 5036/M	(um/2017)	621
•		016] 67 taxmann.co		656
1		y Pvt. Ltd. v. Asst	. CIT [2010] 2	60
		5] 379 ITR 256 (AA	AR)	465
		19] 417 ITR 334 (B		636
		CIT (I. T. A. No. 8		
dated March 1	•	(,, _F <u>_</u>	386
Shell India Marke	ts (P.) Ltd., In r	e [2012] 342 ITR 2	223 (AAR)	222
Sheveta Construc	tion Co. Pvt. L	td. v. ITO (D. B.	I. T. Appeal	
No.534 of 2008	8 dated Decemb	er 6, 2016 (Raj))		386
Shivsagar Veg. Re	estaurant v. Asst.	CIT [2009] 317 II	TR 433 (Bom)	585
Sibia Healthcare (Amritsar)	Pvt. Ltd. v. Dy	. CIT [2016] 46 I	TR (Trib) 453	426
Signature Hotels	(P.) Ltd. v. ITO	[2011] 338 ITR 51	(Delhi)	595
Siro Clinpharm P dated March 3	•	IT (I. T. A. No. 26	518/Mum/2014	555
	nd Holding Ltd.	v. Asst. CIT [2012] 145 TTJ 497	555
•		ΓΟ, International T	axation [2018]	
171 ITD 723 (A				465

xxvi	ITR's Tribunal Tax Re	PORTS	[Vol. 79
			PAGE
Sky Light Hospit	ality v. Asst. CIT [2018] 254 Taxn	nan 390 (SC)	176
Spice Entertainm 280 ELT 43 (D	ent Ltd. v. Commissioner of Ser Pelhi)	rvice Tax [2012]	176
	dia v. Dy. CIT (I. T. A. Nos. 727 ovember 13, 2018) followed	and 737/Indore/	426
State Bank of Indidated May 31,	ia, Gwalior <i>v.</i> ITO (TDS) (I. T. A. l 2018)	No. 3/Agra/2018	426
State Bank of Pat	tiala v. CIT [2005] 272 ITR 54 (P&	&H)	207
Steria (India) Ltd	., In re [2014] 364 ITR 381 (AAR)	222
Sudershan Goyal dated April 9,	v. Dy. CIT (TDS) (I. T. A. No 2018)	. 442/Agra/2017	426
Sudha Agro Oil a	and Chemical Industries Ltd. v. A 196/Vizag/2013 dated March 24,	,	520
	CIT [1995] 214 ITR 801 (SC)	, ,	636
	ce Ltd. v. Asst. CIT [2018] 403 IT	R 407 (Mad)	280, 386
Sundaram Financ	e Ltd. v. Dy. CIT [2018] 408 ITR	(St.) 57 (SC)	280
	v. ITO (International Taxation) 2 (Mumbai Trib)	[2013] 33 tax-	222
Sunworld infrastr (Delhi) followe	ucture (P.) Ltd. <i>v.</i> ITO [2015] 64 ta ed	xmann.com 471	158
Sutlej Cotton Mil	ls Ltd. v. CIT [1979] 116 ITR 1 (S	SC)	322
	re and Services India (P.) Ltd. <i>v.</i> D 208 (Chennai-Trib)	y. CIT [2017] 79	656
	are India P. Ltd. v. Dy. CIT [2020] 114 tax-	030
	(Pune-Trib) followed	2020] 111 (65)	656
Syndicate Bank <i>v</i>	. Dy. CIT [2001] 78 ITD 103 (Bar	ng)	207
T. R. F. Ltd. v. C	IT [2010] 323 ITR 397 (SC)		60
TAG Offshore Ltd 8, 2014)	d. v. Asst. CIT (I. T. A. No. 710/Mu	ım/2014 August	555
Taparia Tools Ltd	l. v. Jt. CIT [2015] 372 ITR 605 (S	SC)	322
Tara Devi Aggary	val (Smt.) v. CIT [1973] 88 ITR 3	23 (SC)	636
Target Corporation	on India (P.) Ltd., <i>In re</i> [2012] 348	B ITR 61 (AAR)	222
Tata Communica (Mum)	ations Ltd. v. Jt. CIT [2009] 12	21 ITD SB 384	447

2020]	TABLE OF CASES CITED	xxvii
		PAGE
ĕ	dia P. Ltd. v. Asst. CIT [2013] 23 ITR	(5)
(Trib) 364 (Mum)	" [2012] 24/ JED 245 (AAD)	656
e e	re [2012] 346 ITR 345 (AAR)	222
ITR 42 (Bom)	g Co. Ltd. v. Union of India [2019] 413	364
Tolani P. Ltd. v. Addl. CIT uary 4, 2018) followed	(I. T. A. No. 5562/Mum/2013 dated Jan-	555
Trilogy E Business Softward 45 (URO) (Bang)	e India (P.) Ltd. v. Dy. CIT [2011] 47 SOT	364
Trilogy E-Business Softwar (Trib) 464 (Bang)	re India P. Ltd. v. Dy. CIT [2013] 23 ITR	656
Trimurti Engineering Wordated April 4, 2012)	ks v. ITO (I. T. A. No. 3889/Delhi/2011	280
Unimed Technologies Ltd.	. v. Dy. CIT [2000] 73 ITD 150 (Ahd)	533
	Addl. CIT [2016] 76 taxmann.com 103	
(Bang) (Trib) followed		533
US Technology Internation 592/Coch/2018 dated D	nal P. Ltd. v. Asst. CIT (I. T. (T. P.) A. No. december 11, 2019)	656
Ushodaya Enterprises Ltd. (Hyd)	v. Asst. CIT [2014] 41 taxmann.com 304	695
Van Oord India P. Ltd. v.	Asst. CIT [2019] 72 ITR (Trib) (S.N.) 59	
(Mum)		555
Vardhman Polytex Ltd. v.	CIT [2012] 349 ITR 690 (SC)	322
Varghese (K. P.) v. ITO [1	981] 131 ITR 597 (SC) relied on	489
Verizon Data Services Inc (AAR)	dia Pvt. Ltd., In re [2011] 337 ITR 192	222
Vijay Aggarwal <i>v.</i> Dy. CI Trib.)	TT [2019] 109 taxmann.com 175 (Delhi	280, 386
Vijay Proteins Ltd. v. CIT	[2015] 58 taxmann.com 44 (Guj)	1
Virendra R. Gandhi v. Ass 124 of 2005 dated Nove	st. CIT (Tax Appeal Nos. 20 of 2004 and ember 27, 2014)(Guj)	555
Vishnu Anant Mahajan v.	Asst. CIT [2012] 137 ITD 189 (Ahd) [SB]	60
Vodafone India Services P	P. Ltd. v. Union of India [2014] 361 ITR	
531 (Bom)		555

xxviii	ITR's Tribunal Tax Reports	[Vol. 79
Vodafone India Services P. Ltd. v. Union of India [2014] 368 ITR 1 (Bom)		PAGE
		555
Woolcombers of Ind	dia Ltd. v. CIT [1982] 134 ITR 219 (Cal)	60
Yogendra Parsad Sa 299 (All)	antosh Kumar v. CIT [2014] 44 taxmann.com	263

ITR'S TRIBUNAL TAX REPORTS

SHORT NOTES CASES

VOLUME 79 — 2020

SUBJECT INDEX OF SHORT NOTES CASES

Agricultural income—Agriculturist—Assessee owning fleet of vehicles-Not a reason to hold that assessee not earning agricultural income—Coconut trees and mango orchard on land not disputed—Agricultural income declared by assessee acceptable—Income-tax Act, 1961— VARUSAI MOHAMMED ROWTHER KAZAKAMAL v. ITO (Chennai) 1 Agricultural land—Compulsory acquisition of Exemption—Enhanced compensation—Assessee entitled to exemption—Sumesh Kumar v. ITO 2 Agriculturist—Agricultural income—Assessee owning fleet of vehicles-Not a reason to hold that assessee not earning agricultural income—Coconut trees and mango orchard on land not disputed—Agricultural income declared by assessee acceptable—VARUSAI MOHAMMED ROWTHER KAZAKAMAL v. ITO 1 (Chennai) Appeal to Appellate Tribunal—Assessee expiring after filing appeal before Commissioner (Appeals) and on day of passing of order assessee not surviving—Legal heirs of assessee not brought on record before Commissioner (Appeals)—Authorised representative continuing to appear for deceased assessee before Commissioner (Appeals)—Appeal not maintainable—Legal heir of assessee to file amended form 35 before Commissioner (Appeals) bringing legal representatives on record after intimating Commissioner (Appeals) about death of assessee—Income-tax Act, 1961—RAJAN ROY (LATE) v. ASST. CIT (Delhi) 3

Appeal to Commissioner (Appeals)—Delay of eight years in filing appeal—Condonation of delay—Assessee taking different stands in pursuing matter and giving misleading statements—Assessee not properly explaining huge time gap between different steps taken by him—Assessee not properly handling matter, resulting in delay in filing appeal—Delay not condonable—Income-tax Act, 1961—Prakash Ramachandra Prabhu v. ITO (Bangalore) . . .

27

ii

	PAGE
Application of income —Charitable purpose—Building security deposit, canteen equipment, computer system and printer, advancing loans to staff, vehicle loan and tax deduction at source payable—Assessee not having registration when Assessing Officer passed assessment order but Tribunal later restoring registration—Expenditure incurred in the nature of application of income—Deputy CIT (Exemptions) v. Cargo Handling Private Workers Pool Trust (Visakhapatnam)	38
—Charitable purpose—Determination of income—Computation under normal commercial principles—Income-tax payment—Allowable deduction towards income available for application to charitable purposes—Deputy CIT (Exemptions) v. Cargo Handling Private Workers Pool Trust (Visakhapatnam)	38
Arm's length price—See International transactions	22
Assessment—Prima facie adjustment—Intimation—Assessing Officer denying special deduction on ground return filed late—Intimation to assessee to proposed adjustment—Mandatory—No such intimation to assessee—Adjustment liable to be deleted—Income-tax Act, 1961, ss. 143(1)(a)(v), 80-IC—SMT. NEELAM PACHISIA v. DEPUTY CIT (CPC) (Bang)	14
—Revision—Jurisdiction—Assessee expiring before passing revisional order—Notice of assessment and assessment order completed in name of legal representative—Issue of notice on late assessee and consequent assessment invalid—Deverasetty Venkata Subba Rao (Late) v. ITO (Visakhapatnam)	6
Bogus purchases —Business expenditure—Unexplained expenditure—Sales effected by assessee not doubted—Assessee failing to prove source of purchases through cogent evidence—Disallowance to be made at 12.5 per cent of non-genuine purchases—Addition to be restricted to 12.5 per cent. less gross profit already declared by assessee—ITO v . JASMIN MULRAJ MEHTA (Mumbai)	9
Business expenditure —Bogus purchases—Unexplained expendi-	
ture—Sales effected by assessee not doubted—Assessee failing to prove source of purchases through cogent evidence—Disallowance to be made at 12.5 per cent of non-genuine purchases—Addition to be restricted to 12.5 per cent. less gross profit already declared by assessee—Income-tax Act, 1961, ss. 37, 69C—ITO v. Jasmin Mulraj Mehta (Mumbai)	9
—Department not doubting nature of expenses incurred—Vouchers self-made and not verifiable—Net profit earned by assessee not compared with net profit of companies engaged in similar business to establish that expenditure inflated—Addition based on surmises and conjectures—Estimated disallowance at 15 per cent. of expenditure not justified—Incometax Act, 1961, c. 37. Viana Brayani Constructions P. Ltd. 27. Viana Brayani Constructions P. Ltd. 27. June 20. 170.	

(Hyderabad) ...

GENERAL INDEX (SHORT NOTES) 2020 iii PAGE **Business expenditure** (Contd.)— -Hotel and textile business-Assessee bound to incur various expenses for smooth running of its business—Onus on assessee to prove genuineness of expenses by furnishing relevant bills and vouchers-Restriction of disallowance by ten per cent. against twenty per cent.— Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 37—R. N. SAHOO v. DEPUTY CIT (Cuttack) . . . 20 **Business income**—Capital gains—Whether assessee carrying out any activity in the nature of trade—Tests—Nothing on record to suggest that assessee carrying on business of property development—That assessee incurring expenditure on continuous basis not sufficient to conclude business intent-Income generated by assessee from sale of property taxable under head "Capital gains"—Anil Dye Chem Industries Pvt. Ltd. v. (Ahmedabad) . . . 30 Asst. CIT Business loss—Import duty—Assessee paying duty pursuant to action carried out by Department of Revenue Intelligence-Payments made out of assessee's own funds in name of assessee's proprietary concern—Other entities denying their liability and despite legal action amount eventually becoming irrecoverable for assessee—Loss incurred in course of business carried out by assessee-Non-payment of duty would have resulted in substantial losses for assessee and damaged assessee's reputation in market-Loss as business loss out of commercial expediency-Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 37—Mihir Bipin Parekh v. Deputy CIT (Mumbai) 5 Capital gains—Business income—Whether assessee carrying out any activity in the nature of trade—Tests—Nothing on record to suggest that assessee carrying on business of property development—That assessee incurring expenditure on continuous basis not sufficient to conclude business intent-Income generated by assessee from sale of property taxable under head "Capital gains"—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 48—Anil Dye CHEM INDUSTRIES PVT. LTD. v. ASST. CIT (Ahmedabad) . . . 30 -Short-term capital gains—Transfer of property with co-owners— Assessee claiming he had not received part of consideration—In the absence of receipt of sale consideration—No capital gains could be taxed—Assessing Officer to verify non-receipt of consideration—Incometax Act, 1961, s. 2(47)—Mohanrao Vishwanath Gaikwad v. ITO 42 Cash credits—Firm—Capital introduction by partners—Assessee furnishing relevant evidence—Correctness of evidence not challenged—Primary onus discharged by assessee—Addition unsustainable—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 68—R. N. SAHOO v. DEPUTY CIT (Cuttack) . . . 20 Charitable purpose—Application of income—Building security deposit, canteen equipment, computer system and printer, advancing loans to staff, vehicle loan and tax deduction at source payable—Assessee not having registration when Assessing Officer passed assessment order

but Tribunal later restoring registration—Expenditure incurred in the

iv ITR's Tribunal	TAX REPORTS	[Vol. 79)
Charitable purpose (Contd.)—		PAG	Е
nature of application of income—Income CIT (Exemptions) v . Cargo Handling I			8
——Application of income—Determina under normal commercial principles—In- deduction towards income available for poses—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 11—E CARGO HANDLING PRIVATE WORKERS PC	come-tax payment—Allowab application to charitable pu DEPUTY CIT (EXEMPTIONS)	le r-	
	(Visakhapatnam)	38	8
——Assessee following cash system of a income for purpose of application of ir account without finding any defects in account Act, 1961, s. 11—Deputy CIT (Exemptio VATE WORKERS POOL TRUST	ncome—Rejection of books of books of the come—tage of the come of	of ax ai-	Q
—Exemption—Assessee earmarking poses like hospital, and educational instit dominant object is to carry out charitable p Merely because some profit arising from a charitable character—Assessee entitled to 1961, s. 11(2)—Shree Shree Mohanan ITO (Exemption)	funds for public charitable purutions and thirthasharm—Propurpose and not to earn profitactivity—Purpose not losing its exemption—Income-tax Ac	r- e- ts et, v.	
——Exemption—Disqualification—Execution normal course of business—No violatic diversion of funds at instance of trust Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 13(1)(c)—Deput	on of provisions—Not a case of ees—Entitled to exemption- or CIT (Exemptions) v. Card	of — GO	
HANDLING PRIVATE WORKERS POOL TRU ——Registration—Assessee's existence tered address mentioned in application as to assessee to substantiate its case before and details—Matter remanded—Income-t Awas Nivas Foundation v. ITO	e disputed—Assessee's regiond on letterhead—Opportunite Commissioner with evidence	s- ty ce	
Co-operative bank—Co-operative			
Assessing Officer to conduct inquiry into far assessee to determine eligibility for deduct out of total loan disbursed by assessee only purpose or allied activities—Finding not convex examine activities of assessee afresh and compliance with activities of co-operative ala Co-operative Societies Act, 1969 a AYALUR SERVICE CO-OPERATIVE BANK LT.	tictual situation as to activities of tion—Assessing Officer finding 12.54 per cent. for agricultur onclusive—Assessing Officer to determine whether activities is society functioning under Kend to grant deduction—Tender V. ITO (Cochin)	of ng al to in r- HE	7
	uction—Co-operative bank-		
Assessing Officer to conduct inquiry into far assessee to determine eligibility for deduc out of total loan disbursed by assessee only	tion—Assessing Officer findir	ng	

2020]	General Index (Short Notes)	\mathbf{v}
Co-operative society	y (Contd.)—	PAGE
purpose or allied active examine activities of a compliance with active ala Co-operative Societa	vities—Finding not conclusive—Assessing Officer to assessee afresh and determine whether activities in rities of co-operative society functioning under Kereties Act, 1969 and to grant deduction—Income-tax HE AYALUR SERVICE CO-OPERATIVE BANK LTD. v. (Cochin)	17
in loan extracts in au agricultural loan or n details of each loan di	tion—Primary agricultural credit society—Narration adit reports—Not conclusive as to whether loan is on-agricultural loan—Assessing Officer to examine isbursement and determine purpose for which loans ax Act, 1961, s. 80P—The Sholayoor Service Coo. v. ITO (Cochin)	32
Concealment of i	ncome—See Penalty	11, 25
services in various pa discount to prepaid ca tributors on principal distributors not commarrangements with of ing no human interac- ing any managerial, technical services—A	at source—Assessee providing telecommunication rts of India under prepaid arrangement—Extending ards to distributors—Arrangement with prepaid distributors—Discount extended to prepaid hission requiring tax deduction at source—Roaming her telecommunications operators—Services requirtion or skill—Roaming charges not paid for rendertechnical or consultancy services and not fees for assessee not required to deduct tax at source—ss. 194H, 194J—VODAFONE IDEA LTD. v. ASST. CIT (Cuttack)	44
——Fees for delay source—No power in	in furnishing returns regarding deduction of tax at authority either to compute and collect any fee—6-2015—Not sustainable—Income-tax Act, 1961, s.	77
	s India P. Ltd. v. Asst. CIT, TDS (Cochin)	37
Exempt income—		18
lic charitable purposes thasharm—Predomina to earn profit—Merely not losing its charita	itable purpose—Assessee earmarking funds for pubsilike hospital, and educational institutions and thirant object is to carry out charitable purpose and not because some profit arising from activity—Purpose able character—Assessee entitled to exemption—NANANDA SAMAJ SEVA SAMITY v. ITO (EXEMPTION)	
	(Kolkata)	43
refunded in normal cocase of diversion of fu	arpose—Disqualification—Excess amount charged burse of business—No violation of provisions—Not a nds at instance of trustees—Entitled to exemption—PTIONS) v. CARGO HANDLING PRIVATE WORKERS (Visakhapatnam)	38
	cquisition of agricultural land—Enhanced compen- ntitled to exemption—Income-tax Act, 1961,	

vi ITR's Tribunal Tax Reports	[Vol. 79
Exemption (Contd.)—	PAGE
s. 10(37)—Land Acquisition Act, 1894, s. 28—Sumesh Kumar v. ITC (Delhi)) 2
Fees for delay in furnishing returns regarding deduction of tax	
source —No power in authority either to compute and collect any fe Demand prior to 1-6-2015—Not sustainable—Travel Trails India	
·	
Firm—Cash credits—Capital introduction by partners—Assessee f	
nishing relevant evidence—Correctness of evidence not challenged—l	
mary onus discharged by assessee—Addition unsustainable—R.	
SAHOO v. DEPUTY CIT (Cuttack)	
—Interest paid to partners—Assessee consistently calculating in	
est at 12 per cent. on opening balance of each assessment years—Partr	
declaring interest in their returns and assessments completed in the	
hands—Double taxation of same income both in hands of partners as was in hands of assessee—Entire exercise of Assessing Officer revenue n	
tral when he calculated interest at 12 per cent. for relevant year—Dir	
tion to Assessing Officer to rectify assessments in hands of partners—	
practicable—Interest payments deductible—Income-tax Act, 1961—S.	
GEETH NURSING HOME v. ASST. CIT (Cochin)	
Furnishing inaccurate particulars of income—See Penalty	25, 34
Hotel and textile business—Business expenditure—Assessee box	,
to incur various expenses for smooth running of its business—Onus	
assessee to prove genuineness of expenses by furnishing relevant bills a	
vouchers—Restriction of disallowance by ten per cent. against twenty	
cent.—R. N. Sahoo v. Deputy CIT (Cuttack)	
Import duty—Business loss—Assessee paying duty pursuant to act	ion
carried out by Department of Revenue Intelligence—Payments made	out
of assessee's own funds in name of assessee's proprietary concern—Ot	
entities denying their liability and despite legal action amount eventu	
becoming irrecoverable for assessee—Loss incurred in course of busin	
carried out by assessee—Non-payment of duty would have resulted	
substantial losses for assessee and damaged assessee's reputation in m	
ket—Loss as business loss out of commercial expediency—MIHIR BI PAREKH v. DEPUTY CIT (Mumbai)	
,	
Income —Disallowance of expenditure in relation to exempt incom	
Assessing Officer not recording satisfaction that assessee incur expenditure for earning dividend income—No claim made in respec-	
dividend income—No disallowance could be made—Income-tax A	
1961, s. 14A—Income-tax Rules, 1962, r. 8D—S. K. MINERALS HANDLE	
P. LTD. v. Asst. CIT (Cuttack)	
Income from other sources —Deduction of interest expendit	
against income from other sources or against business income—In eit	
case effect on total income remains same—Interest expenditure to be	

2020]	General In	dex (Short No	otes)	vii
Income from otl	her sources (Contd	.)—		PAGE
	st earned and offer e-tax Act, 1961, s. 5		RENDRA BANSAI	
have been denied parative analysis Department in las not mean that as thing in bills do bogus—Assessee	merely on consumpor without any furtest year—Assessee reseases not transferres not make purchentitled to deduction	ption of electricity ther evidence—Po not producing toli ring goods—Not nases of goods t	without any consition accepted tax receipt—D mentioning sorthrough those tot, 1961, s. 80-16	om- by oes me- bills C—
	UF) v. Asst. CIT	Onus on assesse	(Delhi)	
interest-bearing loss used notice to prest bearing loan u	orrowed capital— can not used to exter properly show cause used for advancing in Income-tax Act, 1	end interest-free to establish that ranterest-free loan-	loan—Assessee no amount of in —Assessing Off —R. N. Sahoo	not ter- icer
	to partners—Firm			
Partners declaring their hands—Dou as well as in ha revenue neutral v year—Direction to	cent. on opening of interest in their results the taxation of same and of assessee—Each of the calculated of Assessing Officer racticable—Interest of Asset CIT	turns and assessrate income both in Entire exercise of interest at 12 pe to rectify assess	nents completed hands of partress. Assessing Offer cent. for relevents in handsuctible—Sange	d in ners icer vant s of
	transactions —Tra	nsfer pricing—Ar	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Capacity utilisation deduction from its puting adjustment cent. of capacity—Officer to call for panies and there	on of comparable in profit level indicated presuming comparable. Details not available information on cappeafter compute adjusted and the compute adjusted in the comparable i	companies—As or towards capaci rable companies of e in public domai acity utilisation of ustment after shadows.	sessee entitled ity—Assessee coperated at 100 n—Transfer Price from parable contains details versions.	to per per cing pm- vith v. v.
	Assessment—Prima			
assessee to propo	deduction on grou osed adjustment—I ment liable to be d C)	Mandatory—No	such intimation	to V.
	Revision—Assessm	ent—Assessee ex	· ·	
ing revisional ord	ler—Notice of asses f legal representativ	ssment and asses	ssment order co	om-

viii	ITR's Tribunal Tax 1	Reports	[Vol. 79
Jurisdiction (Contd.)—	_		PAGE
	ment invalid—Deveraset	/T 7: 1.1	AO 6
notice—Legal heir not explore jurisdiction for dead person—No juri	of notice—Assessee expir- filing return—Right course issuing notice on legal heir isdiction in Assessing Off ncome-tax Act, 1961, s. 14 E) v. ITO	e for Assessing Officer —Service of notice upo icer to pass assessme	to on nt M-
tion to exempt incomincome assessee to incloss account—Neither particulars of income-	nent of income—Disallowane—No mandatory rule to cur any expenditure—Amore concealment of income neprendity not warranted—I AYS MANAGEMENT SERVICE	hat for earning exem unt debited in profit ar or furnishing inaccura Income-tax Act, 1961,	pt nd ite s. T
income—Penalty proc ment order penalty on in mind of Assessing C prepare his defence—	of income—Furnishing in reedings initiated under boally initiated for concealment of the	oth limbs but in asses at of income—Ambigui alty—Assessee unable itiated in such circum	ity to n- EL
Officer giving several of account but assessee a books of account got of Not tenable and not re-	naintain accounts—Reason opportunities to assessee for not producing books of accidamaged by white ants and easonable cause—Penalty I.A., 271A, 273B—SMT. SAN	or production of books count—Explanation th I hard disks corrupted- evied justified—Incom	of eat e- v.
—Furnishing inacdue to failure to dedu details relating to releving of inaccurate part expenses—Not a case allowable expense an responsibility expense ss. 37, 40(a)(i), (iii), 27, 110	ccurate particulars of incomect tax at source on paymer vant expenses—Statutory deficulars of income—Corpore that assessee disclosed of Assessing Officer founders—Penalty not leviable—71(1)(c)—Frontier Busin	ne—Expenses disallowents—Assessee disclosing is allowance not furnish rate social responsibilities as some other to be corporate social to be corporate social responses as Systems P. Ltd. (Bangalore)	ed ng h- ity er ial i1, v 34
	tion —Assessing Officer no profits declared considere		
prepared—Most of ap	plications of income direct addition not warranted—	tly linked to business	of
s 44AD—SMT HONE		(Cochin)	41

GENERAL INDEX (SHORT NOTES) 2020 ix PAGE Revision—Jurisdiction—Assessment—Assessee expiring before passing revisional order-Notice of assessment and assessment order completed in name of legal representative—Issue of notice on late assessee and consequent assessment invalid-Income-tax Act, 1961, ss. 143(2), 263—Deverasetty Venkata Subba Rao (Late) v. ITO (Visakhapatnam) . . . 6 **Search and seizure**—Suppression of income—Excess consumption of x-ray films—No basis for estimation of suppression of x-rays—Addition not based upon any material or evidence—No allegation that no receipts were issued or of any suppression of receipts—Addition not sustainable— Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 132A—Mewar Hospital Pvt. Ltd. v. Asst. **CIT** (Jodhpur) . . . 12 -Undisclosed income—No claim of discount and addition based on estimated discounts—No case of suppression of receipts—Disallowance not warranted-If receipts shown net of discount receipts they could not be said to be not verifiable as receipts directly linked to corresponding receipts—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 132A—Mewar Hospital Pvt. Ltd. v. Asst. CIT (Jodhpur) 12 Short-term capital gains—Transfer of property with co-owners— Assessee claiming he had not received part of consideration—In the absence of receipt of sale consideration—No capital gains could be taxed—Assessing Officer to verify non-receipt of consideration—Mohan-RAO VISHWANATH GAIKWAD v. ITO (Pune) 42 **Special deduction**—Co-operative society—Co-operative bank— Assessing Officer to conduct inquiry into factual situation as to activities of assessee to determine eligibility for deduction—Assessing Officer finding out of total loan disbursed by assessee only 12.54 per cent. for agricultural purpose or allied activities-Finding not conclusive-Assessing Officer to examine activities of assessee afresh and determine whether activities in compliance with activities of co-operative society functioning under Kerala Co-operative Societies Act, 1969 and to grant deduction—The AYALUR SERVICE CO-OPERATIVE BANK LTD. v. ITO (Cochin) . . . 17 -Co-operative society—Primary agricultural credit society—Narration in loan extracts in audit reports—Not conclusive as to whether loan is agricultural loan or non-agricultural loan—Assessing Officer to examine details of each loan disbursement and determine purpose for which loans disbursed—The Sholayoor Service Co-operative Bank Ltd. v. ITO (Cochin) 32 —Industrial undertaking—Deduction could not have been denied merely on consumption of electricity without any comparative analysis or without any further evidence-Position accepted by Department in last

year—Assessee not producing toll tax receipt—Does not mean that assessee not transferring goods—Not mentioning something in bills does not

x ITR's T	ribunal Tax Repo	PRTS	[Vol. 79
Special deduction (Contd.)—			PAGE
make purchases of goods throug deduction—Bharat Sons (HUI		Assessee entitled to (Delhi)	
Suppression of income —Sea x-ray films—No basis for estimation not based upon any material or were issued or of any suppression MEWAR HOSPITAL PVT. LTD. v.	ation of suppression of evidence—No allegat n of receipts—Additio	of x-rays—Addition ion that no receipt	n s -
Transfer of property with			
capital gains—Assessee claiming tion—In the absence of receipt could be taxed—Assessing Office MOHANRAO VISHWANATH GAIL	of sale consideration er to verify non-receip	—No capital gain	s -
Transfer pricing—See Inter		,	. 22
Undisclosed income—Search addition based on estimated receipts—Disallowance not warr receipts they could not be said linked to corresponding receipts CIT	h and seizure—No cla discounts—No case anted—If receipts sho to be not verifiable	nim of discount and of suppression o own net of discoun as receipts directly	f t y
Unexplained expenditure	—Business expendi	ture—Bogus pur	-
chases—Sales effected by assesses source of purchases through cog at 12.5 per cent of non-genuine 12.5 per cent. less gross profit al	gent evidence—Disallo purchases—Additior	owance to be made to be restricted to	e O
min Mulraj Mehta		(Mumbai)	. 9

End of Volume 79

SECTIONWISE INDEX OF SHORT NOTES CASES

ACTS:

Income-tax Act, 1961:

S. 2(47) —Capital gains—Short-term capital gains—Transfer of property with co-owners—Assessee claiming he had not received part of consideration—In the absence of receipt of sale consideration—No capital gains could be taxed—Assessing Officer to verify non-receipt of consideration—No capital gains could be taxed—Assessing Officer to verify non-receipt of consideration.	40
eration—Mohanrao Vishwanath Gaikwad v. ITO (Pune) S. 10(37) —Exemption—Compulsory acquisition of agricultural land—Enhanced compensation—Assessee entitled to exemption—Sumesh Kumar v. ITO (Delhi)	42
S. 11 —Charitable purpose—Application of income—Building security deposit, canteen equipment, computer system and printer, advancing loans to staff, vehicle loan and tax deduction at source payable—Assessee not having registration when Assessing Officer passed assessment order but Tribunal later restoring registration—Expenditure incurred in the nature of application of income—Deputy CIT (Exemptions) v. Cargo	
Handling Private Workers Pool Trust (Visakhapatnam)	38
Private Workers Pool Trust (Visakhapatnam)	38
Workers Pool Trust (Visakhapatnam)	38
(EXEMPTION) (Kolkata)	43
FOUNDATION v. ITO (Bangalore) S. 13(1)(c) —Charitable purpose—Exemption—Disqualification—Excess amount charged refunded in normal course of business—No violation of provisions—Not a case of diversion of funds at instance of trustees—Entitled to exemption—Deputy CIT (Exemptions) v. Cargo	26
HANDLING PRIVATE WORKERS POOL TRUST (Visakhapatnam)	38

xii

PAGE

S. 14A—Income—Disallowance of expenditure in relation to exempt income—Assessing Officer not recording satisfaction that assessee incurred expenditure for earning dividend income-No claim made in respect of dividend income—No disallowance could be made—S. K. MIN-ERALS HANDLING P. LTD. v. ASST. CIT (Cuttack) 18 S. 36(1)(iii)—Interest on borrowed capital—Onus on assessee to establish that interest-bearing loan not used to extend interest-free loan—Assessee not issued notice to properly show cause to establish that no amount of interest bearing loan used for advancing interest-free loan—Assessing Officer to decide afresh—R. N. SAHOO v. DEPUTY CIT 20 (Cuttack) 37—Business expenditure—Bogus purchases—Unexplained expenditure—Sales effected by assessee not doubted—Assessee failing to prove source of purchases through cogent evidence—Disallowance to be made at 12.5 per cent of non-genuine purchases-Addition to be restricted to 12.5 per cent. less gross profit already declared by assessee— ITO v. Jasmin Mulraj Mehta (Mumbai) —Business expenditure—Department not doubting nature of expenses incurred—Vouchers self-made and not verifiable—Net profit earned by assessee not compared with net profit of companies engaged in similar business to establish that expenditure inflated—Addition based on surmises and conjectures—Estimated disallowance at 15 per cent. of expenditure not justified—Vijaya Bhavani Constructions P. Ltd. v. (Hyderabad) 24 -Business expenditure-Hotel and textile business-Assessee bound to incur various expenses for smooth running of its business-Onus on assessee to prove genuineness of expenses by furnishing relevant bills and vouchers-Restriction of disallowance by ten per cent. against twenty per cent.—R. N. Sahoo v. Deputy CIT (Cuttack) . . . 20 -Business loss-Import duty-Assessee paying duty pursuant to action carried out by Department of Revenue Intelligence—Payments made out of assessee's own funds in name of assessee's proprietary concern—Other entities denying their liability and despite legal action amount eventually becoming irrecoverable for assessee—Loss incurred in course of business carried out by assessee—Non-payment of duty would have resulted in substantial losses for assessee and damaged assessee's reputation in market—Loss as business loss out of commercial expediency—Mihir Bipin Parekh v. Deputy CIT (Mumbai) 5 -Penalty-Furnishing inaccurate particulars of income-Expenses disallowed due to failure to deduct tax at source on payments—Assessee disclosing details relating to relevant expenses—Statutory disallowance not furnishing of inaccurate particulars of income—Corporate social responsibility expenses—Not a case that assessee disclosed expenses as some other allowable expense and Assessing Officer found to be corporate social responsibility expenses—Penalty not leviable—Frontier Busi-

NESS SYSTEMS P. LTD. v. ITO

(Bangalore) . . .

2020]	General Index (Short	г Notes)	xiii
			PAGE
income—Expense payments—Asse Statutory disalled—Corporate soc closed expenses found to be cor	(iii)—Penalty—Furnishing ina ses disallowed due to failure to dessee disclosing details relating owance not furnishing of inaccura rial responsibility expenses—Not a as some other allowable expens porate social responsibility exper	deduct tax at source on to relevant expenses— te particulars of income a case that assessee dis- e and Assessing Officer ases—Penalty not levia-	
	Business Systems P. Ltd. v. ITO	. 0	34
Assessing Office books of accountion that books rupted—Not ter	enalty—Failure to maintain accour r giving several opportunities to as t but assessee not producing book of account got damaged by white hable and not reasonable cause—I	ssessee for production of ks of account—Explana- ants and hard disks cor- Penalty levied justified—	46
——Presump cash balance an prepared—Most	etrra Pattnaik v. ITO otive taxation—Assessing Officer 1 d only profits declared considered of applications of income direct ed—Addition not warranted—Sm	d as inflow in cash flow ly linked to business of	46
out any activity gest that assess assessee incurring	tal gains—Business income—Wh in the nature of trade—Tests—No ee carrying on business of prope ng expenditure on continuous bas intent—Income generated by ass	othing on record to sug- erty development—That sis not sufficient to con-	41
	der head "Capital gains"—ÂNIL		30
iture against inc either case effect set off against in	ncome from other sources—Deductione from other sources or again on total income remains same—Interest earned and offered under harendra Bansal v. Deputy C	ction of interest expend- nst business income—In interest expenditure to be ead "Income from other	8
see furnishing	credits—Firm—Capital introducti relevant evidence—Correctness y onus discharged by assessee—A Deputy CIT	of evidence not chal-	20
expenditure—Sa prove source of made at 12.5 restricted to 12.5	usiness expenditure—Bogus pales effected by assessee not doub purchases through cogent evidence cent of non-genuine purchases profit already MULRAJ MEHTA	ted—Assessee failing to ace—Disallowance to be hases—Addition to be	9
puted—Assessed letterhead—Opp Commissioner	aritable purpose—Registration—Ae's registered address mentioned portunity to assessee to substawith evidence and details—Ma	I in application and on antiate its case before	
Nivas Founda	гіоn v. ITO	(Bangalore)	26

xiv	ITR's Tribunal Tax Reports	[Vol. 79
		PAGI
ing Officer denying spe mation to assessee to p	ent—Prima facie adjustment—Intimation—Assessecial deduction on ground return filed late—Intoroposed adjustment—Mandatory—No such intadjustment liable to be deleted—Smt. Neela:	i- i-
PACHISIA v. DEPUTY C	, ,	
have been denied merel parative analysis or wit Department in last year- mean that assessee not bills does not make pure	taking—Special deduction—Deduction could not on consumption of electricity without any contribution and further evidence—Position accepted be a case of producing toll tax receipt—Does not transferring goods—Not mentioning something in chases of goods through those bills bogus—Asses	n- oy ot in s-
	n—Bharat Sons (HUF) v. Asst. CIT (Delhi)	
bank—Assessing Officer ities of assessee to dete finding out of total loan cultural purpose or all Officer to examine acti activities in compliance under Kerala Co-operati	tive society—Special deduction—Co-operative to conduct inquiry into factual situation as to active training eligibility for deduction—Assessing Office disbursed by assessee only 12.54 per cent. for agricular activities—Finding not conclusive—Assessirativities of assessee afresh and determine whether with activities of co-operative society functioning ve Societies Act, 1969 and to grant deduction—Teperative Bank Ltd. v. ITO (Cochin)	v- er i- ng er ng IE
credit society—Narratio as to whether loan is ag Officer to examine deta	ociety—Special deduction—Primary agricultur n in loan extracts in audit reports—Not conclusiv ricultural loan or non-agricultural loan—Assessir ils of each loan disbursement and determine pur disbursed—The Sholayoor Service Co-opera	re ng r-
TIVE BANK LTD. v. ITC		
price—Capacity utilisate to deduction from its promputing adjustment proper cent. of capacity—Pricing Officer to call for companies and thereafted	nal transactions—Transfer pricing—Arm's lengtion of comparable companies—Assessee entitle profit level indicator towards capacity—Assesse presuming comparable companies operated at 10 Details not available in public domain—Transfer information on capacity utilisation of comparable compute adjustment after sharing details with NDIA) PVT. LTD. v. ITO (Bangalore)	ed ee 00 er le th
,	nd seizure—Suppression of income—Excess cor	
sumption of x-ray films— Addition not based upo receipts were issued or	—No basis for estimation of suppression of x-rays- n any material or evidence—No allegation that r of any suppression of receipts—Addition not su- PITAL PVT. LTD. v. Asst. CIT (Jodhpur)	— 10 S-
and addition based on receipts—Disallowance receipts they could not	ure—Undisclosed income—No claim of discourtiestimated discounts—No case of suppression on the warranted—If receipts shown net of discourties to be said to be not verifiable as receipts directly receipts— Mewar Hospital Pvt. Ltd. v. Ass	of nt ly

(Jodhpur) ...

Subba Rao (Late) v. ITO

GENERAL INDEX (SHORT NOTES) 2020 XVPAGE **S. 142(1)**—Notice—Service of notice—Assessee expiring before service of notice—Legal heir not filing return—Right course for Assessing Officer to explore jurisdiction for issuing notice on legal heir—Service of notice upon dead person-No jurisdiction in Assessing Officer to pass assessment order on legal heir—Keshavlal Somnath Panchal (late) 15 S. 143(1)(a)(v)—Assessment—Prima facie adjustment—Intimation— Assessing Officer denying special deduction on ground return filed late— Intimation to assessee to proposed adjustment—Mandatory—No such intimation to assessee—Adjustment liable to be deleted—Smt. Neelam PACHISIA v. DEPUTY CIT (CPC) 14 **S. 143(2)**—Revision—Jurisdiction—Assessment—Assessee expiring before passing revisional order—Notice of assessment and assessment order completed in name of legal representative—Issue of notice on late assessee and consequent assessment invalid—Deverasetty Venkata Subba Rao (Late) v. ITO (Visakhapatnam) 6 S. 194H—Deduction of tax at source—Assessee providing telecommunication services in various parts of India under prepaid arrangement—Extending discount to prepaid cards to distributors—Arrangement with prepaid distributors on principal-to-principal basis—Discount extended to prepaid distributors not commission requiring tax deduction at source—Roaming arrangements with other telecommunications operators—Services requiring no human interaction or skill—Roaming charges not paid for rendering any managerial, technical or consultancy services and not fees for technical services—Assessee not required to deduct tax at source—Vodafone Idea Ltd. v. Asst. CIT (TDS) (Cuttack) 44 S. 194J—Deduction of tax at source—Assessee providing telecommunication services in various parts of India under prepaid arrangement— Extending discount to prepaid cards to distributors—Arrangement with prepaid distributors on principal-to-principal basis—Discount extended to prepaid distributors not commission requiring tax deduction at source— Roaming arrangements with other telecommunications operators—Services requiring no human interaction or skill—Roaming charges not paid for rendering any managerial, technical or consultancy services and not fees for technical services—Assessee not required to deduct tax at source—Vodafone Idea Ltd. v. Asst. CIT (TDS) S. 234E—Deduction of tax at source—Fees for delay in furnishing returns regarding deduction of tax at source—No power in authority either to compute and collect any fee—Demand prior to 1-6-2015—Not sustainable—Travel Trails India P. Ltd. v. Asst. CIT, TDS (Cochin) . . . 37 **263**—Revision—Jurisdiction—Assessment—Assessee before passing revisional order—Notice of assessment and assessment order completed in name of legal representative—Issue of notice on late assessee and consequent assessment invalid—Deverasetty Venkata

(Visakhapatnam) . . .

xvi ITR's	Γribunal Tax Repo	ORTS	[Vol.	79
			P	AGE
S. 271(1)(c) —Penalty—Co expenses in relation to exempt i ing exempt income assessee to i profit and loss account—Neith inaccurate particulars of income Management Service P. Ltd.	ncome—No mandator ncur any expenditure– er concealment of inc e—Penalty not warran	y rule that for earn –Amount debited i ome nor furnishin	n g s	11
——Penalty—Concealment culars of income—Penalty procassessment order penalty only Ambiguity in mind of Assessing see unable to prepare his defendircumstances—SMT. VIMALAB	eedings initiated under initiated for concea g Officer while impos: ce—No penalty could	er both limbs but i lment of income- ing penalty—Asses	n h	25
—Penalty—Furnishing inadisallowed due to failure to decidisclosing details relating to renot furnishing of inaccurate responsibility expenses—Not a some other allowable expense rate social responsibility expense.	luct tax at source on pelevant expenses—Sta particulars of income case that assessee di and Assessing Officer	payments—Assessed tutory disallowand e—Corporate social sclosed expenses a found to be corporate Busile—Frontier Busi	e e al s -	24
S. 271A —Penalty—Failure the Assessing Officer giving several of books of account but assessed nation that books of account growing corrupted—Not tenable and not be a several property.	l opportunities to asse e not producing books ot damaged by white ot reasonable cause—	essee for productions of account—Expla ants and hard disk	n .s	34
fied—SMT. SANGHAMITRA PAT S. 273B —Penalty—Failure t Assessing Officer giving severa of books of account but assesse nation that books of account ge corrupted—Not tenable and no fied—SMT. SANGHAMITRA PAT	o maintain accounts— I opportunities to asse e not producing books of damaged by white of reasonable cause—	essee for production of account—Explanates and hard disk	n .s	46
Land Acquisition Act, 189		(Cuttack)	•	40
S. 28 —Exemption—Compute Enhanced compensation—Ass Kumar v. ITO RULES:	alsory acquisition of	xemption—Sumes:		2
Income-tax Rules, 1962 :				
R. 8D —Income—Disallowa income—Assessing Officer no incurred expenditure for earning respect of dividend income—No ERALS HANDLING P. LTD. v. A	ot recording satisfac ng dividend income— o disallowance could b	tion that assesse -No claim made i	e n I -	18

End of Volume 79

ITR'S TRIBUNAL TAX REPORTS

VOLUME 79 — 2020

SUBJECT INDEX

Accounting—Rejection of books of account—General principles— Suppression of sales—Low gross profit rate—No evidence that assessee by making sale at price lower than cost of purchase received some consideration without recording sales in books of account—No enquiry by Assessing Officer from parties to ascertain whether assessee sold goods at price lower than purchase price—No comparable cases showing market price more than price assessee sold goods—No defect in stock statement, purchase and sales, bank statement furnished by assessee—Rejection of books on account of suppression of sales—Not justified—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 145(3)—PANCHSHIL EXIM P. LTD. v. DEPUTY CIT (Rajkot) . . . 472 **Accrual of income**—Deduction of tax at source—Non-resident—Taxability in India—Royalty—International celebrity appearance—Whole purpose of organising India centric event at Dubai was to benefit Indian business—Target audience in India, potential customers in India, intended benefits in India-Income accruing or arising in India by reason of business connection in India-Assessee bound to withhold taxes from payment to celebrity—Volkswagen Finance P. Ltd. v. ITO (Mumbai). . . 447 Actual cost—Depreciation—Acquisition of trade mark—Revaluation of trade mark—Department not producing approval from Joint Commissioner—Explanation 3 to section 43(1) not attracted—PIK Studios P. LTD. v. DEPUTY CIT (Mumbai) 533 **Additional depreciation**—Depreciation—Coffee making machine, vending machine and express kiosks used for converting raw coffee beans into liquid coffee fit for human consumption-Manufacturing activity-Assessee entitled to additional depreciation—Deputy CIT v. Coffee Day GLOBAL LTD. (Bang) . . . 322 Amortisation of demerger expenses—Business expenditure—

Demerger—Amortisation of demerger expenses allowable in hands of parent company and not resultant company—Assessee not entitled to deduction—Asst. CIT v. NIIT Technologies Ltd. (Delhi) . . .

G-79-ii

XV111	ITR'S TRIBUNAL TAX RE	PORTS	[VOL. 79
			PAGE
assessee during rem and supervisory offi Commissioner (App Assessing Officer—	llate Tribunal —Assessing Office and proceeding—Stand taken over in remand proceeding is stated beals) deciding issue in view No infirmity in order on issale. Phoenix Lamps Ltd.	by Assessing Offand of Department of remand reportue—Income-tax	ficer nt— t of
stances created owir	ent of orders—Time limit for- ng to spread of coronavirus—On come-tax (Appellate Tribunal) F LTD.	der passed after t	rime 5)—
not withdrawing applicating revision applicating imposed upon assess	missioner (Appeals)—Appeala peal filed before Commissioner (ation—Revision not justified v see—Commissioner (Appeals) t Act, 1961, s. 246А—Dісјам L	(Appeals) and also when pending—(to adjudicate issue	o fil- Cost
Arm's length pr	ice—See International tran		. 222, 295, 364, 555, 656
143(2) for commend Assessing Officer—labeyond period of lininitio and liable to b Kumar v. Asst. CI		by non-jurisdiction Officer issuing no essment order voice 61, s. 143(2)—MA (Delhi)	onal otice l ab NOJ 158
Assessment of t	hird person—See Internatio	NAL TRANSACTIO	ns 607
evidence—Assessee	rnment agencies and other partito provide all required details 1—Asst. CIT v. NIIT TECHNO	in respect of deb	tary ts—
allowance—Provisio by assessee for rele and loss account sur	r bad and doubtful debts—Conn must be actually debited in power previous year—Assessee rong towards provision for bad and a—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 36(1)	ndition precedent rofit and loss acco not debiting its pa I doubtful debts—	ount rofit Not T v.
	ransactions—See Internation	. 0.	
-8			364, 656
by assessee in profit	—Business expenditure—Figure and loss account matching figure and value added tax return fil	ares certified by S	ales

2020]	General Index	xix
Bogus purchase (Contd.)—		PAGE
	is of earlier tentative figure shown by assesent—Pabitra Banerjee v . ITO (Cuttack)	480
Officer satisfied with book resu No specific defects pointed ou	tion of—Fall in net profit rate—Assessing alts produced during remand proceedings—at in books of account—No reason to apply assessee—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 145—acages Ltd. (Delhi)	133
by assessee in profit and loss Tax Department and value ad tion could be made on basis of as per Sales Tax Departmen BANERJEE v. ITO	ogus purchase—Figures of purchase shown account matching figures certified by Sales ded tax return filed by assessee—No addiof earlier tentative figure shown by assessee t—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 37—Pabitra (Cuttack)	480
lease rental charges for period to relevant year will be one-nin to be treated as pre-paid advaninetieth of amount every year expenditure—Income-tax Act,	renditure—Composite one-time payment of of 90 years—Liability of lease rent relatable netieth of amount paid and balance amount ance rent—Assessee entitled to claim one-till period of lease of 90 years as revenue 1961—Asst. CIT v. NIIT TECHNOLOGIES	(0)
contribution under arrangem dence to show that under instr- ident fund from billing amoun bution to provident fund of provident fund from bill raises bution to provident fund aut	(Delhi)	60
hands of parent company and	(Cuttack)	480
State Insurance contribution—that amount deposited before fied—Income-tax Act, 1961, s ITO ——Disallowance—Paymen	ion only on actual payment—Employees' -Assessee not producing evidence to show furnishing its return—Disallowance justi 43B—SATERN GRIHA NIRMAN P. LTD. v. (Kolkata) ints in cash exceeding specified limit—Duty particular payees incorporated in their books	359
	respective sales—Assessee purchasing gold	

XX

ITR's Tribunal Tax Reports

[Vol. 79

Business expenditure (Contd.)—	PAGE
ornaments and parties having banking facilities—Assessee making cash payment in different dates—Assessee inserting some entries in his books with support of some internal vouchers and complete bills and vouchers not produced before Department—Disallowance justified—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 40A(3)—Income-tax Rules, 1962, r. 6DD(j), (k)—RAJENDRA KUMAR SAHOO v. ASST. CIT (Cuttack)	10
——Disallowance—Payments liable to deduction of tax at source—Assessee exhibiting films and making payments to distributor—Revenue shared between theatre owner and film distributor—Neither contractual payment nor rent payment—Tax deduction at source provisions not applicable—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 40(a)(ia)—Sri Parameswari Projects P. Ltd. v. ITO (Visakhapatnam)	529
——Disallowance—Payments liable to deduction of tax at source—Tax not deducted at source from interest payments on basis of form 15G or 15H obtained from depositors—No disallowance merely forms not submitted before Commissioner—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 40(a)(ia)—Joint CIT v. Karnataka Vikas Grameena Bank (Bang)	207
——Interest on borrowed capital—Interest expenses on amount borrowed for purpose of giving intercorporate deposit to its subsidiary—Investment in group company for strategic purpose and not for earning dividend—Interest expenses allowable—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 36(1)(iii)—ESSAR SHIPPING LTD. v. ASST. CIT (Mumbai)	555
——Interest on borrowed capital—Till asset for which loan borrowed put to use, interest not allowable—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 36(1)(iii)— DEPUTY CIT v. COFFEE DAY GLOBAL LTD. (Bang)	322
—Loss on account of fluctuation in rate of foreign exchange—Assessee consistently following mercantile system of accounting—Foreign exchange loss due to reinstatement of accounts at end of financial year and on repayment of borrowings similar to interest expenditure—Allowable—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 37—Deputy CIT v. Coffee Day Global	
Ltd. (Bang) —Prior period expenses—Interest for delayed payment of pole rental charges—Not prior period expenses but compensatory in nature—Deductible—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 37—Deputy CIT v. Asianet Satellite Communications Ltd. (Cochin)	322 695
——Shipping business—Tonnage tax scheme—Tonnage and non-tonnage activity—Common interest expenditure—To be apportioned on basis of cost of financing and not on basis of turnover—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 37—ESSAR SHIPPING LTD. v. ASST. CIT (Mumbai)	555
Business income—Shipping business—Tonnage tax scheme—Ton-	
nage income not form part of normal business income—Income-tax Act, 1961—ESSAR SHIPPING LTD. v. ASST. CIT (Mumbai)	555

xxi

2020

PAGE Capital gains—Long-term capital gains—Exemption—Sale of capital asset and purchase of residential property-Amount deposited in capital gains accounts scheme before filing of return under section 139(4)—Entitled to exemption—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 54F—Renu Jain v. ITO (Jaipur) 621 -Long-term capital gains—Short-term capital gains—Financial asset—Meaning of—Period of holding of asset—Assessee acquiring brand name of transferor company and other assets under scheme of amalgamation—Assets not financial assets—Assessee selling its brand name, trade mark, packaging design and know-how and product intangibles and marketing intangibles—Transfer of intangible assets with right to carry on business—Holding period should be determined including period of holding of previous owner, i. e., amalgamating company—No transfer taking place on appointed date of amalgamation—Period of holding much more than 36 months—Receipt taxable as long-term capital gains—Income-tax Act, 1961, ss. 2(42A), 49(1)—Asst. CIT v. Feroke Boards Ltd. Capital or revenue expenditure—Business expenditure—Composite one-time payment of lease rental charges for period of 90 years—Liability of lease rent relatable to relevant year will be one-ninetieth of amount paid and balance amount to be treated as pre-paid advance rent—Assessee entitled to claim one-ninetieth of amount every year till period of lease of 90 years as revenue expenditure—Asst. CIT v. NIIT Technologies 60 (Delhi) ... -Expenditure on setting up of new outlets an expansion of existing business-Expenditure on salary and conveyance revenue in nature-Allowable—Income-tax Act, 1961—Deputy CIT v. Coffee Day Global LTD. 322 (Bang) . . . Cash credits—Tax savings investment—Special deduction—Assessee not able to produce sufficient evidence to justify claim—Financial strain and nature of additions considered—Assessing Officer to consider afresh—Sanjeeva Reddy Paga v. ITO 439 (Hyderabad) -Share premium—Assessee purchasing land and venturing into project for construction of multistoried residential project and paying huge amount to collaborator—Premium paid by shareholders not without proper reasons—Worth of assessee at time of issue of shares not negative-Assessing Officer not disputing identity and creditworthiness of shareholders and genuineness of transaction-No unexplained cash credit—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 68—Deputy CIT v. International LAND AND DEVELOPERS P. LTD. 441 (Delhi) . . . Charitable purpose—Exemption—Assessee providing facilities to tourists and pilgrims coming to Kurukshetra throughout year—Maintain-

GENERAL INDEX

xxii	ITR's Tribunal Tax Re	PORTS	[Vol. 79
ing support for celebra Maintaining and oper mercial element invol	storical places in and around lation of Gita Jayanti at Brahm ating Krishna Museum at Kuved in activities—Entitled to JOINT CIT (OSD) (EXEMPTIO	Sarovar every year- urukshetra—No con exemption—Incom	— n- e- RA
	, ıachine —Depreciation—Addi	· ·	
Coffee making machi converting raw coffee tion—Manufacturing	ne, vending machine and ex beans into liquid coffee fit a activity—Assessee entitled to COFFEE DAY GLOBAL LTD.	press kiosks used f for human consum additional depreci	or o-
of property—Part of retaxing his income but accruing to assessee—	rch and seizure—Assessment cords found during search use other documents clearly sugge Assessing Officer not examinities in paid by them to assess TTAL v. DEPUTY CIT	ed against assessee f esting no such incon ing buyers of proper	or ne ty s-
Comparable comp	anies—See International	TRANSACTIONS .	364
Concealment of in	ncome—See Penalty	28	0, 386, 419
	See Search and se	IZURE .	386
Royalty—Accrual of ir purpose of organising business—Target audi benefits in India—Inco ness connection in In ment to celebrity—Inc	at source—Non-resident—necome—International celebrity. India centric event at Dubai ence in India, potential customome accruing or arising in India—Assessee bound to with tome-tax Act, 1961, ss. 5, 9(1) eement between India and T. P. L.T.D. 7. ITO	y appearance—Who was to benefit India ners in India, intende dia by reason of bus shold taxes from pa (i), 195—Double Ta	lle an si- y- x-
——Payments liab see exhibiting films an between theatre owne nor rent payment—Ta	le to Business expenditure—led making payments to distributer and film distributor—Neithent deduction at source provisuojects P. Ltd. v. ITO	Disallowance—Asse utor—Revenue share r contractual payme ions not applicable	s- ed nt
——Payments liabliture—Disallowance—on basis of form 15G of	e to deduction of tax at source fr Tax not deducted at source fr or 15H obtained from deposit mitted before Commissioner	ce—Business expend om interest payment ors—No disallowan	d- ts ce r-
Statement of t	ax deducted at source—Amer in furnishing statement broug	ndment enabling le	vy

2020]	General Index		xxiii
statement of tax deduc-	in nature—Levy of late feted at source before amenda 961, ss. 200A, 234E—Oswa	ment—Not sustaina-	PAGE 426
Deduction only on lowance—Employees' Sducing evidence to sho	actual payment—Business State Insurance contribution ow that amount deposited astified—SATERN GRIHA NIR	expenditure—Disal-—Assessee not probefore furnishing its	359
	–Advances given for busin puty CIT v. Internationa		441
	s expenditure—Amortisatinands of parent company and itled to deduction—Asst. Cl	d not resultant com-	60
of trade mark—Department of trade mark—Departm	al cost—Acquisition of tradenent not producing approval to section 43(1) not attract—PIK Studios P. Ltd. v . D	from Joint Commis- ed—Income-tax Act,	533
machine and express kid uid coffee fit for human	oreciation—Coffee making osks used for converting raw consumption—Manufacturing preciation—Income-tax Act, Day Global Ltd.	machine, vending coffee beans into liq-ng activity—Assessee	322
——Modem is an into of depreciation at 60 per	tegral part of a computer—E cent.—Income-tax Act, 1961 Communications Ltd.	ligible for higher rate	695
incurred and not on rev applicable for predecess item—Total amount of assessee would be entitled	evaluation—Depreciation to aluation figure—Rate and an or would be amount of depreciation cannot exceed ced if succession had not take TUDIOS P. LTD. v. DEPUTY (nount of depreciation eciation allowable on lepreciation to which en place—Income-tax	533
	dividend—Advances gi d dividend—Income-tax Ac ational Land and Develo		441
	relief —Non-resident—Sala espect of employment rende	ry and allowances	-111

xxiv ITF	a's Tribunal Tax Repor	TS [Vol. 79
dered in Austria and not receiving money in India— Not a reason not to grant l	ontd.)— sessee liable to tax in Austria in India—Entitled to exemp Non-production of tax resid benefit of Double Taxation A ASA REDDY CHEEMALAMAR	otion—No bar to lency certificate— Avoidance Agree) -
_	condary and higher educ	Hyderabad) cation cess—See	è
Disallowance—Deduction of ing evidence to show that an	rance contribution—Busine nly on actual payment—Asse nount deposited before furni TERN GRIHA NIRMAN P. LTI	essee not produc- shing its return—	-
sion—No change in busine could be assessed to tax only	—Assessee a milk supplier ss for earlier and subsequer y on real income and not on mated at seven per cent.—GAR v. ITO	nt year—Assessee any estimation of	- 2 r
Exempt income —See In	NCOME	1,	322., 585
asset and purchase of resid gains accounts scheme befortled to exemption—Renu J——Charitable purposepilgrims coming to Kuruksl serving historical places in for celebration of Gita Jayar and operating Krishna Mussinvolved in activities—Entit	—Assessee providing facilitienetra throughout year—Main and around Kurukshetra—Inti at Brahm Sarovar every yeum at Kurukshetra—No corled to exemption—Joint Cl'	posited in capita ion 139(4)—Enti- (Jaipur) es to tourists and pre- Providing suppor ear—Maintaining mmercial elemen T (OSD) (EXEMP	1
export oriented units of ass books of account as a ne Export oriented units eligi	entity and independent exi- essee—No requirement to recessary pre-condition for cluble for exemption—Exempt ration of gross total income—	maintain separate aiming benefit— tion allowable a	e e t
	up of new outlets an expan	, ,	
business—Capital or rever	nue expenditure—Expenditure—Allowable—Deputy CI	re on salary and	l

2020]	GENERAL INDEX		XXV
			PAGE
Export —Exemption—Sepa eligible export oriented units separate books of account as a fit—Export oriented units eligisource and not after compute NIIT TECHNOLOGIES LTD.	of assessee—No require necessary pre-condition to ble for exemption—Exem	ment to maintain for claiming beneption allowable at	60
Fees for technical serv			
pricing—Arm's length price—foreign banks for money borr of corporate guarantee not stancy—Corporate guarantee fe services—JCDECAUX S. A. v.	owed by its associated en ervices of managerial, tec ee received by assessee no	terprise—Services chnical or consul-	222
——International transactorice—Management services to viding entire correspondence to the correspondence of the		Assessee not pro-	
ciated enterprise—Assessee to			
in support of services rendere correspondence in respect o			
decide afresh—JCDECAUX S.			222
——International transactorice—Secondment of employagreement between expatrial		iated enterprise—	
assessee of social security con			
ment by associated enterpris	e—Assessing Officer to	verify agreements	202
and decide issue—JCDECAUX			222
Furnishing inaccurate pa			280, 386
Housing project—Specia pletion certificate to be obtain pletion of project—Completio Assessee not entitled to deduc plan road acquired by munic land area of project—Income-Shewale and Sons	ned from municipal corpo n certificate not obtained tion in respect of those flatipal ipal corporation not be re-	oration after com- for certain flats— ats—Development educed from total	310
	terest on bank deposits—	, ,	
of interest not business of a investment in bank deposits—of transfer fees received by a received for delay in payment ness of assessee of developing Disallowance in respect of in	ssessee of developing ho -Not eligible for deduction ssessee for apartment boo against flat—Direct conr housing project—Eligibl	ousing project but n—Income by way bking and interest nection with busi- le for deduction—	
Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 80-I		irman P. Ltd. v.	250
ITO		(Kolkata)	359

xxvi	ITR's Tribunal Tax Ref	PORTS	[Vol. 79
			PAGE
No exempt income re	ance of expenditure in relation received by assessee during yea Act, 1961, s. 14A—Income-tax Industries Ltd.	ar—Disallowance no	ot -
exempt income in rele	of expenditure in relation to exect evant previous year—No disall come-tax Rules, 1962, r. 8D(2)	owance—Income-ta	x).
ing Officer expressing incurred for earning entree funds to invest Administrative expensions of expenses—Restimation—Income-tage	of expenditure relating to exemption of assessee's claxempt income—Assessee having in mutual funds—Disallowards incurred for earning exemplestriction of disallowance at 0.5 ax Act, 1961, s. 14A—Income IT TECHNOLOGIES LTD.	aim that no expense ng sufficient interest nce to be deleted– ot income—No bifur 5 per cent. reasonabl	es e r.
income exempt from tance can be made—.	of expenditure relating to eax received in relevant previou Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 14A EPUTY CIT v. COFFEE DAY GL	s year—No disallow —Income-tax Rules	5,
fer of shares in forei from Indian subsidiar treated as resident in not be regarded as tra dition of shares transfer ident of contracting Taxation Avoidance A visions of Agreement— able only in contraction transferor of shares, a taxable in Belgium and	gn company—Shares deriving y—Deeming fiction—Foreign India—Transfer of shares of heansfer of shares of heansfer of shares of its Indian serred to form part of capital storagreement—Provisions of Actu-Gains derived from alienationing State of which alienator is resident of Belgium—Gains frod not in India—Addition of shares on the justified—Sofina Attion)	g value substantiall company cannot boolding company can subsidiary—Pre-conock of company a resease under Doubl cannot override property tax is resident—Assessed om transfer of share nort-term capital gai	y e - - e e - e e - T
in enhancing deduction	aking —Special deduction—Don—Deduction to be computeding to disallowance—Income-	d taking into accour	nt
IB(8A)—Lotus Labs	P. Ltd. v . Deputy CIT	(Bang)	. 295

Interest—Refund—Intimation—Assessable in year granted—If interest adjusted with prior tax liability of earlier years and paid to Government account—No need of separate intimation to assessee as interest paid to

2020]	General Index		xxvii
Interest (Contd.)—			PAGE
assessee—Income-tax A v. Deputy CIT	ct, 1961, s. 244A—FIS Solut	ions (India) P. Ltd. (Pune)	656
Immediate source of inte ing project but investme Income by way of transfe and interest received for with business of assess deduction—Disallowance	leposits—Housing project— erest not business of assessee int in bank deposits—Not eliger fees received by assessee for delay in payment against flat see of developing housing the in respect of interest to a Nirman P. Ltd. v. ITO	of developing hous- gible for deduction— or apartment booking t—Direct connection project—Eligible for	359
expenses on amount l deposit to its subsidiary-	owed capital—Business of porrowed for purpose of general endough and a superstant of the company	giving intercorporate any for strategic pur-	555
Business expend	iture—Till asset for which loble—Deputy CIT v. Coffee	oan borrowed put to	322
Assessee advancing sun owned subsidiary—No s see—Transaction a loan	actions—Transfer pricing—An towards share application shares allotted and full mone and interest chargeable on let at LIBOR—Income-tax Act	Arm's length price—money to its wholly by refunded to asses- toan—Rate of interest	322
Transfer pricingness of drilling oil rigs that intercorporate depositions Income on such intercornot income from other sout of business compulsions.		(Mumbai) see carrying out busicing borrowed funds at drilling business—business income and ank as margin money in margin money tax-	555 555
——Transfer pricing- vice agreement with its receivables—Transfer Pr charging interest for del Assessing Officer to rec	—Arm's length price—Assess associated enterprises—Intericing Officer justified in many in receipt of payment for alculate chargeable interestand not thereafter—Income-t	see entering into ser- erest on outstanding aking adjustment by services rendered— —Interest to be con-	<i>3</i> 33
SHIPPING LTD. v. Asst. ——Transfer pricingence to Transfer Pricing		(Mumbai) ssing Officer—Refer- bound to make refer-	555

xxviii	ITR's Tribunal Tax Reports	[Vol. 79
International transac	tions (Contd.)—	PAGE
Rs. 5 crores—Requiren seen only in context of tional transactions doe	f reported specified domestic transactions exceed nent to consider it "necessary or expedient" to f cases where aggregate value of reported intermal solutions of exceed Rs. 15 crores—Income-tax Act, 190 NTIA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY PVT. LTD.	be na- 61, <i>v</i> .
—Transfer pricin tions—Comparable cortal information not avwith assessee's—Softw	(Pune) . g—Arm's length price—Benchmarking transa mpanies—Companies in respect of which segme vailable—Companies whose functions in contra are testing services company—Company renderi —Company providing software services to its o	ac- en- ast ng
ents—Not comparables (India) P. Ltd. v. Dei	s—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 92CA—FIS Solutio риту CIT (Pune) .	
tions—Comparable con basis independently engaged in rendering passing turnover filt	ng—Arm's length price—Benchmarking transampanies—Comparability position on year to ye to be examined—Comparable not exclusive software services as assessee—Comparable reter—Not comparables—Income-tax Act, 190 (FORMATION TECHNOLOGY PVT. LTD. v. DEPUT	ear ely not 61, rry
expense—Not includib	g—Arm's length price—Disallowance of particule in operating expenses for calculating profit may 1961, s. 92CA—EXTENTIA INFORMATION TECHNOLUTY CIT (Pune) .	ar-
ary and higher educat	g—Arm's length price—Education cess and secon ion cess—Not applicable while taxing income reaty—Income-tax Act, 1961—JCDECAUX S. A. (Delhi)	on v.
—Transfer pricin vices—Assessee provide money borrowed by its antee not services of guarantee fee received	g—Arm's length price—Fees for technical solding corporate guarantee to foreign banks associated enterprise—Services of corporate guaranagerial, technical or consultancy—Corporad by assessee not fees for technical services s. 9(1)(vii)—JCDECAUX S. A. v. Asst./DEPULY C.	er- for ar- ate ;—
vices—Management se viding entire correspon ciated enterprise—Asse in support of services r	g—Arm's length price—Fees for technical services to associated enterprise—Assessee not produce regarding services rendered by it to its assessee to furnish all necessary documentary evider rendered by it to its associated enterprise including spect of services provided—Assessing Officer	co- so- nce ng

2020]	General Index	xxix
International transactions (C	Contd.)—	PAGE
decide afresh—Income-tax Ac Asst./Deputy CIT	t, 1961, s. 9(1)(vii)—JCDECAUX S. A. v. (Delhi)	222
vices—Secondment of employed Agreement between expatriated assessee of social security contra ment by associated enterprise	's length price—Fees for technical ser- ees to assessee by associated enterprise— e employee and assessee for payment by ribution in foreign country and reimburse— —Assessing Officer to verify agreements Act, 1961—JCDECAUX S. A. v. ASST./DEP- (Delhi)	222
——Transfer pricing—Arm' loss arising out of revenue tr operating revenue/cost, both	s length price—Foreign exchange gain or ansactions—To be considered as item of for assessee as well as comparables— —Extentia Information Technology (Pune)	364
invoices akin to loan advanced prise—International transaction of receivables appearing in accordables shown and whether trans- tional transactions—Credit of t	of slength price—Outstanding sum of d by assessee to foreign associated enterm—Transfer Pricing Officer to study impact ounts of assessee and consider why receivactions could be characterised as internative deduction at source—Assessing Officer et., 1961, s. 92B(2), Expln.—Lotus Labs P.	
LTD. v. DEPUTY CIT	(Bangalore)	295
debts-To be included in exp	's length price—Provision for doubtful benses side of comparable for calculating , 1961, s. 92CA—EXTENTIA INFORMATION PUTY CIT (Pune)	364
—Transfer pricing—Arm's see's parent company taking lessel 49 per cent. of its stake bank—Guarantee commissionapplying 0.25 per cent. to transfer	s length price—Shipping business—Asses- can from bank—Assessee agreeing not to in subsidiary without prior consent from —Assessing Officer to make adjustment by action instead of 0.5 per cent.—Income-tax	555
nage taxation scheme—Interest of transfer pricing provisions scheme—Income-tax Act, 1962	s length price—Shipping business—Ton- con purchase of two ships—No application to income covered under tonnage tax 1, Chap. XII-G—Essar Shipping Ltd. v.	555
Powers—Specified domestic power to determine arm's leng Commissioner or making re	(Mumbai) s length price—Transfer Pricing Officer—transaction—Unreported transaction—No gth price without approval from Principal ference to him—Income-tax Act, 1961, Prion Technology Pvt. Ltd. v. Deputy (Pune)	555 364
C11	(1 une)	304

XXX	ITR's Tribunal Ta	X Reports	[Vol. 79
			PAGE
tion 143(2) for committional Assessing Offinotice beyond period	sessment—Notice—Limit nencing scrutiny assessm icer—Proper jurisdictiona d of limitation—Notice able to be quashed—Man	ent issued by non-jurisd al Assessing Officer issui invalid—Assessment ord	lic- ing der
Limitation —Asse	essment—Notice—Jurisdi	ction—Notice under sect	ion
Assessing Officer—I beyond period of lin	ing scrutiny assessment i Proper jurisdictional Asse nitation—Notice invalid— e quashed—Manoj Kun	ssing Officer issuing not -Assessment order void MAR v. Asst. CIT	rice
——Revision—Iss	sues subject to revision po		
ment and not reope from original assessment revision could have passed on 26-2-201	ened assessment—Period nent—Original assessmen been taken up to 31-3 9—Revision beyond pe LTD. v. PRINCIPAL CIT	d of limitation would st nt passed on 16-1-2014 a 3-2016 but revisional or riod of limitation—Jing	art ind der
	al gains—Exemption—Sa		
	roperty—Amount deposit of return under section ITO	139(4)—Entitled to exem	
see acquiring brand scheme of amalgam its brand name, trade intangibles and mark right to carry on bus- ing period of holding No transfer taking p holding much more to	et—Meaning of—Period name of transferor compation—Assets not finance mark, packaging design teting intangibles—Transiness—Holding period shad of previous owner, i. e., lace on appointed date chan 36 months—Receipt FEROKE BOARDS LTD.	any and other assets undial assets—Assessee selliand know-how and produced for of intangible assets would be determined inclution, amalgamating company of amalgamation—Period	der ing uct rith ud- V— of ital
ĕ		` ′	
ness expenditure—A accounting—Foreign end of financial year	of fluctuation in rate of a session of session of session of the consistently follows: exchange loss due to real and on repayment of both ble—Deputy CIT v. Consider the constant of the const	owing mercantile system einstatement of accounts orrowings similar to inter	of at rest
Low gross profit	t rate—See Accounting	. 0.	472
	n—Assessee merging with		
-	ling return after merger i	* *	

ought to have remitted record to Commissioner having jurisdiction over

2020]	GENERAL INDEX		XXX1
Merger (Contd.)—			PAGE
	y for taking action—Revis OWHILL AGENCIES P. LTD.		
see a milk supplier ear lier and subsequent ye income and not on an	ning commission—Estimate rning commission—No char rar—Assessee could be asse y estimation or surmises—F IAL BABAN BANGAR v. ITO	nge in business for ear- ssed to tax only on real Profit to be estimated at	
Eligible for higher rate	tion—Modem is an integra e of depreciation at 60 per COMMUNICATIONS LTD.		
alty—Accrual of inco purpose of organising business—Target audio benefits in India—Inco ness connection in Ind	duction of tax at source—Ta ome—International celebrit India centric event at Duba ence in India, potential custo ome accruing or arising in I dia—Assessee bound to wi okkswagen Finance P. Lti	ty appearance—Whole is was to benefit Indian omers in India, intended india by reason of busithhold taxes from pay-	
in respect of employm	n relief—Salary and allowar ent rendered in Austria du to tax in Austria for servic	nces earned by assessee e to his foreign assign-	
India—Non-production grant benefit of Doub Income-tax Act, 1961,	itled to exemption—No bar n of tax residency certificate ole Taxation Avoidance Ag ss. 5(2), 90(4)—Double Taxa nd Austria, art. 15—SREENI	e—Not a reason not to greement to assessee— ation Avoidance Agree-	
——Income deeme foreign company—Sha sidiary—Deeming fiction in India—Transfer of stransfer of stransfer of stransfer of shares of its ferred to form part of State not satisfied—Not ment—Provisions of Aderived from alienation of which alienator is rebelgium—Gains from India—Addition of shoustified—Income-tax	d to accrue or arise in india ares deriving value substan on—Foreign company cannon shares of holding company is Indian subsidiary—Pre-con- capital stock of company a bot taxable under Double Taxa- cct cannot override provision in of any property taxable of esident—Assessee, transferor transfer of shares taxable bort-term capital gain made in Act, 1961, s. 9(1)(i)—Double andia and Belgium, article, 15	n—Transfer of shares in tially from Indian subot be treated as resident cannot be regarded as ndition of shares transresident of contracting ation Avoidance Agreets of Agreement—Gains nly in contracting State of shares, a resident of in Belgium and not in hands of assessee not ble Taxation Avoidance	
ASST CIT (INTERN.	ational Taxation)	(Mumbai)	489

xxxii	ITR's Tribunal Tax Reports	[Vol. 79
		PAGE
Notice—See Ass	SESSMENT	158
See Rea	ASSESSMENT	705
ture—Disallowance- incorporated in the sales—Assessee pur facilities—Assessee inserting some entri ers and complete b	—Duty of assessee to prove whether pareir books for computing their profits rehasing gold ornaments and parties has making cash payment in different dailes in his books with support of some ir ills and vouchers not produced before led—RAJENDRA KUMAR SAHOO v. ASST	rticular payees on respective aving banking tes—Assessee aternal vouch- Department—
of income—Additional closed interest income deleted by Tribunal-expenses to Assess:	alment of income—Furnishing inaccurations made by Assessing Officer on account and deposits made in bank account —Tribunal remanding issue of disallowating Officer—Penalty levied against address Act, 1961, s. 271(1)(c)—Deputy CIT	unt of undis- of employees ince of certain litions unsus-
income—Assessing notice—Assessing C see for which penal- ify charge and mak	Officer not striking off irrelevant part of Officer not definite about charge and dety levied—Assessing Officer under obligue assessee known for what default per oble—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 271(1)(c)—D SHARMA	of show-cause fault of asses- ation to spec- nalty levied—
income—Whether p curate particulars of Department preclud- ing appeal before Tr	of income—Furnishing inaccurate penalty for concealment of income or furnishing income or furnishing income not clear from notice or pelled from filing appeal in view of monetaribunal—Valuation estimate alone cannot—Penalty not justified—Income-tax. A. Shihabudeen	rnishing inac- nalty order— ary limit of fil- ot justify find-
there was concealing respect of unsecured Commissioner (App	at of income—No detailed finding as ent of particulars of income relating to control of the cont	onfirmation in commission—
income—Assessing material representir see—Penalty on acc	of income—Search and seizure-Officer not making reference to any ang undisclosed material or income declar count of deemed concealment of income to Prakash Chand Sharma	incriminating ared by asses-

xxxiii

G-79-iii

2020 PAGE **Penalty** (Contd.)— -Repayment of loan otherwise than in prescribed mode—Exceptions—Reasonable cause—Transactions between mutually or closely associated persons—Loans taken by company from directors—Transactions genuine duly reflected in books of account-Interest paid allowed by Assessing Officer-Mere technical violation and no loss to Revenue-Penalty not justified—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 271E—Sudha Agro Oil AND CHEMICAL INDUSTRIES LTD. v. ADDL. CIT (Visakhapatnam) . . . 520 Prior period expenses—Business expenditure—Interest for delayed payment of pole rental charges—Not prior period expenses but compensatory in nature—Deductible—Deputy CIT v. Asianet Satellite Com-MUNICATIONS LTD. (Cochin) . . . 695 Provident fund—Contribution to provident fund—Business expenditure—Assessee, a contractor, making contribution under arrangement between him and principal—No evidence to show that under instruction of assessee, principal deducted provident fund from billing amount of assessee for further depositing contribution to provident fund department-Whether principal deducted provident fund from bill raised by assessee for further depositing contribution to provident fund authority— Assessing Officer to verify factual aspect—Pabitra Banerjee v. ITO 480 Reassessment—Notice after four years—Condition precedent—Reasons recorded vague and general—Assessee disclosing during course of original assessment proceedings details of all loan creditors—Assessee repaying loan with interest and deducting tax at source thereon—Loan repaid within same year-Addition on account of cash credit not justified—Reassessment not valid—Income-tax Act, 1961, ss. 68, 147, 148— Bajaj Parivahan P. Ltd. v. ITO (Kolkata) . . . 705 -Validity—Reassessment on basis of wrong facts and figures and non-application of mind-Assessee disclosing sale of shares in its books-Same amount cannot be treated as a cash credit-Gross receipt could not be brought to tax, specifically when assessee acquired shares pursuant to allotment as evidenced by letter of allotment and payment details-Reassessment not valid-Income-tax Act, 1961, ss. 147, 148-BHAGWANT MERCHANTS P. LTD. v. ITO 595 (Kolkata) **Refund**—Interest—Intimation—Assessable in year granted—If interest adjusted with prior tax liability of earlier years and paid to Government account-No need of separate intimation to assessee as interest paid to assessee—FIS Solutions (India) P. Ltd. v. Deputy CIT (Pune) 656 **Rejection of books of account**—Accounting—General principles— Suppression of sales-Low gross profit rate-No evidence that assessee by making sale at price lower than cost of purchase received some consideration without recording sales in books of account—No enquiry by

GENERAL INDEX

xxxiv ITR's Tribunal Tax Reports	[Vol. 79
Rejection of books of account (Contd.)—	PAGE
Assessing Officer from parties to ascertain whether assessee price lower than purchase price—No comparable cases she price more than price assessee sold goods—No defect in sto purchase and sales, bank statement furnished by assessee-books on account of suppression of sales—Not justified—Figure R. Length Property CIT.	owing market ock statement, —Rejection of —Panchshil
	(Rajkot) 472
Revision —Condition precedent—Appeal pendi Commissioner (Appeals)—No power of revision—Incomes. 264—Digjam Ltd. v. Asst. CIT	
—Erroneous and prejudicial to Revenue, meaning enquiry or no enquiry by Assessing Officer—Necessary enquiregarding accommodation entry—Principal Commissioner with manner of enquiry conducted by Assessing Officer—Cutte his own reasons to hold order erroneous and prejudicity of Revenue—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 263—Arihant Teller. v. Principal CIT	iry conducted not agreeing Cannot substi- al to interests
——Limitation—Issues subject to revision pertaining assessment and not reopened assessment—Period of lim start from original assessment—Original assessment passed and revision could have been taken up to 31-3-2016 but re passed on 26-2-2019—Revision beyond period of limitation Act, 1961, s. 263—JINDAL STEEL AND POWER LTD. v. PRIN	itation would on 16-1-2014 visional order —Income-tax CIPAL CIT
	(Delhi) 636
—Merger—Assessee merging with another comparated company filing return after merger in its name—Cought to have remitted record to Commissioner having jurn amalgamated company for taking action—Revision upon entity—Not valid—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 263—Snowhill Ltd. v. Principal CIT	Commissioner isdiction over non-existent
——Scrutiny assessment to examine share application Assessing Officer making specific query in relation to details mium—Assessee furnishing complete details in respect of stion money received—Share application money received from persons from whom share application and share premareceived in earlier years—No adverse inference drawn in earspect of money received from very same persons—Share pring the year ought to be confined to examination of application of Merely because assessment order silent order could not be erroneous and prejudicial to interests of the Revenue—valid—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 263—Sunray Cotspin (P.) CIPAL CIT	s of share pre- share applica- om very same nium amount arlier years in premium dur- cion of section f section 68— considered as -Revision not

2020]	GENERAL INDEX		XXXV
			PAGE
India—Accrual of incorpurpose of organising Ir business—Target audien benefits in India—Incomness connection in India	of tax at source—Non- me—International celebrit dia centric event at Duba ce in India, potential custo he accruing or arising in India—Assessee bound to OLKSWAGEN FINANCE P.	ty appearance—Who is was to benefit India omers in India, intendendia by reason of bus withhold taxes fro LTD. v. ITO	ed m si- m
	N D. I	(Mumbai) .	447
ary and allowances earne in Austria due to his fore for services rendered in A No bar to receiving mone tificate—Not a reason no	ees—Non-resident—Doubled by assessee in respect of ign assignment—Assessee Austria and not in India—Fey in India—Non-production to grant benefit of Double-Sreenivasa Reddy Che	f employment rendere e liable to tax in Austr Entitled to exemption- ion of tax residency ce ble Taxation Avoidance	ed ia — r- ce
Sale of property—S	ee International trans	SACTIONS .	607
Commission—Part of re for taxing his income b income accruing to asse property with respect to	-Assessment of third pers cords found during search ut other documents clear assee—Assessing Officer recommission paid by them tax Act, 1961, s. 153A—St	n used against assessed rly suggesting no succept of examining buyers in to assessee—Addition of MITTAL v. De	ee ch of on
ing Officer not making r ing undisclosed materia account of deemed con	lment of income—Undisc eference to any incriminat l or income declared by cealment of income unsuff(1)(c), Expln. 5A—Der	ting material represen assessee—Penalty custainable—Income-ta	t- on ax sH
Secondment of emp	loyees—See Internatio	NAL TRANSACTIONS	222
turing into project for copaying huge amount to without proper reasons-negative—Assessing Offishareholders and genu	ish credits—Assessee pure instruction of multistoried collaborator—Premium pa -Worth of assessee at tim- cer not disputing identity ineness of transaction— NTERNATIONAL LAND AN	residential project areaid by shareholders note of issue of shares note and creditworthiness. -No unexplained case	nd ot ot of sh
		(Delhi) .	441

xxxvi	ITR's Tribunal Tax Reports	[Vol. 79
		PAGE
Tonnage and non-toni	—Business expenditure—Tonnage tax schemenage activity—Common interest expenditure—T is of cost of financing and not on basis of turnord. v . Asst. CIT (Mumbai)	o)-
	ne—Tonnage tax scheme—Tonnage income no siness income—Essar Shipping Ltd. v. Asst. CI (Mumbai)	T
price—Assessee's pare agreeing not to sell 49 consent from bank—G	transactions—Transfer pricing—Arm's lengthent company taking loan from bank—Assessed per cent. of its stake in subsidiary without pricuarantee commission—Assessing Officer to making 0.25 per cent. to transaction instead of 0.5 per LTD. v. Asst. CIT (Mumbai)	ee or ke er
Short-term capital	gains—Financial asset—Meaning of—Period	of
holding of asset—Asse and other assets unde assets—Assessee sellin and know-how and p Transfer of intangible period should be dete owner, i. e., amalgar appointed date of amal	ssee acquiring brand name of transferor comparer scheme of amalgamation—Assets not financing its brand name, trade mark, packaging design product intangibles and marketing intangibles—assets with right to carry on business—Holding remined including period of holding of previounating company—No transfer taking place of legamation—Period of holding much more than 3 the as long-term capital gains—Asst. CIT v. Fei (Cochin)	ny al m ng us on 36
pletion certificate to be pletion of project—Cor Assessee not entitled to plan road acquired by	—Housing project—Condition precedent—Come obtained from municipal corporation after completion certificate not obtained for certain flatsocheduction in respect of those flats—Development municipal corporation not be reduced from tot DEPUTY CIT v. SHEWALE AND SONS (Pune)	n- — nt al
—Housing project interest not business of ment in bank deposits transfer fees received received for delay in paness of assessee of dev Disallowance in respe	t—Interest on bank deposits—Immediate source of assessee of developing housing project but investually investually assessee for apartment booking and interest against flat—Direct connection with bus reloping housing project—Eligible for deduction-ct of interest to be restricted to net interest-	of t- of st i- —
deduction—Deduction	AN P. Ltd. v. ITO (Kolkata) ertaking—Disallowance resulted in enhancin to be computed taking into account incomallowance—Lotus Labs P. Ltd. v. Deputy CIT	ig ne
<u> </u>	(Bang)	

2020]	General Index		xxxvii
Special deduction (Contd.)—			PAGE
——Tax savings investmen duce sufficient evidence to just additions considered—Assessi REDDY PAGA v. ITO		rain and nature of	439
Suppression of sales—Sec	e Accounting		472
Tax savings investment— not able to produce sufficient and nature of additions co afresh—Income-tax Act, 1961 ITO	Special deduction—Case evidence to justify clair nsidered—Assessing C	m—Financial strain officer to consider	439
Taxability in India—See	DEDUCTION OF TAY AT		447
Tonnage tax scheme—Bu			447
Tonnage and non-tonnage ac be apportioned on basis of cover—ssar Shipping Ltd. v. A	tivity—Common interests of financing and not	st expenditure—To	555
——Business income—Ship part of normal business incom	oping business—Tonnag ne—Essar Shipping Lt		555
Trade mark —Acquisition of Revaluation of trade mark—I Joint Commissioner— <i>Explana</i> STUDIOS P. LTD. v. DEPUTY C	Department not production 3 to section 43(1)	ing approval from	533
——Depreciation—Revalua incurred and not on revaluatio applicable for predecessor wou item—Total amount of deprecassessee would be entitled if pios P. Ltd. v. Deputy CIT	ald be amount of deprectiation cannot exceed dep	unt of depreciation iation allowable on preciation to which	533
Transfer of shares in for	eion company—See No	•	489
Transfer pricing—See Int	• •		295, 364,
Transfer prieme bee in	ERNATIONAL TRANSACT		555, 656
Transfer Pricing Officer— Unreported transaction—No p out approval from Principal Co EXTENTIA INFORMATION TECH	ower to determine arm's ommissioner or making	s length price with- reference to him—	364
Undisclosed income —Sea	rch and seizure—Penalt		
income—Assessing Officer no material representing undisclo see—Penalty on account of de	ot making reference to sed material or income eemed concealment of i	any incriminating declared by asses-	
ble—Deputy CIT v . Prakase	CHAND SHARMA	(Jaipur)	386

xxxviii	ITR's Tribunal Tax	Reports	[Vo	L. 79
				PAGE
doubted—Quantitative and purchases reflected case that purchases m	penditure—Unverifiable e tally of purchases of med in credit column of bank ade outside books of according to the column of the	eat and exports a account of assertion CIT v. HIND IN	furnished ssee—No not justi-	1
making machine, vend raw coffee beans into facturing activity—Ass	—Depreciation—Addition ing machine and express liquid coffee fit for huma essee entitled to addition	kiosks used for co an consumption al depreciation-	onverting —Manu- —Deputy	
CIT v. Coffee Day G	lobal Ltd.	(Ba	ng)	322
Words and phrase	es .			
erroneous and p	rejudicial to Revenue			119
financial asset			1	22
	End of Volume	79		

SECTIONWISE INDEX

Double Taxation Avoidance Agreement between India and Austria:

Art. 15—Non-resident—Double taxation relief—Salary and allowances earned by assessee in respect of employment rendered in Austria due to his foreign assignment—Assessee liable to tax in Austria for services rendered in Austria and not in India—Entitled to exemption—No bar to receiving money in India—Non-production of tax residency certificate —Not a reason not to grant benefit of Double Taxation Avoidance Agreement to assessee—Sreenivasa Reddy Cheemalamarri v. ITO

(Hyderabad) . . . 465

Double Taxation Avoidance Agreement between India and Belgium:

Arts. 13(5), (6)—Non-resident—Income deemed to accrue or arise in india—Transfer of shares in foreign company—Shares deriving value substantially from Indian subsidiary—Deeming fiction—Foreign company cannot be treated as resident in India—Transfer of shares of holding company cannot be regarded as transfer of shares of its Indian subsidiary—Pre-condition of shares transferred to form part of capital stock of company a resident of contracting State not satisfied—Not taxable under Double Taxation Avoidance Agreement—Provisions of Act cannot override provisions of Agreement—Gains derived from alienation of any property taxable only in contracting State of which alienator is resident—Assessee, transferor of shares, a resident of Belgium—Gains from transfer of shares taxable in Belgium and not in India—Addition of short-term capital gain made in hands of assessee not justified—Sofina S. A. v. Asst. CIT (International Taxation) (Mumbai) . . .

489

Double Taxation Avoidance Agreement between India and the USA:

Art. 12—Deduction of tax at source—Non-resident—Taxability in India—Royalty—Accrual of income—International celebrity appearance—Whole purpose of organising India centric event at Dubai was to benefit Indian business—Target audience in India, potential customers in India, intended benefits in India—Income accruing or arising in India by reason of business connection in India—Assessee bound to withhold taxes from payment to celebrity—Volkswagen Finance P. Ltd. v. ITO

(Mumbai) . . . 447

ITR's Tribunal Tax Reports

[Vol. 79]

PAGE

ACTS:

x1

Income-tax Act, 1961:

S. 2(22)(e)—Dividend—Deemed dividend—Advances given for business purpose—Not a deemed dividend—Deputy CIT v. International Land and Developers P. Ltd. (Delhi) . . .

441

S. 2(42A)—Capital gains—Long-term capital gains—Short-term capital gains—Financial asset—Meaning of—Period of holding of asset—Assessee acquiring brand name of transferor company and other assets under scheme of amalgamation—Assets not financial assets—Assessee selling its brand name, trade mark, packaging design and know-how and product intangibles and marketing intangibles—Transfer of intangible assets with right to carry on business—Holding period should be determined including period of holding of previous owner, i. e., amalgamating company—No transfer taking place on appointed date of amalgamation—Period of holding much more than 36 months—Receipt taxable as long-term capital gains—Asst. CIT v. Feroke Boards Ltd. (Cochin) . . .

22

S. 5—Deduction of tax at source—Non-resident—Taxability in India—Royalty—Accrual of income—International celebrity appearance—Whole purpose of organising India centric event at Dubai was to benefit Indian business—Target audience in India, potential customers in India, intended benefits in India—Income accruing or arising in India by reason of business connection in India—Assessee bound to withhold taxes from payment to celebrity—Volkswagen Finance P. Ltd. v. ITO (Mumbai) . . .

447

S. 5(2)—Non-resident—Double taxation relief—Salary and allowances earned by assessee in respect of employment rendered in Austria due to his foreign assignment—Assessee liable to tax in Austria for services rendered in Austria and not in India—Entitled to exemption—No bar to receiving money in India—Non-production of tax residency certificate — Not a reason not to grant benefit of Double Taxation Avoidance Agreement to assessee—Sreenivasa Reddy Cheemalamarri v. ITO

465

(Hyderabad) . . .

(Mumbai)

S. 9(1)(i)—Deduction of tax at source—Non-resident—Taxability in India—Royalty—Accrual of income—International celebrity appearance—Whole purpose of organising India centric event at Dubai was to benefit Indian business—Target audience in India, potential customers in India, intended benefits in India—Income accruing or arising in India by reason of business connection in India—Assessee bound to withhold taxes from payment to celebrity—Volkswagen Finance P. Ltd. v. ITO

447

S. 9(1)(i)—Non-resident—Income deemed to accrue or arise in india—Transfer of shares in foreign company—Shares deriving value substantially from Indian subsidiary—Deeming fiction—Foreign company

2020] General Index xli

PAGE

cannot be treated as resident in India—Transfer of shares of holding company cannot be regarded as transfer of shares of its Indian subsidiary—Pre-condition of shares transferred to form part of capital stock of company a resident of contracting State not satisfied—Not taxable under Double Taxation Avoidance Agreement—Provisions of Act cannot override provisions of Agreement—Gains derived from alienation of any property taxable only in contracting State of which alienator is resident—Assessee, transferor of shares, a resident of Belgium—Gains from transfer of shares taxable in Belgium and not in India—Addition of short-term capital gain made in hands of assessee not justified—Sofina S. A. v. Asst. CIT (International Taxation) (Mumbai) . . .

489

S. 9(1)(vii)—International transactions—Transfer pricing—Arm's length price—Fees for technical services—Assessee providing corporate guarantee to foreign banks for money borrowed by its associated enterprise—Services of corporate guarantee not services of managerial, technical or consultancy—Corporate guarantee fee received by assessee not fees for technical services—JCDECAUX S. A. v. ASST./DEPUTY CIT

elhi) . . . 222

—International transactions—Transfer pricing—Arm's length price—Fees for technical services—Management services to associated enterprise—Assessee not providing entire correspondence regarding services rendered by it to its associated enterprise—Assessee to furnish all necessary documentary evidence in support of services rendered by it to its associated enterprise including correspondence in respect of services provided—Assessing Officer to decide afresh—JCDECAUX S. A. v. ASST./DEPUTY CIT (Delhi) . . .

222

S. 10B—Exemption—Export—Separate identity and independent existence of eligible export oriented units of assessee—No requirement to maintain separate books of account as a necessary pre-condition for claiming benefit—Export oriented units eligible for exemption—Exemption allowable at source and not after computation of gross total income —Asst. CIT *v*. NIIT Technologies Ltd. (Delhi) . . .

60

S. 11—Charitable purpose—Exemption—Assessee providing facilities to tourists and pilgrims coming to Kurukshetra throughout year—Maintaining and preserving historical places in and around Kurukshetra—Providing support for celebration of Gita Jayanti at Brahm Sarovar every year—Maintaining and operating Krishna Museum at Kurukshetra—No commercial element involved in activities—Entitled to exemption—Joint CIT (OSD) (Exemptions) v. Kurukshetra Development Board

31

S. 14A—Income—Disallowance of expenditure relating to exempt income—Assessing Officer expressing dissatisfaction on assessee's claim that no expenses incurred for earning exempt income—Assessee having

(Chandigarh)

xlii ITR's Tribunal Tax Reports [V	OL. 79
	PAGE
sufficient interest-free funds to invest in mutual funds—Disallowance to be deleted—Administrative expenses incurred for earning exempt income—No bifurcation of expenses—Restriction of disallowance at 0.5 per cent. reasonable estimation—Asst. CIT v . NIIT TECHNOLOGIES LTD. (Delhi)	60
——Income—Disallowance of expenditure in relation to exempt income—No exempt income received by assessee during year—Disallowance not justified—Deputy CIT v . Hind Industries Ltd. (Delhi)	1
——Income—Disallowance of expenditure in relation to exempt income—No tax exempt income in relevant previous year—No disallowance—Deputy CIT v . JSW Ltd. (Mumbai)	585
——Income—Disallowance of expenditure relating to exempt income—No income exempt from tax received in relevant previous year—No disallowance can be made—Deputy CIT v. Coffee Day Global Ltd. (Bang)	322
S. 32 —Depreciation—Modem is an integral part of a computer—Eligible for higher rate of depreciation at 60 per cent.—Deputy CIT v. Asi-	
ANET SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS LTD. (Cochin)	695 533
S. 32(1) (iia) —Depreciation—Additional depreciation—Coffee making machine, vending machine and express kiosks used for converting raw coffee beans into liquid coffee fit for human consumption—Manufacturing activity—Assessee entitled to additional depreciation—Deputy CIT v . Coffee Day Global Ltd. (Bang)	322
S. 35DD —Business expenditure—Demerger—Amortisation of demerger expenses allowable in hands of parent company and not resultant company—Assessee not entitled to deduction—Asst. CIT v . NIIT TECHNOLOGIES LTD. (Delhi)	60
S. 36(1)(iii) —Business expenditure—Interest on borrowed capital—Interest expenses on amount borrowed for purpose of giving intercorporate deposit to its subsidiary—Investment in group company for strategic purpose and not for earning dividend—Interest expenses allowable—ESSAR SHIPPING LTD. v . ASST. CIT (Mumbai)	555
——Business expenditure—Interest on borrowed capital—Till asset for which loan borrowed put to use, interest not allowable—Deputy CIT v . Coffee Day Global Ltd. (Bang)	322

2020]	General Index			xliii
				PAGE
Condition precedent profit and loss account debiting its profit	-Bad debt—Provision for bad an at for allowance—Provision must bount by assessee for relevant previous and loss account sum towards pot entitled to deduction—Joint Chank	e actually debito ious year—Asse rovision for bad	ed in essee and TAKA	207
shown by assessee Sales Tax Department addition could be m	s expenditure—Bogus purchase—I in profit and loss account matching ent and value added tax return file hade on basis of earlier tentative fig x Department—PABITRA BANERJE	g figures certified by assesseure shown by assesseure shown by asses v. ITO	ed by —No sses-	400
a contractor, making principal—No evide cipal deducted provide depositing contributed deducted provident contribution to provident	penditure—Contribution to providing contribution under arrangement ence to show that under instruction wident fund from billing amount of tion to provident fund department- fund from bill raised by assessee for wident fund authority—Assessing (nt between him on of assessee, job assessee for fur Whether printer further depose Officer to verify	and orin- rther cipal iting fac-	480
Business ex foreign exchange—accounting—Foreig end of financial year	RA BANERJEE v. ITO penditure—Loss on account of fleating and account of fleating and account of following an exchange loss due to reinstated ar and on repayment of borrowing	nercantile systement of accoungs similar to int	m of ts at erest	480
expenditure—Allow	vable—Deputy CIT v. Coffee Da	AY GLOBAL LTD (Bang)		322
delayed payment o	f pole rental charges—Not prior р ature—Deductible—Deputy CIT		TEL-	695
iture—To be apport	expenditure—Shipping busine and non-tonnage activity—Comm tioned on basis of cost of financing HIPPING LTD. v. Asst. CIT		sis of	555
S. 40(a)(ia) —B to deduction of tax ments to distributed distributor—Neithetion at source provided by the control of the cont	usiness expenditure—Disallowand at source—Assessee exhibiting film or —Revenue shared between theat or contractual payment nor rent particular sions not applicable—Sri Parami (Vi	re—Payments l ns and making atre owner and syment—Tax de eswari Project sakhapatnam)	iable pay- film duc- rs P.	529
-	penditure—Disallowance—Payme e—Tax not deducted at source from			

xliv	ITR's Tribunal Tax Rei	PORTS	[Vol. 79
			PAGI
	or 15H obtained from deposite mitted before Commissioner- EENA BANK		R-
exceeding specified line payees incorporated in tive sales—Assessee puting facilities—Assessee inserting some entries ers and complete bills	ss expenditure—Disallowance nit—Duty of assessee to prove their books for computing the archasing gold ornaments and making cash payment in differin his books with support of and vouchers not produced—RAJENDRA KUMAR SAHOO	we whether particul neir profits on respe parties having bankerent dates—Assessome internal voucle before Department- v. Asst. CIT	ar c- k- ee h-
mark—Revaluation of	—Depreciation—Actual cost- trade mark—Department no ner—Explanation 3 to section v. Deputy CIT	-Acquisition of tract t producing approv 43(1) not attracted-	de ⁄al
actual payment—Empl producing evidence to	expenditure—Disallowance—oyees' State Insurance contril show that amount deposited justified—SATERN GRIHA NII	bution—Assessee n before furnishing i RMAN P. LTD. v. IT	ot its
gains—Financial asset- see acquiring brand na scheme of amalgamati its brand name, trade n intangibles and market right to carry on busing ing period of holding of No transfer taking place	ains—Long-term capital gain—Meaning of—Period of holome of transferor company arion—Assets not financial assuark, packaging design and kring intangibles—Transfer of itess—Holding period should be previous owner, i. e., amalge on appointed date of amagen 36 months—Receipt taxable EROKE BOARDS LTD.	ding of asset—Asse and other assets und ets—Assessee sellir now-how and produ intangible assets wi be determined include gamating company- lgamation—Period e as long-term capit	s- er ng ict th d- of
capital asset and purch capital gains accounts	ns—Long-term capital gains- nase of residential property—s scheme before filing of r	Amount deposited return under section	in on
	emption—Renu Jain v. ITO —Share premium—Assessee	(Jaipur) .	621 nd

venturing into project for construction of multistoried residential project and paying huge amount to collaborator—Premium paid by shareholders not without proper reasons—Worth of assessee at time of issue of shares not negative—Assessing Officer not disputing identity and creditworthiness of shareholders and genuineness of transaction—No unex-

2020]	General Index	xlv
		PAGE
plained cash credit—Deputy Clopers P. Ltd.	CIT <i>v.</i> International Land and (Delhi)	
Reasons recorded vague and g of original assessment proceed repaying loan with interest an repaid within same year—Add	after four years—Condition precede general—Assessee disclosing during dings details of all loan creditors—As ad deducting tax at source thereon—dition on account of cash credit not—BAJAJ PARIVAHAN P. LTD. v. ITO	course sessee -Loan justi-
see not able to produce suffi	(Kolkata) —Special deduction—Cash credit—Accient evidence to justify claim—Fin considered—Assessing Officer to co A v. ITO (Hyderabad)	Asses- ancial nsider
S. 69C —Unexplained exper doubted—Quantitative tally of and purchases reflected in cred	nditure—Unverifiable purchases—Sal purchases of meat and exports furn it column of bank account of assessed side books of account—Addition not	es not nished e—No justi-
Assessee not able to produce s	tment—Special deduction—Cash cr sufficient evidence to justify claim—I ons considered—Assessing Officer to Y PAGA v. ITO (Hyderabad)	Finan- o con-
S. 80-IB(8A) —Industrial unance resulted in enhancing dec	ndertaking—Special deduction—Disa luction—Deduction to be computed d owing to disallowance—Lotus La	allow- taking ABS P.
edent—Completion certificate after completion of project—C tain flats—Assessee not entitle Development plan road acquire	(Bang) Dject—Special deduction—Condition to be obtained from municipal corpo Completion certificate not obtained for ed to deduction in respect of those for ed by municipal corporation not be re —Deputy CIT v. Shewale and So	prec- ration or cer- lats— duced NS
Immediate source of interest noting project but investment in but Income by way of transfer fees and interest received for delay with business of assessee of deduction—Disallowance in re-	(Pune) ial deduction—Interest on bank deport business of assessee of developing ank deposits—Not eligible for deduct received by assessee for apartment both in payment against flat—Direct conn developing housing project—Eligible espect of interest to be restricted to	osits— hous- tion— ooking ection le for to net
interest—Satern Griha Nirm	MAN P. LTD. v. ITO (Kolkata)	359

xlvi

ITR's Tribunal Tax Reports

[Vol. 79]

PAGE

S. 90(4)—Non-resident—Double taxation relief—Salary and allowances earned by assessee in respect of employment rendered in Austria due to his foreign assignment—Assessee liable to tax in Austria for services rendered in Austria and not in India—Entitled to exemption—No bar to receiving money in India—Non-production of tax residency certificate —Not a reason not to grant benefit of Double Taxation Avoidance Agreement to assessee—Sreenivasa Reddy Cheemalamarri v. ITO

(Hyderabad) . . . 465

S. 92B(2), *Expln.*—International transactions—Transfer pricing—Arm's length price—Outstanding sum of invoices akin to loan advanced by assessee to foreign associated enterprise—International transaction—Transfer Pricing Officer to study impact of receivables appearing in accounts of assessee and consider why receivables shown and whether transactions could be characterised as international transactions—Credit of tax deduction at source—Assessing Officer to verify claim—Lotus Labs P. Ltd. v. Deputy CIT (Bangalore) . . .

295

S. 92C—International transactions—Transfer pricing—Arm's length price—Assessing Officer—Reference to Transfer Pricing Officer—Assessing Officer bound to make reference in case aggregate value of reported international transactions exceeds Rs. 15 crores or that of reported specified domestic transactions exceeds Rs. 5 crores—Requirement to consider it "necessary or expedient" to be seen only in context of cases where aggregate value of reported international transactions does not exceed Rs. 15 crores—Extentia Information Technology Pvt. Ltd. v. Deputy CIT (Pune) . . .

364

S. 92CA—International transactions—Transfer pricing—Arm's length price—Assessing Officer—Reference to Transfer Pricing Officer—Assessing Officer bound to make reference in case aggregate value of reported international transactions exceeds Rs. 15 crores or that of reported specified domestic transactions exceeds Rs. 5 crores—Requirement to consider it "necessary or expedient" to be seen only in context of cases where aggregate value of reported international transactions does not exceed Rs. 15 crores—Extentia Information Technology Pvt. Ltd. v. Deputy CIT (Pune) . . .

364

——International transactions—Transfer pricing—Arm's length price—Benchmarking transactions—Comparable companies—Comparability position on year to year basis independently to be examined—Comparable not exclusively engaged in rendering software services as asses-see—Comparable not passing turnover filter—Not comparables—Extentia Information Technology Pvt. Ltd. v. Deputy CIT

(Pune) ... 364

——International transactions—Transfer pricing—Arm's length price—Benchmarking transactions—Comparable companies—Companies

2020]	General Ini	DEX	xlvii
			PAGE
whose functions in cocompany—Company	ontrast with assessee's- rendering whole ba vices to its clients—No	not available—Companies —Software testing services asket services—Company t comparables—FIS Solu- (Pune)	656
price—Disallowance of	f particular expense—N g profit margin —Exte	pricing—Arm's length Jot includible in operating NTIA INFORMATION TECH- (Pune)	364
price—Foreign exchang To be considered as its	em of operating revenue	pricing—Arm's length at of revenue transactions—e/cost, both for assessee as TECHNOLOGY PVT. LTD. v. (Pune)	364
——International tra	debts—To be included i ofit margin —Extentia	cing—Arm's length price—in expenses side of compa- Information Technol- (Pune)	364
price—Transfer Pricing tion—Unreported trans without approval from	saction—No power to de Principal Commission	pecified domestic transac- etermine arm's length price er or making reference to Pvr. Ltd. v . Deputy CIT	
length price—Shipping purchase of two ships- income covered under	; business—Tonnage tax —No application of tra	(Pune) —Transfer pricing—Arm's cation scheme—Interest on ansfer pricing provisions to ESSAR SHIPPING LTD. v.	364
under section 143(2) for jurisdictional Assessing issuing notice beyond order void ab initio an	or commencing scrutiny g Officer—Proper juriso period of limitation—N	(Mumbai) iction—Limitation—Notice assessment issued by non-dictional Assessing Officer Notice invalid—Assessment —Manoj Kumar v. Asst.	555
Assessing Officer satisty proceedings—No spectreason to apply higher	fied with book results ific defects pointed out net profit rate against	(Delhi) —Fall in net profit rate— produced during remand in books of account—No assessee—Deputy CIT v.	158
	ing—Rejection of books	(Delhi) s of account—General prinfit rate—No evidence that	133

xlviii	ITR's Tribunal Tax Reports	[Vol. 79

PAGE

assessee by making sale at price lower than cost of purchase received some consideration without recording sales in books of account—No enquiry by Assessing Officer from parties to ascertain whether assessee sold goods at price lower than purchase price—No comparable cases showing market price more than price assessee sold goods—No defect in stock statement, purchase and sales, bank statement furnished by assessee—Rejection of books on account of suppression of sales—Not justified—Panchshil Exim P. Ltd. v. Deputy CIT (Rajkot) . . .

472

S. 147—Reassessment—Notice after four years—Condition precedent—Reasons recorded vague and general—Assessee disclosing during course of original assessment proceedings details of all loan creditors—Assessee repaying loan with interest and deducting tax at source thereon—Loan repaid within same year—Addition on account of cash credit not justified—Reassessment not valid—BAJAJ PARIVAHAN P. LTD. *v.* ITO (Kolkata) . . .

705

—Reassessment—Validity—Reassessment on basis of wrong facts and figures and non-application of mind—Assessee disclosing sale of shares in its books—Same amount cannot be treated as a cash credit—Gross receipt could not be brought to tax, specifically when assessee acquired shares pursuant to allotment as evidenced by letter of allotment and payment details—Reassessment not valid—Bhagwant Merchants P. Ltd. v. ITO (Kolkata) . . .

595

S. 148—Reassessment—Notice after four years—Condition precedent—Reasons recorded vague and general—Assessee disclosing during course of original assessment proceedings details of all loan creditors—Assessee repaying loan with interest and deducting tax at source thereon—Loan repaid within same year—Addition on account of cash credit not justified—Reassessment not valid—Bajaj Parivahan P. Ltd. 7. ITO

705

—Reassessment—Validity—Reassessment on basis of wrong facts and figures and non-application of mind—Assessee disclosing sale of shares in its books—Same amount cannot be treated as a cash credit—Gross receipt could not be brought to tax, specifically when assessee acquired shares pursuant to allotment as evidenced by letter of allotment and payment details—Reassessment not valid—Bhagwant Merchants P. Ltd. v. ITO (Kolkata) . . .

595

S. 153A—Search and seizure—Assessment of third person—Sale of property—Commission—Part of records found during search used against assessee for taxing his income but other documents clearly suggesting no such income accruing to assessee—Assessing Officer not examining buyers of property with respect to commission paid by them to assessee—Addition unsustainable—Summit Mittal v. Deputy CIT (Delhi) . . .

607

G-79-iv

2020] General Index	X	xlix
		PAGE
——Search and seizure—Penalty—Concealm closed income—Assessing Officer not making renating material representing undisclosed material assessee—Penalty on account of deemed conceal tainable—Deputy CIT v. Prakash Chand Sha	eference to any incrimi- l or income declared by lment of income unsus-	386
S. 195 —Deduction of tax at source—Non-India—Royalty—Accrual of income—International Whole purpose of organising India centric event Indian business—Target audience in India, poter intended benefits in India—Income accruing or an of business connection in India—Assessee bound payment to celebrity—Volkswagen Finance P.	at Dubai was to benefit at Dubai was to benefit ntial customers in India, rising in India by reason to withhold taxes from	447
6 2004 Deduction of toy at source Statem		447
S. 200A —Deduction of tax at source—Staten source—Amendment enabling levy of late fee for statement brought in with effect from 1-6-2015—Levy of late fees while processing statement of before amendment—Not sustainable—OSWAL (CONSULTANTS PVT. LTD. v. ITO (TDS)	or default in furnishing -Prospective in nature— tax deducted at source	426
S. 234E —Deduction of tax at source—Statem source—Amendment enabling levy of late fee festatement brought in with effect from 1-6-2015—Levy of late fees while processing statement of before amendment—Not sustainable— OSWAL CONSULTANTS PVT. LTD. v. ITO (TDS)	or default in furnishing -Prospective in nature— tax deducted at source	426
S. 244A —Interest—Refund—Intimation—agranted—If interest adjusted with prior tax liabile paid to Government account—No need of separates interest paid to assessee—FIS SOLUTIONS (INTERT	lity of earlier years and te intimation to assessee DIA) P. LTD. v. DEPUTY	656
	(Pune)	656
S. 246A —Appeal to Commissioner (Appeals Assessee not withdrawing appeal filed before C and also filing revision application—Revision noting—Cost imposed upon assessee—Commission applications on marity. Droven Letter of Acceptances on marity.	Commissioner (Appeals) of justified when pender (Appeals) to adjudi-	263
S. 263 —Revision—Erroneous and prejudicial of—Lack of enquiry or no enquiry by Assess enquiry conducted regarding accommodation en sioner not agreeing with manner of enquiry conficer—Cannot substitute his own reasons to he prejudicial to interests of Revenue—Arihant T	I to Revenue, meaning sing Officer—Necessary try—Principal Commis- conducted by Assessing old order erroneous and	203
Principal CIT	(Delhi)	119

1 ITR's Tribunal Tax Reports	[Vol. 79
	PAGE
——Revision—Limitation—Issues subject to revision pertaining original assessment and not reopened assessment—Period of limitation would start from original assessment—Original assessment passed on 1-2014 and revision could have been taken up to 31-3-2016 but revision order passed on 26-2-2019—Revision beyond period of limitation—JID DAL STEEL AND POWER LTD. v . PRINCIPAL CIT (Delhi) .	on 6- al
——Revision—Merger—Assessee merging with another company. Amalgamated company filing return after merger in its name—Commi sioner ought to have remitted record to Commissioner having jurisdiction over amalgamated company for taking action—Revision upon non-existent entity—Not valid—Snowhill Agencies P. Ltd. v. Principal CI (Ahd) .	s- on et- T
—Revision—Scrutiny assessment to examine share application money—Assessing Officer making specific query in relation to details share premium—Assessee furnishing complete details in respect of sha application money received—Share application money received from versame persons from whom share application and share premium amour received in earlier years—No adverse inference drawn in earlier years respect of money received from very same persons—Share premium during the year ought to be confined to examination of application of section 56(2)(vii)(b) and had nothing to do with the application of section 68-Merely because assessment order silent order could not be considered erroneous and prejudicial to interests of the Revenue—Revision in valid—Sunray Cotspin (P.) Ltd. v. Principal CIT (Delhi)	of re ry nt in r- on as
S. 264 —Revision—Condition precedent—Appeal pending befo Commissioner (Appeals)—No power of revision—DIGJAM LTD. v. Ass CIT (Rajkot) .	
S. 271(1)(c) —Penalty—Concealment of income—Furnishing inaccerate particulars of income—Additions made by Assessing Officer of account of undisclosed interest income and deposits made in bar account of employees deleted by Tribunal—Tribunal remanding issue disallowance of certain expenses to Assessing Officer—Penalty levic against additions unsustainable—Deputy CIT v. Prakash Chan Sharma (Jaipur) .	u- on nk of ed ID
——Penalty—Concealment of income—Furnishing inaccurate partiulars of income—Assessing Officer not striking off irrelevant part show-cause notice—Assessing Officer not definite about charge ar default of assessee for which penalty levied—Assessing Officer und obligation to specify charge and make assessee known for what defau penalty levied—Penalty unsustainable—Deputy CIT v. Prakash Chansharma (Jaipur) .	of nd er ılt

2020]	General Index	li
		PAGE
culars of income—Whether particulars order—Department precluded of filing appeal before Tribun	t of income—Furnishing inaccurate partipenalty for concealment of income or furof income not clear from notice or penalty from filing appeal in view of monetary limit hal—Valuation estimate alone cannot justify alty not justified—ITO v . A. Shihabudeen	200
how there was concealment	(Cochin) t of income—No detailed finding as regards of particulars of income relating to confir-	280
	d loan or receipt of cash and insurance com- peals) to decide issue by reasoned order— (Delhi)	419
of income—Undisclosed incorto any incriminating material declared by assessee—Penal-	Search and seizure—Penalty—Concealment me—Assessing Officer not making reference representing undisclosed material or income ty on account of deemed concealment of TY CIT v. Prakash Chand Sharma (Jaipur)	386
mode—Exceptions—Reasonal or closely associated persons- Transactions genuine duly re	ment of loan otherwise than in prescribed ble cause—Transactions between mutually —Loans taken by company from directors—effected in books of account—Interest paid	
	:—Mere technical violation and no loss to fied—Sudha Agro Oil and Chemical IT (Visakhapatnam)	520
DIMEC		
RULES:		
Income-tax Rules, 1962		
cash exceeding specified limiticular payees incorporated in respective sales—Assessee pubanking facilities—Assessee Assessee inserting some entrinal vouchers and complete Department—Disallowance juccit	s expenditure—Disallowance—Payments in t—Duty of assessee to prove whether partheir books for computing their profits on rchasing gold ornaments and parties having making cash payment in different dates—es in his books with support of some interbills and vouchers not produced before astified—RAJENDRA KUMAR SAHOO v. ASST. (Cuttack)	10
income—No exempt income	vance of expenditure in relation to exempt received by assessee during year—Disallow-CIT v. HIND INDUSTRIES LTD. (Delhi)	1

lii ITR's Tribunal Tax Reports	[Vol. 79
	PAGE
——Income—Disallowance of expenditure relating to exemplincome—Assessing Officer expressing dissatisfaction on assessee's claim that no expenses incurred for earning exempt income—Assessee having sufficient interest-free funds to invest in mutual funds—Disallowance to deleted—Administrative expenses incurred for earning exemplincome—No bifurcation of expenses—Restriction of disallowance at 0 per cent. reasonable estimation—Asst. CIT v. NIIT Technologies Ltd.	ng to pt .5
(Delhi)	
R. 8D(2)(ii)—Income—Disallowance of expenditure in relation to exempt income—No tax exempt income in relevant previous year—Note allowance—Deputy CIT v. JSW Ltd. (Mumbai)	lo
R. 8D(2)(iii) —Income—Disallowance of expenditure relating the exempt income—No income exempt from tax received in relevant previous year—No disallowance can be made—DEPUTY CIT v. COFFEE DA	ri-
GLOBAL LTD. (Bang) Income-tax (Appellate Tribunal) Rules, 1963 :	322
R. 34(5) —Appeal to Appellate Tribunal—Pronouncement of orders-	
Time limit for—Exceptional circumstances created owing to spread coronavirus—Order passed after time limit prescribed—Deputy CIT	of v.
JSW Ltd. (Mumbai)	585

End of Volume 79