

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.

THE
ITR'S TRIBUNAL TAX REPORTS
VOLUME 79 — 2020
SHORT NOTES

TABLE OF CASES REPORTED

	PAGE
Ajay Narendra Bansal <i>v.</i> Deputy CIT (Mumbai)	8
Anil Dye Chem Industries Pvt. Ltd. <i>v.</i> Asst. CIT (Ahmedabad)	30
Awasthi Nivas Foundation <i>v.</i> ITO (Bangalore)	26
Bharat Sons (HUF) <i>v.</i> Asst. CIT (Delhi)	29
Commissioner of Income-tax (Deputy) (Exemptions) <i>v.</i> Cargo Handling Private Workers Pool Trust (Visakhapatnam)	38
Deverasetty Venkata Subba Rao (Late) <i>v.</i> ITO (Visakhapatnam)	6
Essentra (India) Pvt. Ltd. <i>v.</i> ITO (Bangalore)	22
Frontier Business Systems P. Ltd. <i>v.</i> ITO (Bangalore)	34
Honey Rahulan (Smt.) <i>v.</i> ITO (Cochin)	41
Income-tax Officer <i>v.</i> Jasmin Mulraj Mehta (Mumbai)	9

ii	ITR'S TRIBUNAL TAX REPORTS	[VOL. 79
		PAGE
	Jasmin Mulraj Mehta <i>v.</i> ITO	(Mumbai) 9
	Keshavlal Somnath Panchal (late) <i>v.</i> ITO	(Ahd) 15
	Mewar Hospital Pvt. Ltd. <i>v.</i> Asst. CIT	(Jodhpur) 12
	Mihir Bipin Parekh <i>v.</i> Deputy CIT	(Mumbai) 5
	Mohanrao Vishwanath Gaikwad <i>v.</i> ITO	(Pune) 42
	Neelam Pachisia (Smt.) <i>v.</i> Deputy CIT (CPC)	(Bang) 14
	Prakash Ramachandra Prabhu <i>v.</i> ITO	(Bangalore) 27
	Rajan Roy (Late) <i>v.</i> Asst. CIT	(Delhi) 3
	S. K. Minerals Handling P. Ltd. <i>v.</i> Asst. CIT	(Cuttack) 18
	Sahoo (R. N.) <i>v.</i> Deputy CIT	(Cuttack) 20
	Sangeeth Nursing Home <i>v.</i> Asst. CIT	(Cochin) 36
	Sanghamitra Pattnaik (Smt.) <i>v.</i> ITO	(Cuttack) 46
	Shree Shree Mohanananda Samaj Seva Samity <i>v.</i> ITO (Exemption)	(Kolkata) 43
	Sumesh Kumar <i>v.</i> ITO	(Delhi) 2
	The Ayalur Service Co-operative Bank Ltd. <i>v.</i> ITO	(Cochin) 17
	The Sholayoor Service Co-operative Bank Ltd. <i>v.</i> ITO	(Cochin) 32
	Travel Trails India P. Ltd. <i>v.</i> Asst. CIT, TDS	(Cochin) 37

2020] TABLE OF CASES REPORTED (SHORT NOTES)		iii
		PAGE
Unique Ways Management Service P. Ltd. <i>v.</i> Asst. CIT	(Indore)	11
Varusai Mohammed Rowther Kazakamal <i>v.</i> ITO	(Chennai)	1
Vijaya Bhavani Constructions P. Ltd. <i>v.</i> ITO	(Hyderabad)	24
Vimalaben B. Patel (Smt.) <i>v.</i> ITO	(Pune)	25
Vodafone Idea Ltd. <i>v.</i> Asst. CIT (TDS)	(Cuttack)	44

**TABLE OF CASES JUDICIALLY NOTICED
(SHORT NOTES CASES)**

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

2020] TABLE OF CASES JUDICIALLY NOTICED (SHORT NOTES CASES) v

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

THE
ITR'S TRIBUNAL TAX REPORTS
VOLUME 79 — 2020

TABLE OF CASES REPORTED

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

2020]	TABLE OF CASES REPORTED	vii
		PAGE
Devender Kumar <i>v.</i> ITO	(Delhi)	419
Digjam Ltd. <i>v.</i> Asst. CIT	(Rajkot)	263
Essar Shipping Ltd. <i>v.</i> Asst. CIT	(Mumbai)	555
Extentia Information Technology Pvt. Ltd. <i>v.</i> Deputy CIT	(Pune)	364
FIS Solutions (India) P. Ltd. <i>v.</i> Deputy CIT	(Pune)	656
Income-tax Officer <i>v.</i> Shihabudeen (A.)	(Cochin)	280
JCDecaux S. A. <i>v.</i> Asst./Deputy CIT	(Delhi)	222
Jindal Steel and Power Ltd. <i>v.</i> Principal CIT	(Delhi)	636
Karnataka Vikas Grameena Bank <i>v.</i> Joint CIT	(Bang)	207
Keshav Industries Pvt. Ltd. <i>v.</i> ITO (TDS)	(Indore)	426
Lotus Labs P. Ltd. <i>v.</i> Deputy CIT	(Bang)	295
Madhur Mittal <i>v.</i> Deputy CIT	(Delhi)	607
Manoj Kumar <i>v.</i> Asst. CIT	(Delhi)	158
NIIT Technologies Ltd. <i>v.</i> Asst. CIT	(Delhi)	60
Oswal Computers and AMP Consultants Pvt. Ltd. <i>v.</i> ITO (TDS)	(Indore)	426
Pabitra Banerjee <i>v.</i> ITO	(Cuttack)	480

viii	ITR'S TRIBUNAL TAX REPORTS	[VOL. 79
		PAGE
Padmavati Retail India Pvt. Ltd. <i>v.</i> ITO (TDS)	(Indore)	426
Panchshil Exim P. Ltd. <i>v.</i> Deputy CIT	(Rajkot)	472
PIK Studios P. Ltd. <i>v.</i> Deputy CIT	(Mumbai)	533
Rajendra Kumar Sahoo <i>v.</i> Asst. CIT	(Cuttack)	10
Renu Jain <i>v.</i> ITO	(Jaipur)	621
Sanjeeva Reddy Paga <i>v.</i> ITO	(Hyderabad)	439
Satern Griha Nirman P. Ltd. <i>v.</i> ITO	(Kolkata)	359
Snowhill Agencies P. Ltd. <i>v.</i> Principal CIT	(Ahd)	176
Sofina S. A. <i>v.</i> Asst. CIT (International Taxation)	(Mumbai)	489
Sreenivasa Reddy Cheemalamarri <i>v.</i> ITO	(Hyderabad)	465
Sri Parameswari Projects P. Ltd. <i>v.</i> ITO	(Visakhapatnam)	529
Sudha Agro Oil and Chemical Industries Ltd. <i>v.</i> Addl. CIT	(Visakhapatnam)	520
Summit Mittal <i>v.</i> Deputy CIT	(Delhi)	607
Sunray Cotspin (P.) Ltd. <i>v.</i> Principal CIT	(Delhi)	193
Vithal Baban Bangar <i>v.</i> ITO	(Mum)	55
Volkswagen Finance P. Ltd. <i>v.</i> ITO	(Mumbai)	447

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) <i>followed</i>	555
A. T. & S India (P.) Ltd., <i>In re</i> [2006] 287 ITR 421 (AAR)	222
ACB India Ltd. v. Asst. CIT [2015] 374 ITR 108 (Delhi) <i>followed</i>	60
ACG Associated Capsules Pvt. Ltd. v. CIT [2012] 343 ITR 89 (SC) <i>followed</i>	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, <i>In re</i> [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) <i>followed</i>	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] <i>followed</i>	656

x	ITR'S TRIBUNAL TAX REPORTS	[VOL. 79
		PAGE
Avaya India (P.) Ltd. v. Addl. CIT [2019] 112 taxmann.com 301 (Delhi) <i>followed</i>		656
Avenue Asia Advisors Pvt. Ltd. v. Dy. CIT [2017] 398 ITR 120 (Delhi)		295
Avion Systems Inc. v. Dy. DIT (IT) [2012] 138 ITD 57 (Mumbai)		222
Awadhesh Pratap Singh Abdul Rehman and Bros. v. CIT [1994] 210 ITR 406 (All) <i>relied on</i>		472
Babu Mathew v. Asst. CIT [2018] TaxPub (DT) 6676 (Cochin)		280
Baby Memorial Hospital Ltd. v. Asst. CIT [2020] 77 ITR (Trib) 484 (Cochin)		322
Balaji Textile Industries Pvt. Ltd. v. Third ITO [1994] 49 ITD 177 (Mum)		1
Banashankari Medical and Oncology Research Centre Ltd v. Asst. CIT (I. T. A. No. 1217/Bang/2007)		322
Bechtel India P. Ltd. v. Dy. CIT [2016] 66 taxmann.com 6 (Delhi)		295
Bharti Airtel Ltd. v. Addl. CIT [2014] 2 ITR (Trib)-OL 475 (Delhi)		555
Bhupesh Kumar J. Sanghvi v. Dy. CIT (I. T. A. No. 15/Indore/ 2018 dated January 22, 2019) <i>followed</i>		426
Bunty Builders v. ITO [2010] 127 ITD 286 (Pune)		310
Cambay Electric Supply Industrial Co. Ltd. v. CIT [1978] 113 ITR 84 (SC)		60
Canara Bank (I. T. A. No. 58/Bang/2004 dated June 9, 2006)		207
Cash Edge India (P.) Ltd. v. ITO (I. T. A. No. 64/Delhi/2015 dated September 23, 2015)		656
CBDT v. Oberoi Hotels (India) P. Ltd. [1998] 231 ITR 148 (SC) <i>followed</i>		222
Centrica India Offshore P. Ltd. [2014] 364 ITR 336 (Delhi) confirmed in [2015] 371 ITR (St.) 373 (SC)		222
CESC Ltd. v. CIT [1998] 233 ITR 50 (SC)		322
Ceva Asia Pacific Holdings Co. P. Ltd. v. Dy. DIT (I. T. A. No. 1503/ Delhi/2014 dated January 8, 2018)		222
CGI Information Systems and Management Consultants Pvt. Ltd. v. Asst. CIT [2018] 94 taxmann.com 97		656
CGU Logistics Ltd. v. ITO (I. T. A. No. 1053/Mum/2014)		555
Changepond Technologies (P.) Ltd. v. Asst. CIT [2008] 119 TTJ 18 (Chennai)		60

2020]	TABLE OF CASES CITED	xi
		PAGE
Cheminvest Ltd. v. CIT [2015] 378 ITR 33 (Delhi)		322
do. v. do. <i>relied on</i>		1, 585
Cheminvest Ltd. v. ITO [2009] 317 ITR (AT) 86 (Delhi) [SB]		60, 585
Chennakesava Pharmaceuticals v. CIT [2012] 349 ITR 196 (AP)		386
Chitra Publicity Co. P. Ltd. v. Asst. CIT [2010] 4 ITR (Trib) 738 (Ahd) (TM)		533
Cloth Traders P. Ltd. v. Addl. CIT [1979] 118 ITR 243 (SC)		60
Commissioner of Income-tax v. Abhinandan Investment Ltd. [2016] 6 ITR-OL 139 (Delhi)		555
CIT v. Agnity India Technologies (P.) Ltd. [2013] 219 Taxman 26 (Delhi)		656
CIT v. Alagappa Cotton Mills [1984] 149 ITR 640 (Mad)		533
CIT v. Alagendran Finance Ltd. [2007] 293 ITR 1 (SC) <i>relied on</i>		636
CIT v. Alembic Glass Industries Ltd. [1976] 103 ITR 715 (Guj)		322
CIT v. Apsara Talkies [1985] 155 ITR 303 (Mad)		280
CIT (Dy.) v. Arabian Exports Ltd. [2007] 109 TTJ 440 (Mum)		60
CIT v. Arthusa Offshore Co. [2008] 216 CTR 86 (Uttarakhand)		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 of 2014—Bombay) <i>followed</i>		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 2016 dated October 13, 2016)		585
CIT (Pr.) v. Basti Sugar Mills Co. Ltd. [2018] 408 ITR 184 (Delhi)		322
CIT (Dy.) v. Bengal Beverages (P.) Ltd. [2017] 60 ITR (Trib) (S.N.) 49 (Kol)		322
CIT v. Bharat Commercial Corpn. [1997] 226 ITR 242 (Patna)		322
CIT v. Bharati Airtel Ltd. [2013] 218 Taxman 112 (Delhi) (Mag)		636
CIT v. Bhatia (K. S.) [2004] 269 ITR 577 (P&H) <i>applied</i>		133
CIT (Pr.) v. Bikram Singh [2017] 399 ITR 407 (Delhi)		1
CIT (Dy.) v. BOC Group Ltd. [2015] 64 taxmann.com 386 (Kolkata-Trib)		222
CIT v. Bombay Dyeing and Manufacturing Co. Ltd. [1996] 219 ITR 521 (SC) <i>distinguished</i>		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.) v. 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) <i>followed</i>		555
CIT (Dy.) v. Core Health Care Ltd. [2008] 298 ITR 194 (SC)		322
CIT v. Corrotech Energy (P.) Ltd. [2015] 372 ITR 97 (Guj)		585
CIT v. Cotton Naturals (I.) (P.) Ltd. [2015] 5 ITR-OL 1 (Delhi) <i>followed</i>		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] <i>followed</i>		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) <i>distinguished</i>		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 <i>v.</i> Golani Brothers [2018] 300 CTR 245 (Bom)	1
	CIT <i>v.</i> Gopal (M. R.) [1965] 58 ITR 598 (Mad)	322
	CIT <i>v.</i> Gotan Lime Khanij Udhyog [2002] 256 ITR 243 (Raj) <i>applied</i>	133
	CIT <i>v.</i> Gotla (J. H.) [1985] 156 ITR 323 (SC)	621
	CIT <i>v.</i> Gurvinder Transport [2013] 215 Taxman 593 (Guj)	207
	CIT <i>v.</i> H. M. T. Ltd. (No. 3) [1993] 203 ITR 820 (Karn)	60
	CIT <i>v.</i> HEDE Consultancy (P.) Ltd. [2002] 258 ITR 380 (Bom)	322
	CIT <i>v.</i> Hero Cycles Ltd. [2010] 323 ITR 518 (P&H)	585
	CIT <i>v.</i> Himatasigike Seide Ltd. [2006] 286 ITR 255 (Karn)	60
	CIT <i>v.</i> Hindustan Samuh Awas Ltd. [2015] 377 ITR 150 (Bom)	310
	CIT <i>v.</i> Holcim India (P.) Ltd. [2015] 57 taxmann.com 28 (Delhi)	585
	CIT <i>v.</i> ICICI Bank Ltd. [2012] 343 ITR 74 (Bom)	636
	CIT (Pr.) <i>v.</i> IL and FS Energy Developments Co. Ltd. [2017] 399 ITR 483 (Delhi)	322
	CIT <i>v.</i> Insecticides (India) Ltd. [2013] 357 ITR 330 (Delhi)	595
	CIT <i>v.</i> Intel Technology India P. Ltd. [2016] 380 ITR 272 (Karn)	176
	CIT <i>v.</i> Investa Industrial Corpn. Ltd. [1979] 119 ITR 380 (Bom) <i>followed</i>	555
	CIT <i>v.</i> Jagriti Aggarwal (Ms.) [2011] 339 ITR 610 (P&H)	621
	CIT <i>v.</i> Jagtar Singh Chawla [2013] 33 taxmann.com 38 ; 215 Taxman 154 (P&H)	621
	CIT (Dy.) <i>v.</i> Jammu and Kashmir Bank Ltd. [2013] 152 TTJ 522 (Amritsar)	60
	CIT (Dy.) <i>v.</i> JSW Ltd. [2020] 79 ITR (Trib) 585 (Mumbai)	595, 705
	CIT <i>v.</i> Kothari Auto Parts Manufacturers P. Ltd. [1977] 109 ITR 333 (Bom)	322
	CIT (Pr.) <i>v.</i> Kusum Health Care Pvt. Ltd. [2017] 398 ITR 66 (Delhi)	295
	CIT <i>v.</i> La Medica [2001] 250 ITR 575 (Delhi)	1
	CIT <i>v.</i> Lakhani Marketing Inc. [2015] 4 ITR-OL 246 (P&H)	585
	CIT <i>v.</i> Lark Chemicals Ltd. [2014] 368 ITR 655 (Bom)	636
	CIT <i>v.</i> Lovely Exports (P.) Ltd. [2009] 319 ITR (St.) 5 (Delhi)	119
	CIT <i>v.</i> Madras Auto Service Pvt. Ltd. [1998] 233 ITR 468 (SC)	60
	CIT <i>v.</i> Mahaan Foods Ltd. [2008] 216 CTR 148 (Delhi)	60
	CIT <i>v.</i> Mangalam Cement Ltd. [2017] 398 ITR 621 (Raj)	322
	CIT <i>v.</i> Manipal Universal Learning Pvt. Ltd. [2013] 359 ITR 369 (Karn)	533

xiv	ITR'S TRIBUNAL TAX REPORTS	[VOL. 79
		PAGE
CIT v. Manjunatha Cotton and Ginning Factory [2013] 359 ITR 565 (Karn)		280, 386
CIT v. Manu Engineering Works [1980] 122 ITR 306 (Guj)		386
CIT (Pr.) v. Maruti Suzuki India Ltd. [2019] 416 ITR 613 (SC)		176
CIT v. Max India Ltd. (No. 1) [2016] 388 ITR 74 (P&H)		322
CIT v. Mediworld Publications (P.) Ltd. [2011] 337 ITR 178 (Delhi) <i>followed</i>		22
CIT v. Messers. Harveys Ltd. [1940] 8 ITR 307 (Mad)		533
CIT v. Micra India (P.) Ltd. [2015] 231 Taxman 809 (Delhi)		176
CIT (Dy.) v. Microsoft Corporation India Pvt. Ltd. [2011] 9 taxmann.com 253 (Delhi Trib.)		695
CIT v. Micron Steels P. Ltd. [2015] 372 ITR 386 (Delhi)		176
CIT v. Mira Exim Ltd. [2013] 359 ITR 70 (Delhi)		533
CIT (Pr.) v. Mohammad Haji Adam and Co. (I. T. A. No. 1004/2016 dated February 11, 2019)		1
CIT v. Mohammed Kunhi [1973] 87 ITR 189 (Ker)		280
CIT v. Monarch Educational Society [2016] 387 ITR 416 (Delhi)		119
CIT v. Monnet Industries Ltd. [2013] 350 ITR 304 (SC)		322
CIT (Asst.) v. NIIT Technologies Ltd. (I. T. A. No. 3076/Delhi/2012 dated February 27, 2019)		60
CIT v. N. C. Budharaja and Co. [1993] 204 ITR 412 (SC)		322
CIT v. Nirav Modi [2017] 390 ITR 292 (Bom)		193
CIT v. Noorjahan (P. K.) (Smt.) [1999] 237 ITR 570 (SC)		1
CIT v. Noorjehan (P. K.) (Smt.) [1980] 123 ITR 3 (Ker)		1
CIT v. Nova Promoters and Finlease P. Ltd. [2012] 342 ITR 169 (Delhi)		119, 636
CIT v. Patni Computer Systems Ltd. [2013] 1 ITR-OL 146 (Bom)		295
CIT (Asst.) v. Petroleum India International [2012] 27 taxmann.com 325 (Mum)		222
CIT v. Phil Corporation Ltd. [2011] 244 CTR 226 (Bom) <i>followed</i>		555
CIT (Pr.) v. Pinaki D. Panani (I. T. A. No. 1543 of 2017 dated January 8, 2020 (Bom))		1
CIT (Pr.) v. Piramal Glass Ltd. (I. T. A. No 566 of 2017 dated June 11, 2019) (Bombay)		555
CIT v. Prabhudas Kishordas Tobacco Products P. Ltd. [2006] 282 ITR 568 (Guj)		322
CIT (Asst.) v. Prakash L. Shah [2008] 306 ITR (A.T.) 1 (Mum) [SB]		364
CIT v. R. D. Aggarwal 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) <i>followed</i>	280
	CIT v. Radio Today Broadcasting Ltd. [2016] 382 ITR 42 (Delhi)	322
	CIT v. Rai Bahadur Hardutroy Motilal Chamaria [1967] 66 ITR 443 (SC)	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 Kumar Jalan [2006] 286 ITR 274 (Gauhati)	621
	CIT v. Ram Commercial Enterprises Ltd. [2000] 246 ITR 568 (Delhi)	386
	CIT (Pr.) v. Rama Shankar Yadav [2017] 85 taxmann.com 173 (All)	1
	CIT (Pr.) v. Reebok 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
	CIT v. Reliance Utilities and Power Ltd. [2009] 313 ITR 340 (Bom) <i>applied</i>	60
	CIT v. Rex Talkies [1984] 148 ITR 560 (Karn)	322
	CIT (Pr.) v. Rishabdev Technocable Ltd. (I. T. A. No. 1330 of 2017 dated February 10, 2020 (Bom)	1
	CIT v. RPG Transmissions Ltd. [2013] 359 ITR 673 (Mad) <i>followed</i>	555
	CIT (Dy.) v. Rohini Builders [2002] 256 ITR 360 (Guj) <i>relied on</i>	705
	CIT v. Sakthi Sugars Ltd. [2011] 339 ITR 400 (Mad)	322
	CIT v. Samson Perinchery [2017] 392 ITR 4 (Bom)	386
	CIT v. Sarkar Builders [2015] 375 ITR 392 (SC)	310
	CIT v. Satish Bala Malhotra (Smt.) (No. 1) [2016] 387 ITR 403 (P&H)	322
	CIT (Pr.) v. Saxo India P. Ltd. [2017] 397 ITR 160 (Delhi)	656
	CIT (Pr.) v. Seagram Manufacturing Pvt. Ltd. [2017] 78 tax- mann.com 293 (Delhi)	322
	CIT (Pr.) v. Sesa Resources Ltd. [2018] 404 ITR 707 (Bom)	555
	CIT (Pr.) v. Shankar Lal Saini [2018] 89 taxmann.com 235 (Raj) <i>relied on</i>	621
	CIT v. Sharma (M. K.) [2008] 307 ITR 147 (Delhi)—an appeal [2008] 306 ITR (St.) 2 (SC)	386
	CIT v. Shivam Motors (P.) Ltd. [2015] 230 Taxman 63 (All)	585
	CIT (Asst.) v. Shreyas Shipping Logistics Ltd. (I. T. A. No. 7406/ Mum/2014 dated August 3, 2016)	555
	CIT v. Shree Triveni Foods [2015] 59 taxmann.com 292 (HP)	322

xvi

ITR'S TRIBUNAL TAX REPORTS

[VOL. 79

	PAGE
CIT <i>v.</i> Shri Goverdhan Ltd. [1968] 69 ITR 675 (SC)	656
CIT (Asst.) <i>v.</i> SIL Investment Ltd. [2012] 148 TTJ 213 (Delhi)	60
CIT <i>v.</i> Siemens Aktiengesellschaft [2009] 310 ITR 320 (Bom) <i>relied on</i>	489
CIT <i>v.</i> Software Consultants [2012] 341 ITR 240 (Delhi)	119
CIT <i>v.</i> Sonal Construction [2013] 359 ITR 532 (Delhi)	607
CIT <i>v.</i> Spice Entofainment Ltd. [2018] 12 ITR-OL 134 (SC)	176
CIT <i>v.</i> Sri Durga Enterprises [2014] 44 taxmann.com 442 (Karn)	280
CIT <i>v.</i> Sri Marikamba Transport Co. [2015] 379 ITR 129 (Karn)	207
CIT <i>v.</i> Sri Shanmuga Ginning Factory [2013] 355 ITR 96 (Mad)	10
CIT <i>v.</i> Sridev Enterprises [1991] 192 ITR 165 (Karn)	555
CIT <i>v.</i> Sriram Engineering Construction Co. Ltd. [2011] 330 ITR 568 (Mad)	636
CIT <i>v.</i> SSA's Emerald Meadows [2015] 11 TMI 1620 (Karn) ; [2016] 73 taxmann.com 241 (Karn)	280, 386
CIT <i>v.</i> SSA's Emerald Meadows [2016] 386 ITR (St.) 13 (SC)	280, 386
CIT <i>v.</i> Sun Engineering Works Pvt. Ltd. [1992] 198 ITR 297 (SC)	447, 533
CIT <i>v.</i> Sunil Kumar Goel [2009] 315 ITR 163 (P&H) <i>distinguished</i>	520
CIT <i>v.</i> Supriya Gill (Smt.) [2013] 31 taxmann.com 69 (HP)	322
CIT (Asst.) <i>v.</i> Surat City Gymkhana [2008] 300 ITR 214 (SC)	31
CIT <i>v.</i> Suretech Hospital and Research Centre Ltd. [2007] 293 ITR 53 (Bom)	60
CIT (Dy.) <i>v.</i> Suyash Laboratories Ltd. [2016] 65 taxmann.com 217 (Mum) (Trib)	533
CIT <i>v.</i> T. V. Sundaram Iyengar and Sons (P.) Ltd. [1975] 101 ITR 764 (SC)	621
CIT <i>v.</i> Text Hundred India P. Ltd. [2013] 351 ITR 57 (Delhi)	60
CIT <i>v.</i> The Mazagaon Dock Co. Ltd. [1938] 6 ITR 124 (Bom)	533
CIT <i>v.</i> Trans Asian Shipping Services (P.) Ltd. [2016] 385 ITR 637 (SC)	555
CIT <i>v.</i> UTI Bank Ltd. [2014] 2 ITR-OL 366 (Guj)	60
CIT <i>v.</i> Valibhai Khanbhai Mankad [2013] 1 ITR-OL 405 (Guj)	207
CIT <i>v.</i> Vatika Township Pvt. Ltd. [2014] 367 ITR 466 (SC)	426
CIT <i>v.</i> Vatika Townships P. Ltd. (I. T. A. No. 1329 of 2010 dated September 10, 2010) (Delhi)	607
CIT <i>v.</i> Vegetable Products Ltd. [1973] 88 ITR 192 (SC)	426

2020]	TABLE OF CASES CITED	xvii
		PAGE
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. 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) <i>followed</i>		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
Devi Dass Gopal Krishnan v. State of Punjab [1967] 20 STC 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
Director of Income-tax (International Taxation) <i>v.</i> Besix Kier Dabhol SA [2012] 210 Taxman 151 (Bom)	555
DIT (Dy.) <i>v.</i> IATA BSP India [2014] 64 SOT 290 (Mumbai)	222
DIT <i>v.</i> New Skies Satellite BV [2016] 382 ITR 114 (Delhi) <i>relied on</i>	489
DIT (International Taxation) <i>v.</i> Prahlad Vijendra Rao [2011] 239 CTR 107 (Karn)	465
Distributors (Baroda) P. Ltd. <i>v.</i> Union of India [1985] 155 ITR 120 (SC) <i>relied on</i>	60
Doshi (P. V.) <i>v.</i> CIT [1978] 113 ITR 22 (Guj)	176
Dundlod Shikshan Sansthan <i>v.</i> Union of India [2015] 63 taxmann.com 243 (Raj)	426
Dwarika Prasad <i>v.</i> ITO [1997] 63 ITD 1 (Patna)	60
Dwarkadish Buildwell P. Ltd. <i>v.</i> CIT [2019] 109 taxmann.com 5 (Delhi) <i>followed</i>	119
East India Pharmaceutical Works Ltd. <i>v.</i> CIT [1997] 224 ITR 627 (SC)	60
Electra (Jaipur) (P.) Ltd. <i>v.</i> IAC [1988] 26 ITD 236 (Delhi)	60
EMC Software and Services India P. Ltd. <i>v.</i> Jt. CIT (I. T. (T.P.) A. No. 3375/Bang/2018, dated December 18, 2019)	656
Emdee Apparels <i>v.</i> Asst. CIT [2012] 19 ITR (Trib) 623 (Bang)	322
Emerald Co. Ltd. <i>v.</i> ITO [2016] 46 ITR (Trib) 619 (Kol)	176
Emerson Electric Co. (India) Pvt. Ltd. <i>v.</i> Asst. CIT dated June 14, 2019	364
Empire Jute Co. Ltd. <i>v.</i> CIT [1980] 124 ITR 1 (SC)	60
Escorts Ltd. <i>v.</i> Asst. CIT [2007] 104 ITD 427 (Delhi)	555
Essar Ports Ltd. <i>v.</i> Asst. CIT (I. T. A. No. 4444/Mum/2017 dated June 26, 2019) <i>followed</i>	555
Everest Kanto Cylinder Ltd. <i>v.</i> Asst. CIT (LTU) (I. T. A. No. 7073/Mum/2012 dated September 25, 2014) <i>followed</i>	555
Fatheraj Singhvi <i>v.</i> Union of India [2017] 10 ITR-OL 509 (Karn)	426
Fathima Bai <i>v.</i> ITO [2009] 32 DTR 243 (Karn)	621
Fition Hotel <i>v.</i> ITO (2008 40-A BCA) 293 - ITAT- Mumbai	322
Food World Supermarkets Ltd. <i>v.</i> Dy. DIT TS-629-ITAT-2015 (Bang)	222
Ganesh Dass Piara Lal Jain <i>v.</i> ITO [2016] 49 ITR (Trib) 36 (Chd)	1

2020]	TABLE OF CASES CITED	xix
		PAGE
	Gee Vee Enterprises <i>v.</i> Addl. CIT [1975] 99 ITR 375 (Delhi)	636
	Glass Lines Equipments Co. Ltd. <i>v.</i> CIT [2002] 253 ITR 454 (Guj)	607
	Godrej and Boyce Mfg. Co. Ltd. <i>v.</i> Dy. CIT [2010] 328 ITR 81 (Bom)	60
	Goverdhan Singh Shekhawat <i>v.</i> ITO [2019] 102 taxmann.com 50 (Jaipur)	621
	Guangzhou Usha International Ltd., <i>In re</i> [2015] 378 ITR 465 (AAR)	222
	Gurdas Garg <i>v.</i> CIT (Appeals) [2015] 63 taxmann.com 289 (P&H)	10
	GXS India Technology Centre P. Ltd. <i>v.</i> ITO (I. T. (T.P.) A No. 1444/Bang/2012 dated July 31, 2015)	656
	Haridas Parikh <i>v.</i> ITO [2008] 113 TTJ 274 (Jodhpur)	472
	Harjit Kaur <i>v.</i> Asst. CIT (I. T. A. No. 280 of 2013 (P&H), dated November 11, 2013)	636
	Haryana Acrylic Manufacturing Co. <i>v.</i> CIT [2009] 308 ITR 38 (Delhi) <i>relied on</i>	705
	Hero Cycles P. Ltd. <i>v.</i> CIT [2015] 379 ITR 347 (SC)	555
	Hinduja Global Solutions Ltd. <i>v.</i> Addl. CIT [2013] 145 ITD 361 (Mum) <i>followed</i>	555
	Hindustan Lever Ltd. <i>v.</i> R. B. Wadkar, Asst. CIT (No. 1) [2004] 268 ITR 332 (Bom) <i>relied on</i>	705
	Honda Siel Cars India Ltd. <i>v.</i> Asst. CIT [2007] 109 ITD 1 (Delhi)	322
	Hoshang D. Nanavati <i>v.</i> Asst. CIT [2012] 16 ITR (Trib) 614 (Mum)	60
	Hotel Rajmahal <i>v.</i> CIT [1985] 152 ITR 218 (Karn)	295
	HPCL Mittal Energy Ltd. <i>v.</i> Asst. CIT [2018] 169 DTR 1 (Amritsar)	386
	Hukumchand Mills Ltd. <i>v.</i> CIT [1967] 63 ITR 232 (SC)	447
	Hyundai Motors India Engineering P. Ltd. <i>v.</i> Dy. CIT (I. T. A. No. 255/Hyd/2014 dated July 31, 2014)	656
	ICICI Bank Ltd. <i>v.</i> K. J. Rao [2004] 268 ITR 203 (Bom) <i>relied on</i>	705
	Idandas <i>v.</i> Anant Ram Chandra Phadke [1982] AIR 1982 SC 127	322
	Income-tax Officer <i>v.</i> Daga Capital Management P. Ltd. [2009] 312 ITR (AT) 1 (Mum)	60
	ITO <i>v.</i> Eagle Impex (I. T. A. No. 5697/Mum/2010 dated February 22, 2013)	1
	ITO <i>v.</i> Gebbs Infotech Ltd. (I. T. A. No. 3370/Mum/2007 dated October 13, 2010)	60
	ITO <i>v.</i> J. M. P. Enterprises [2006] 101 ITD 324 (Asr)	555

xx	ITR'S TRIBUNAL TAX REPORTS	[VOL. 79
		PAGE
ITO <i>v.</i> Lakshdweep Development Corporation Ltd. (I. T. A. No. 312/Cochin/2018 dated October 3, 2018) <i>followed</i>		695
ITO (International Taxation) <i>v.</i> M Far Hotels Ltd. (I. T. A. Nos. 430 to 435/Coch./2011 dated April 5, 2013)		222
ITO <i>v.</i> Rajan Kalimuthu (I. T. A. No. 2900/Chennai/2018 dated May 22, 2019)		386
ITO <i>v.</i> Satyanarayan Ramswaroop Agarwal [2014] 50 taxmann.com 111 (Pune)		310
ITO (OSD) <i>v.</i> Sicgil India Pvt. Ltd. [2010] 1 ITR (Trib) 749 (Chennai)		695
ITO (International Taxation) <i>v.</i> Sunil Chitranjan Muncif [2013] 58 SOT 356 (Ahd)		465
ITO <i>v.</i> Yash Creation [2015] 61 taxmann.com 358 (Ahd.-Trib)		322
Indiabulls Financial Services Ltd. <i>v.</i> Dy. CIT [2017] 395 ITR 242 (Delhi) <i>relied on</i>		60
Indian Hotels Co. Ltd <i>v.</i> ITO [2000] 245 ITR 538 (SC)		322
Indira Industries <i>v.</i> Pr. CIT [2018] 12 ITR-OL 413 (Mad) <i>relied on</i>		636
Indore School of Social Work (I. T. A. No. 117 of 2019 dated February 20, 2020) <i>followed</i>		426
Instrumentarium Corpn. Ltd. <i>v.</i> Dy. DIT (I. T. A. Nos. 1548 and 1549 (Kolkata) of 2009 dated July 15, 2016)		295
Intoto Software India P. Ltd. <i>v.</i> ITO (I. T. A. No. 1810/Hyd/2012 dated December 9, 2015)		656
ION Trading India P. Ltd. <i>v.</i> ITO (I. T. A. No. 1035/Delhi/2015 dated December 7, 2015)		656
ITC Ltd. <i>v.</i> CCE [2004] 3 RC 337 ; [2004] 7 SCC 591		621
J. P. Distilleries <i>v.</i> ITO (I. T. A. No. 470/Bang/2018 dated June 29, 2018)		322
Jagan Nath Singh Lodha <i>v.</i> ITO [2005] 148 Taxman 1 (Jodhpur) (Mag)		621
Jammu Development Authority <i>v.</i> CIT (S. L. P. No. (S) 4990 of 2014 dated July 21, 2014) <i>distinguished</i>		31
Jaswant Sugar Mills Ltd. <i>v.</i> ITO [1973] Tax LR 1336 (All)		533
Jeypore Timber and Veneer Mills (P.) Ltd. <i>v.</i> CIT [1982] 137 ITR 415 (Gauhati)		447
Jindal Steel and Power Ltd. <i>v.</i> Asst. CIT (I. T. A. No. 893/Delhi/2014, dated April 29, 2019)		636
Jogta Coal Co. Ltd. <i>v.</i> CIT [1965] 55 ITR 89 (Cal)		533

2020]	TABLE OF CASES CITED	xxi
		PAGE
John Deere India Pvt. Ltd. v. Asst. CIT (I. T. A. No. 518/Pune/2015 dated April 25, 2019)		656
Kamlapat Moti Lal, <i>In re</i> [1939] 7 ITR 374 (All)		533
Karnataka Vikas Grameena Bank v. Jt. CIT (I. T. A. No. 684/Bang/2014 dated April 25, 2018)		207
Karnataka Vikas Grameena Bank v. Jt. CIT (I. T. A. Nos. 673 and 674/Bang/2014 dated April 25, 2018) <i>followed</i>		207
Kaur Chand Jain v. Dy. CIT (I. T. A. No. 378/Amritsar/2015 dated September 15, 2016)		426
Kedarnath Jute Manufacturing Co. Ltd. v. CIT [1971] 82 ITR 363 (SC)		322, 656
Keshavji Ravji and Co. v. CIT [1990] 183 ITR 1 (SC)		621
Khatiza S. Omerbhoy (Mrs.) v. ITO [2006] 101 TTJ 1095 (Mum)		176
Konark Structural Engineering (P.) Ltd. v. Dy. CIT [2018] 90 taxmann.com 56 (Bom)		1
Kores India Ltd. v. CCE [2004] 174 ELT 7 (SC)		322
KPIT Cummins Infosystems (Bangalore) (P.) Ltd. v. Asst. CIT [2008] 26 SOT 529 (Bang)		60
Kungundi Industrial Works (Pvt.) Ltd. v. CIT [1965] 57 ITR 540 (AP)		533
Kusum Healthcare Pvt. Ltd v. Asst. CIT [2015] 62 taxmann.com 79 (Delhi)		295
LG Electronics India P. Ltd. v. Pr. CIT [2016] 388 ITR 135 (All) <i>relied on</i>		636
Lachmandas Mathuradas 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) P. Ltd. v. Dy. CIT (I. T. A. Nos. 1437 and 1385/Bang/2014)		656
Laxmi Narayan Jewellery v. ITO (I. T. A. No. 250/Cuttack/2018 dated May 13, 2019)		10
LG Software India Pvt. Ltd. v. Dy. CIT (I. T. (TP) A. No. 3122/Bang/2018 dated May 28, 2019)		656
Likproof India Pvt. Ltd. v. Addl. CIT [2016] 50 ITR (Trib) (S.N.) 94 (Mumbai)		322
Lime Labs (India) Pvt. Ltd. v. ITO [2019] 101 taxmann.com 201 (Delhi-Trib.)		656
Lucky Minmat (P.) Ltd. v. CIT [2000] 245 ITR 830 (SC)		322

Madhya Pradesh Power Transmission Ltd. v. Dy. CIT [2019] 69 ITR (Trib) 322 (Indore) <i>followed</i>	426
Mahalakshmi Sugar Mills Co. v. CIT [1980] 123 ITR 429 (SC)	695
Mahesh Vishnu Parab v. ITO (I. T. A. No. 8833/Mum/2010 dated January 31, 2013)	55
Majinder Singh Kang v. CIT [2012] 344 ITR 358 (P&H)	636
Malabar Industrial Co. Ltd. v. CIT [2000] 243 ITR 83 (SC)	176
Malani Ramjivan Jagannath v. Asst. CIT [2009] 316 ITR 120 (Raj) <i>relied on</i>	472
Malwa Cotton Spinning Mills v. Asst. CIT [2004] 89 ITD 65 (Chd)	555
Marico Ltd. v. Asst. CIT (I. T. A. No. 8858/Mum/2011 dated May 18, 2016)	555
Marwell India Pvt. Ltd. v. Dy. CIT (I. T. (T.P.) A. No. 3082/Bang/2018 dated October 23, 2019)	656
Mascot (India) Tools and Forgings (P.) Ltd. v. ITO [1987] 23 ITD 274 (Delhi)	533
Massachusetts v. United States 333 US 611	60
Maxim India Integrated Circuit Design Pvt. Ltd. v. Dy. CIT (I. T. A. No. 287/Bang/2014 dated July 6, 2019)	322
Maxopp Investment Ltd. v. CIT [2012] 347 ITR 272 (Delhi)	60
Maxopp Investment Ltd. v. CIT [2018] 402 ITR 640 (SC)	585
Mentor India Ltd. v. Dy. CIT (I. T. A. No. 738/Jaipur/2016 dated December 16, 2016)	426
Mercedes-Benz Research and Development P. Ltd. v. Dy. CIT (I. T. (T.P.) A. No. 1645/Bang/2016)	656
Merilyn Shipping and Transports v. Addl. CIT [2012] 136 ITD 23 (Vizak) [SB]	207
MetricStream Infotech (India) Pvt. Ltd. v. Dy. CIT (I. T. (TP) A. Nos. 1418 and 2735/Bang/2017 dated February 27, 2019)	656
MFAR Hotels and Resorts Ltd. v. Asst. CIT [2019] 105 taxmann.com 335 (Cochin-Trib.)	322
Micro Ink Ltd. v. Addl. CIT [2016] 157 ITD 132 (Ahd)	555
Micro Inks Ltd. v. Pr. CIT [2018] 407 ITR 681 (Guj)	193
Mircrosoft Research Lab India Pvt. Ltd. v. Dy. CIT (I.T. (TP) A. No. 3131/Bang/2018 dated February 5, 2020) <i>followed</i>	656
Modular Infotech (P.) Ltd. v. Dy. CIT [2010] 131 TITJ (Pune) (Trib) 243	533

2020]	TABLE OF CASES CITED	xxiii
		PAGE
Mumbai Kamgar Sabha v. Abdulbahi Faizullahai [1976] AIR 1976 SC 1455		447
Mumtaz Haji Mohmad Memon v. ITO [2018] 408 ITR 268 (Guj)		595
Murarilal Mittal v. Dy. CIT (I. T. A. No. 334/Jaipur/2015)		386
N. K. Industries Ltd. v. Dy. CIT [2017] 8 ITR-OL 336 (Guj)		1
N. K. Proteins Ltd. v. CIT (Deputy) [2017] 421 ITR (St.) 15 (SC)		1
N. K. Proteins Ltd. v. ITO (OSD) [2016] 389 ITR 541 (Guj)		1
Nagammal Cotton Mills (Pvt.) Ltd. v. CIT [2002] 258 ITR 390 (Mad)		533
Narayan Tatu Rane v. ITO [2016] 70 taxmann.com 227 (Mum-Trib)		636
Narayana Heights and Towers v. ITO (I. T. A. No. 1033/Jaipur/2016 dated February 20, 2017)		386
National Thermal Power Co. Ltd. v. CIT [1998] 229 ITR 383 (SC)		364
Nectar Beverages Pvt. Ltd. v. Dy. CIT [2009] 314 ITR 314 (SC)		60
NXP India P. Ltd. v. Asst. CIT (I. T. A. No. 5140/Delhi/2018 dated February 28, 2019) <i>followed</i>		656
Olive Bar and Kitchen (P.) Ltd. v. Dy. CIT [2019] 102 taxmann.com 98 (Mum-Trib.)		322
OMEC Engineers v. CIT [2007] 294 ITR 599 (Jharkhand)		520
Orange Business Services India Solutions Pvt. Ltd. v. Dy. CIT (I.T.A. No. 6570/Delhi/2016 dated February 15, 2018)		295
Organisation Development Pte. Ltd v. Dy. DIT [2012] 17 ITR (Trib) 341 (Chennai)		222
Orient Trading Co. Ltd. v. CIT [1963] 49 ITR 723 (Bom)		705
Oriental Bank of Commerce v. Addl. CIT [2018] 401 ITR 65 (Delhi)		119
Orissa State Warehousing Corporation v. CIT [1999] 237 ITR 589 (SC)		60
Ostime (Inspector of Taxes) v. Australian Mutual Provident Society [1960] 39 ITR 210 (HL)		60
Otters Club v. DIT (E) [2017] 392 ITR 244 (Bom)		585
Oxford University Press v. CIT [2001] 247 ITR 658 (SC)		621
Pan India Network Infravest Pvt. Ltd. v. Addl. CIT (I. T. A. No. 7026/Mum/2013 dated December 4, 2015)		555
Parekh Automobiles v. ITO [2000] 68 TTJ 722 (Rajkot)		60
Parke Davis and Co. LLC 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
Perfect Crop Science Pvt. Ltd. v. Dy. CIT (I. T. A. Nos. 2957 to 2963/Ahd/2015)	426
Perfetti Van Melle Holding B.V., <i>In re</i> [2012] 342 ITR 200 (AAR)	222
Phool Chand Gajanand v. CIT [1966] 62 ITR 232 (All)	447
Poabs Rock Products (P.) Ltd. v. Asst. CIT [2013] 40 taxmann.com 302 (Cochin-Trib)	322
Pope The King Match Factory v. CIT [1963] 50 ITR 495 (Mad)	656
Prabhavati S. Shah (Smt.) v. CIT [1998] 231 ITR 1 (Bom)	60
Prakash Chand Sharma v. Asst. CIT (I. T. A. Nos. 922, 923 and 924/Jaipur/2016 and I. T. A. Nos. 935, 936 and 937/Jaipur/2016 dated July 30, 2017) <i>followed</i>	386
Prakash Cotton Mills P. Ltd. v. CIT [1993] 201 ITR 684 (SC)	695
Prem Castings (P.) Ltd. v. CIT (Appeals) [2018] 11 ITR-OL 216 (All)	1
Prem Castings (P.) Ltd. v. CIT [2018] 406 ITR (St.) 7 (SC)	1
Rachhpal Singh v. ITO [2005] 94 ITD 79 (Amritsar)	60
Rajesh Kourani v. Union of India [2017] 83 taxmann.com 137 (Guj)	426
Rampyari Devi Saraogi v. CIT [1968] 67 ITR 84 (SC)	636
Ramsukh Properties v. Dy. CIT (I. T. A. No. 84/Pune/2011 dated July 25, 2012)	310
Raptakos Brett and Co. Ltd v. Pr. CIT (I. T. A. No. 2251/Mum/2015 dated December 22, 2016) (Mum-Trib.) <i>followed</i>	555
Rashmikant Kundalia v. Union of India [2015] 373 ITR 268 (Bom)	426
Raymond Ltd. v. Dy. CIT [2003] 86 ITD 791 (Mum)	222
Reliable Finhold Ltd. v. Union of India [2014] 369 ITR 419 (All)	533
Reliance Wellness Ltd. v. Dy. CIT [2016] 6 ITR (Trib)-OL 151 (Mum)	322
Relq Software (P.) Ltd. v. ITO [2010] 125 ITD 101 (Bang)	60
Ryatar Sahakari Sakkare Karkane Niyamit v. Asst. CIT [2016] 383 ITR 561 (Karn)	207
S. A. Builders Ltd. v. CIT (Appeals) [2007] 288 ITR 1 (SC)	555
Sai Venkata Construction v. Addl. CIT (I. T. A. Nos. 994 and 995/Pune/2013) dated March 11, 2016)	386
Sanchita Marine Products P. Ltd. v. Dy. CIT [2007] 15 SOT 280 (Mum)	1
Sandeep Jhanwar Advisory Services Pvt. Ltd. v. ITO, TDS CPC (I.T.A. No. 722 and 723/Jaipur/2016)	426

2020]	TABLE OF CASES CITED	xxv
		PAGE
Sanghavi Savala Commodity Brokers P. Ltd. v. Asst. CIT (I. T. A. No. 1746/Mum/2011 dated December 22, 2015)		386
Sanjay Olicake Industries v. CIT [2009] 316 ITR 274 (Guj)		1
Sanjeev Lal v. CIT [2014] 365 ITR 389 (SC)		621
Sanjog Tarachand Lodha v. ITO (I. T. A. Nos. 688 and 689/Pune/2014 dated August 31, 2015)		386
Sanofi Pasteur Holding SA v. Department of Revenue [2013] 354 ITR 316 (AP) <i>applied</i>		489
do. v. do. <i>relied on</i>		489
SAP Labs India Pvt. Ltd. v. Asst. CIT [2012] 15 ITR (Trib) 506 (Bang)		364
Saraswati Industrial Syndicate Ltd. v. CIT [1990] 186 ITR 278 (SC)		176
Sargent and Lundy LLC, USA v. Addl. DIT (I.T.) [2013] 158 TTJ 453 (Mumbai)		222
Satish P. Malhotra v. ITO (I. T. A. No. 6877/Mum/2014, dated November 29, 2017)		621
Satyavati Arvind Kotian v. ITO (I. T. A. No. 5036/Mum/2017)		621
Saxo India (P.) Ltd. v. Asst. CIT [2016] 67 taxmann.com 155 (Delhi-Trib.)		656
Scientific Atlanta India Technology Pvt. Ltd. v. Asst. CIT [2010] 2 ITR (Trib) 66 (Chennai) [SB]		60
Serco BPO (P.) Ltd. v. AAR [2015] 379 ITR 256 (AAR)		465
Sesa Sterlite Ltd. v. Asst. CIT [2019] 417 ITR 334 (Bom)		636
Shankar Lal Khandelwal v. Dy. CIT (I. T. A. No. 878/Jaipur/2013 dated March 11, 2016)		386
Shell India Markets (P.) Ltd., <i>In re</i> [2012] 342 ITR 223 (AAR)		222
Sheveta Construction Co. Pvt. Ltd. v. ITO (D. B. I. T. Appeal No. 534 of 2008 dated December 6, 2016 (Raj))		386
Shivsagar Veg. Restaurant v. Asst. CIT [2009] 317 ITR 433 (Bom)		585
Sibia Healthcare Pvt. Ltd. v. Dy. CIT [2016] 46 ITR (Trib) 453 (Amritsar)		426
Signature Hotels (P.) Ltd. v. ITO [2011] 338 ITR 51 (Delhi)		595
Siro Clinpharm Pvt. Ltd. v. Dy. CIT (I. T. A. No. 2618/Mum/2014 dated March 31, 2016)		555
Siva Industries and Holding Ltd. v. Asst. CIT [2012] 145 TTJ 497 (Chennai) <i>followed</i>		555
Skaps Industries India (P.) Ltd v. ITO, International Taxation [2018] 171 ITD 723 (Ahd)		465

xxvi

ITR'S TRIBUNAL TAX REPORTS

[VOL. 79

	PAGE
Sky Light Hospitality v. Asst. CIT [2018] 254 Taxman 390 (SC)	176
Spice Entertainment Ltd. v. Commissioner of Service Tax [2012] 280 ELT 43 (Delhi)	176
State Bank of India v. Dy. CIT (I. T. A. Nos. 727 and 737/Indore/2017 dated November 13, 2018) <i>followed</i>	426
State Bank of India, Gwalior v. ITO (TDS) (I. T. A. No. 3/Agra/2018 dated May 31, 2018)	426
State Bank of Patiala v. CIT [2005] 272 ITR 54 (P&H)	207
Steria (India) Ltd., <i>In re</i> [2014] 364 ITR 381 (AAR)	222
Sudershan Goyal v. Dy. CIT (TDS) (I. T. A. No. 442/Agra/2017 dated April 9, 2018)	426
Sudha Agro Oil and Chemical Industries Ltd. v. Addl. CIT (I. T. A. Nos. 191 and 196/Vizag/2013 dated March 24, 2016) <i>followed</i>	520
Sumati Dayal v. CIT [1995] 214 ITR 801 (SC)	636
Sundaram Finance Ltd. v. Asst. CIT [2018] 403 ITR 407 (Mad)	280, 386
Sundaram Finance Ltd. v. Dy. CIT [2018] 408 ITR (St.) 57 (SC)	280
Sunil V. Motiani v. ITO (International Taxation) [2013] 33 taxmann.com 252 (Mumbai Trib)	222
Sunworld infrastructure (P.) Ltd. v. ITO [2015] 64 taxmann.com 471 (Delhi) <i>followed</i>	158
Sutlej Cotton Mills Ltd. v. CIT [1979] 116 ITR 1 (SC)	322
Symantec Software and Services India (P.) Ltd. v. Dy. CIT [2017] 79 taxmann.com 208 (Chennai-Trib)	656
Symantec Software India P. Ltd. v. Dy. CIT [2020] 114 taxmann.com 435 (Pune-Trib) <i>followed</i>	656
Syndicate Bank v. Dy. CIT [2001] 78 ITD 103 (Bang)	207
T. R. F. Ltd. v. CIT [2010] 323 ITR 397 (SC)	60
TAG Offshore Ltd. v. Asst. CIT (I. T. A. No. 710/Mum/2014 August 8, 2014)	555
Taparia Tools Ltd. v. Jt. CIT [2015] 372 ITR 605 (SC)	322
Tara Devi Aggarwal (Smt.) v. CIT [1973] 88 ITR 323 (SC)	636
Target Corporation India (P.) Ltd., <i>In re</i> [2012] 348 ITR 61 (AAR)	222
Tata Communications Ltd. v. Jt. CIT [2009] 121 ITD SB 384 (Mum)	447

2020]	TABLE OF CASES CITED	xxvii
		PAGE
Telcordia Technologies India P. Ltd. v. Asst. CIT [2013] 23 ITR (Trib) 364 (Mum)		656
Thoughtbuzz (P.) Ltd., <i>In re</i> [2012] 346 ITR 345 (AAR)		222
Times Global Broadcasting Co. Ltd. v. Union of India [2019] 413 ITR 42 (Bom)		364
Tolani P. Ltd. v. Addl. CIT (I. T. A. No. 5562/Mum/2013 dated January 4, 2018) <i>followed</i>		555
Trilogy E Business Software India (P.) Ltd. v. Dy. CIT [2011] 47 SOT 45 (URO) (Bang)		364
Trilogy E-Business Software India P. Ltd. v. Dy. CIT [2013] 23 ITR (Trib) 464 (Bang)		656
Trimurti Engineering Works v. ITO (I. T. A. No. 3889/Delhi/2011 dated April 4, 2012)		280
Unimed Technologies Ltd. v. Dy. CIT [2000] 73 ITD 150 (Ahd)		533
United Breweries Ltd v. Addl. CIT [2016] 76 taxmann.com 103 (Bang) (Trib) <i>followed</i>		533
US Technology International P. Ltd. v. Asst. CIT (I. T. (T. P.) A. No. 592/Coch/2018 dated December 11, 2019)		656
Ushodaya Enterprises Ltd. v. Asst. CIT [2014] 41 taxmann.com 304 (Hyd)		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 [1981] 131 ITR 597 (SC) <i>relied on</i>		489
Verizon Data Services India Pvt. Ltd., <i>In re</i> [2011] 337 ITR 192 (AAR)		222
Vijay Aggarwal v. Dy. CIT [2019] 109 taxmann.com 175 (Delhi Trib.)		280, 386
Vijay Proteins Ltd. v. CIT [2015] 58 taxmann.com 44 (Guj)		1
Virendra R. Gandhi v. Asst. CIT (Tax Appeal Nos. 20 of 2004 and 124 of 2005 dated November 27, 2014)(Guj)		555
Vishnu Anant Mahajan v. Asst. CIT [2012] 137 ITD 189 (Ahd) [SB]		60
Vodafone India Services P. Ltd. v. Union of India [2014] 361 ITR 531 (Bom)		555

xxviii	ITR'S TRIBUNAL TAX REPORTS	[VOL. 79
		PAGE
Vodafone India Services P. Ltd. v. Union of India [2014] 368 ITR 1 (Bom)		555
Woolcombers of India Ltd. v. CIT [1982] 134 ITR 219 (Cal)		60
Yogendra Parsad Santosh Kumar v. CIT [2014] 44 taxmann.com 299 (All)		263



**THE
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 <i>v.</i> ITO (Chennai) . . .	1
Agricultural land —Compulsory acquisition of Exemption—Enhanced compensation—Assessee entitled to exemption—SUMESH KUMAR <i>v.</i> ITO (Delhi) . . .	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 <i>v.</i> ITO (Chennai) . . .	1
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) <i>v.</i> 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 <i>v.</i> ITO (Bangalore) . . .	27

<p>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) <i>v.</i> CARGO HANDLING PRIVATE WORKERS POOL TRUST (Visakhapatnam) . . .</p> <p>—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) <i>v.</i> CARGO HANDLING PRIVATE WORKERS POOL TRUST (Visakhapatnam) . . .</p> <p>Arm's length price—See INTERNATIONAL TRANSACTIONS . . .</p> <p>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 <i>v.</i> DEPUTY CIT (CPC) (Bang) . . .</p> <p>—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) <i>v.</i> ITO (Visakhapatnam) . . .</p> <p>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 <i>v.</i> JASMIN MULRAJ MEHTA (Mumbai) . . .</p> <p>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—Income-tax Act, 1961, ss. 37, 69C—ITO <i>v.</i> JASMIN MULRAJ MEHTA (Mumbai) . . .</p> <p>—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—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 37—VIJAYA BHAVANI CONSTRUCTIONS P. LTD. <i>v.</i> ITO (Hyderabad) . . .</p>	<p>38</p> <p>38</p> <p>22</p> <p>14</p> <p>6</p> <p>9</p> <p>9</p> <p>24</p>
---	--

2020]	GENERAL INDEX (SHORT NOTES)	iii
	Business expenditure (<i>Contd.</i>)—	PAGE
	—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— <i>R. N. SAHOO v. DEPUTY CIT</i> (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”— <i>ANIL DYE CHEM INDUSTRIES PVT. LTD. v. ASST. CIT</i> (Ahmedabad) . . .	30
	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— <i>MIHIR BIPIN PAREKH v. DEPUTY CIT</i> (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— <i>ANIL DYE CHEM INDUSTRIES PVT. LTD. v. ASST. CIT</i> (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—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 2(47)— <i>MOHANRAO VISHWANATH GAIKWAD v. ITO</i> (Pune) . . .	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— <i>R. N. SAHOO v. DEPUTY CIT</i> (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 (<i>Contd.</i>)—	PAGE
nature of application of income—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 11—DEPUTY CIT (EXEMPTIONS) <i>v.</i> CARGO HANDLING PRIVATE WORKERS POOL TRUST (Visakhapatnam) . . .	38
—Application of income—Determination of income—Computation under normal commercial principles—Income-tax payment—Allowable deduction towards income available for application to charitable purposes—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 11—DEPUTY CIT (EXEMPTIONS) <i>v.</i> CARGO HANDLING PRIVATE WORKERS POOL TRUST (Visakhapatnam) . . .	38
—Assessee following cash system of accounting for determination of income for purpose of application of income—Rejection of books of account without finding any defects in accounts not justified—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 11—DEPUTY CIT (EXEMPTIONS) <i>v.</i> CARGO HANDLING PRIVATE WORKERS POOL TRUST (Visakhapatnam) . . .	38
—Exemption—Assessee earmarking funds for public charitable purposes like hospital, and educational institutions and thirteentharm—Predominant object is to carry out charitable purpose and not to earn profit—Merely because some profit arising from activity—Purpose not losing its charitable character—Assessee entitled to exemption—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 11(2)—SHREE SHREE MOHANANANDA SAMAJ SEVA SAMITY <i>v.</i> ITO (EXEMPTION) (Kolkata) . . .	43
—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—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 13(1)(c)—DEPUTY CIT (EXEMPTIONS) <i>v.</i> CARGO HANDLING PRIVATE WORKERS POOL TRUST (Visakhapatnam) . . .	38
—Registration—Assessee's existence disputed—Assessee's registered address mentioned in application and on letterhead—Opportunity to assessee to substantiate its case before Commissioner with evidence and details—Matter remanded—Income-tax Act, 1961, ss. 12AA, 80G—AWAS NIVAS FOUNDATION <i>v.</i> ITO (Bangalore) . . .	26
Co-operative bank —Co-operative society—Special deduction—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. <i>v.</i> ITO (Cochin) . . .	17
Co-operative society —Special deduction—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	

2020]	GENERAL INDEX (SHORT NOTES)	v
		PAGE
	Co-operative society (<i>Contd.</i>)—	
	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—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 80P— THE AYALUR SERVICE CO-OPERATIVE BANK LTD. v. ITO (Cochin) . . .	17
	—Special deduction—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—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 80P— THE SHOLAYOOR SERVICE CO-OPERATIVE BANK LTD. v. ITO (Cochin) . . .	32
	Concealment of income —See PENALTY	11, 25
	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—Income-tax Act, 1961, ss. 194H, 194J— VODAFONE IDEA LTD. v. ASST. CIT (TDS) (Cuttack) . . .	44
	—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—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 234E— TRAVEL TRAILS INDIA P. LTD. v. ASST. CIT, TDS (Cochin) . . .	37
	Exempt income —See INCOME . . .	18
	Exemption —Charitable purpose—Assessee earmarking funds for public charitable purposes like hospital, and educational institutions and thirathasharm—Predominant object is to carry out charitable purpose and not to earn profit—Merely because some profit arising from activity—Purpose not losing its charitable character—Assessee entitled to exemption— SHREE SHREE MOHANANANDA SAMAJ SEVA SAMITY v. ITO (EXEMPTION) (Kolkata) . . .	43
	—Charitable purpose—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 HANDLING PRIVATE WORKERS POOL TRUST (Visakhapatnam) . . .	38
	—Compulsory acquisition of agricultural land—Enhanced compensation—Assessee entitled to exemption—Income-tax Act, 1961,	

vi	ITR'S TRIBUNAL TAX REPORTS	[VOL. 79
		PAGE
	Exemption (<i>Contd.</i>)—	
	s. 10(37)—Land Acquisition Act, 1894, s. 28—SUMESH KUMAR <i>v.</i> ITO (Delhi) . . .	2
	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. <i>v.</i> ASST. CIT, TDS (Cochin) . . .	37
	Firm —Cash credits—Capital introduction by partners—Assessee furnishing relevant evidence—Correctness of evidence not challenged—Primary onus discharged by assessee—Addition unsustainable—R. N. SAHOO <i>v.</i> DEPUTY CIT (Cuttack) . . .	20
	—Interest paid to partners—Assessee consistently calculating interest at 12 per cent. on opening balance of each assessment years—Partners declaring interest in their returns and assessments completed in their hands—Double taxation of same income both in hands of partners as well as in hands of assessee—Entire exercise of Assessing Officer revenue neutral when he calculated interest at 12 per cent. for relevant year—Direction to Assessing Officer to rectify assessments in hands of partners—Not practicable—Interest payments deductible—Income-tax Act, 1961—SANGEETH NURSING HOME <i>v.</i> ASST. CIT (Cochin) . . .	36
	Furnishing inaccurate particulars of income —See PENALTY	25, 34
	Hotel and textile business —Business expenditure—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 <i>v.</i> DEPUTY CIT (Cuttack) . . .	20
	Import duty —Business loss—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 <i>v.</i> DEPUTY CIT (Mumbai) . . .	5
	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—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 14A—Income-tax Rules, 1962, r. 8D—S. K. MINERALS HANDLING P. LTD. <i>v.</i> ASST. CIT (Cuttack) . . .	18
	Income from other sources —Deduction of interest expenditure against income from other sources or against business income—In either case effect on total income remains same—Interest expenditure to be set	

2020]	GENERAL INDEX (SHORT NOTES)	vii
		PAGE
	Income from other sources (<i>Contd.</i>)—	
	off against interest earned and offered under head "Income from other sources"—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 57(iii)—AJAY NARENDRA BANSAL <i>v.</i> DEPUTY CIT (Mumbai) . . .	8
	Industrial undertaking —Special deduction—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 make purchases of goods through those bills bogus—Assessee entitled to deduction—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 80-IC—BHARAT SONS (HUF) <i>v.</i> ASST. CIT (Delhi) . . .	29
	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—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 36(1)(iii)—R. N. SAHOO <i>v.</i> DEPUTY CIT (Cuttack) . . .	20
	Interest paid to partners —Firm—Assessee consistently calculating interest at 12 per cent. on opening balance of each assessment years—Partners declaring interest in their returns and assessments completed in their hands—Double taxation of same income both in hands of partners as well as in hands of assessee—Entire exercise of Assessing Officer revenue neutral when he calculated interest at 12 per cent. for relevant year—Direction to Assessing Officer to rectify assessments in hands of partners—Not practicable—Interest payments deductible—SANGEETH NURSING HOME <i>v.</i> ASST. CIT (Cochin) . . .	36
	International transactions —Transfer pricing—Arm's length price—Capacity utilisation of comparable companies—Assessee entitled to deduction from its profit level indicator towards capacity—Assessee computing adjustment presuming comparable companies operated at 100 per cent. of capacity—Details not available in public domain—Transfer Pricing Officer to call for information on capacity utilisation of comparable companies and thereafter compute adjustment after sharing details with assessee—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 92C—ESSENTRA (INDIA) PVT. LTD. <i>v.</i> ITO (Bangalore) . . .	22
	Intimation —Assessment—Prima facie adjustment—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 <i>v.</i> DEPUTY CIT (CPC) (Bang) . . .	14
	Jurisdiction —Revision—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	

viii	ITR'S TRIBUNAL TAX REPORTS	[VOL. 79
		PAGE
	Jurisdiction (<i>Contd.</i>)—	
	and consequent assessment invalid— DEVERASETTY VENKATA SUBBA RAO (LATE) v. ITO (Visakhapatnam) . . .	6
	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—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 142(1)— KESHAVLAL SOMNATH PANCHAL (LATE) v. ITO (Ahd) . . .	15
	Penalty —Concealment of income—Disallowance of expenses in relation to exempt income—No mandatory rule that for earning exempt income assessee to incur any expenditure—Amount debited in profit and loss account—Neither concealment of income nor furnishing inaccurate particulars of income—Penalty not warranted—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 271(1)(c)— UNIQUE WAYS MANAGEMENT SERVICE P. LTD. v. ASST. CIT (Indore) . . .	11
	—Concealment of income—Furnishing inaccurate particulars of income—Penalty proceedings initiated under both limbs but in assessment order penalty only initiated for concealment of income—Ambiguity in mind of Assessing Officer while imposing penalty—Assessee unable to prepare his defence—No penalty could be initiated in such circumstances—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 271(1)(c)— SMT. VIMALABEN B. PATEL v. ITO (Pune) . . .	25
	—Failure to maintain accounts—Reasonable cause—Assessing Officer giving several opportunities to assessee for production of books of account but assessee not producing books of account—Explanation that books of account got damaged by white ants and hard disks corrupted—Not tenable and not reasonable cause—Penalty levied justified—Income-tax Act, 1961, ss. 44AA, 271A, 273B— SMT. SANGHAMITRA PATTNAIK v. ITO (Cuttack) . . .	46
	—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—Income-tax Act, 1961, ss. 37, 40(a)(i), (iii), 271(1)(c)— FRONTIER BUSINESS SYSTEMS P. LTD. v. ITO (Bangalore) . . .	34
	Presumptive taxation —Assessing Officer not considering opening cash balance and only profits declared considered as inflow in cash flow prepared—Most of applications of income directly linked to business of assessee declared—Addition not warranted—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 44AD— SMT. HONEY RAHULAN v. ITO (Cochin) . . .	41

2020]	GENERAL INDEX (SHORT NOTES)	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 TRIBUNAL TAX REPORTS

[VOL. 79

	PAGE
Special deduction (<i>Contd.</i>)—	
make purchases of goods through those bills bogus—Assessee entitled to deduction— BHARAT SONS (HUF) v. ASST. CIT (Delhi) . . .	29
Suppression of income —Search and seizure—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— MEWAR HOSPITAL PVT. LTD. v. ASST. CIT (Jodhpur) . . .	12
Transfer of property with co-owners —Capital gains—Short-term capital gains—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— MOHANRAO VISHWANATH GAIKWAD v. ITO (Pune) . . .	42
Transfer pricing —See INTERNATIONAL TRANSACTIONS . . .	22
Undisclosed income —Search and seizure—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— MEWAR HOSPITAL PVT. LTD. v. ASST. CIT (Jodhpur) . . .	12
Unexplained expenditure —Business expenditure—Bogus purchases—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

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—**MOHANRAO VISHWANATH GAIKWAD v. ITO** (Pune) . . . 42
- S. 10(37)**—Exemption—Compulsory acquisition of agricultural land—Enhanced compensation—Assessee entitled to exemption—**SUMESH KUMAR v. ITO** (Delhi) . . . 2
- 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
- Charitable purpose—Application of income—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
- Charitable purpose—Assessee following cash system of accounting for determination of income for purpose of application of income—Rejection of books of account without finding any defects in accounts not justified—**DEPUTY CIT (EXEMPTIONS) v. CARGO HANDLING PRIVATE WORKERS POOL TRUST** (Visakhapatnam) . . . 38
- S. 11(2)**—Charitable purpose—Exemption—Assessee earmarking funds for public charitable purposes like hospital, and educational institutions and thirteentharm—Predominant object is to carry out charitable purpose and not to earn profit—Merely because some profit arising from activity—Purpose not losing its charitable character—Assessee entitled to exemption—**SHREE SHREE MOHANANANDA SAMAJ SEVA SAMITY v. ITO (EXEMPTION)** (Kolkata) . . . 43
- S. 12AA**—Charitable purpose—Registration—Assessee's existence disputed—Assessee's registered address mentioned in application and on letterhead—Opportunity to assessee to substantiate its case before Commissioner with evidence and details—Matter remanded—**AWAS NIVAS FOUNDATION v. ITO** (Bangalore) . . . 26
- 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 HANDLING PRIVATE WORKERS POOL TRUST** (Visakhapatnam) . . . 38

	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— <i>S. K. MINERALS HANDLING P. LTD. v. ASST. CIT</i> (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— <i>R. N. SAHOO v. DEPUTY CIT</i> (Cuttack) . . .	20
S. 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— <i>ITO v. JASMIN MULRAJ MEHTA</i> (Mumbai) . . .	9
—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— <i>VIJAYA BHAVANI CONSTRUCTIONS P. LTD. v. ITO</i> (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.— <i>R. N. SAHOO v. DEPUTY CIT</i> (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— <i>MIHIR BIPIN PAREKH v. DEPUTY CIT</i> (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— <i>FRONTIER BUSINESS SYSTEMS P. LTD. v. ITO</i> (Bangalore) . . .	34

2020]	GENERAL INDEX (SHORT NOTES)	xiii
		PAGE
	S. 40(a)(i), (iii) —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 BUSINESS SYSTEMS P. LTD. v. ITO (Bangalore) . . .	34
	S. 44AA —Penalty—Failure to maintain accounts—Reasonable cause—Assessing Officer giving several opportunities to assessee for production of books of account but assessee not producing books of account—Explanation that books of account got damaged by white ants and hard disks corrupted—Not tenable and not reasonable cause—Penalty levied justified— SMT. SANGHAMITRA PATNAIK v. ITO (Cuttack) . . .	46
	—Presumptive taxation—Assessing Officer not considering opening cash balance and only profits declared considered as inflow in cash flow prepared—Most of applications of income directly linked to business of assessee declared—Addition not warranted— SMT. HONEY RAHULAN v. ITO (Cochin) . . .	41
	S. 48 —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”— ANIL DYE CHEM INDUSTRIES PVT. LTD. v. ASST. CIT (Ahmedabad) . . .	30
	S. 57(iii) —Income from other sources—Deduction of interest expenditure against income from other sources or against business income—In either case effect on total income remains same—Interest expenditure to be set off against interest earned and offered under head “Income from other sources”— AJAY NARENDRA BANSAL v. DEPUTY CIT (Mumbai) . . .	8
	S. 68 —Cash credits—Firm—Capital introduction by partners—Assessee furnishing relevant evidence—Correctness of evidence not challenged—Primary onus discharged by assessee—Addition unsustainable— R. N. SAHOO v. DEPUTY CIT (Cuttack) . . .	20
	S. 69C —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) . . .	9
	S. 80G —Charitable purpose—Registration—Assessee’s existence disputed—Assessee’s registered address mentioned in application and on letterhead—Opportunity to assessee to substantiate its case before Commissioner with evidence and details—Matter remanded— AWAS NIVAS FOUNDATION v. ITO (Bangalore) . . .	26

<p>S. 80-IC—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) (Bang) . . .</p> <p>—Industrial undertaking—Special deduction—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 make purchases of goods through those bills bogus—Assessee entitled to deduction—BHARAT SONS (HUF) v. ASST. CIT (Delhi) . . .</p> <p>S. 80P—Co-operative society—Special deduction—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) . . .</p> <p>—Co-operative society—Special deduction—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) . . .</p> <p>S. 92C—International transactions—Transfer pricing—Arm's length price—Capacity utilisation of comparable companies—Assessee entitled to deduction from its profit level indicator towards capacity—Assessee computing adjustment presuming comparable companies operated at 100 per cent. of capacity—Details not available in public domain—Transfer Pricing Officer to call for information on capacity utilisation of comparable companies and thereafter compute adjustment after sharing details with assessee—ESSENTRA (INDIA) PVT. LTD. v. ITO (Bangalore) . . .</p> <p>S. 132A—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—MEWAR HOSPITAL PVT. LTD. v. ASST. CIT (Jodhpur) . . .</p> <p>—Search and seizure—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—MEWAR HOSPITAL PVT. LTD. v. ASST. CIT (Jodhpur) . . .</p>	<p>14</p> <p>29</p> <p>17</p> <p>32</p> <p>22</p> <p>12</p> <p>12</p>
---	---

2020]	GENERAL INDEX (SHORT NOTES)	xv
		PAGE
	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) v. ITO (Ahd) . . .	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) (Bang) . . .	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) (Cuttack) . . .	44
	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
	S. 263 —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. 271(1)(c) —Penalty—Concealment of income—Disallowance of expenses in relation to exempt income—No mandatory rule that for earning exempt income assessee to incur any expenditure—Amount debited in profit and loss account—Neither concealment of income nor furnishing inaccurate particulars of income—Penalty not warranted—UNIQUE WAYS MANAGEMENT SERVICE P. LTD. <i>v.</i> ASST. CIT (Indore) . . .	11
—Penalty—Concealment of income—Furnishing inaccurate particulars of income—Penalty proceedings initiated under both limbs but in assessment order penalty only initiated for concealment of income—Ambiguity in mind of Assessing Officer while imposing penalty—Assessee unable to prepare his defence—No penalty could be initiated in such circumstances—SMT. VIMALABEN B. PATEL <i>v.</i> ITO (Pune) . . .	25
—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 BUSINESS SYSTEMS P. LTD. <i>v.</i> ITO (Bangalore) . . .	34
S. 271A —Penalty—Failure to maintain accounts—Reasonable cause—Assessing Officer giving several opportunities to assessee for production of books of account but assessee not producing books of account—Explanation that books of account got damaged by white ants and hard disks corrupted—Not tenable and not reasonable cause—Penalty levied justified—SMT. SANGHAMITRA PATTNAIK <i>v.</i> ITO (Cuttack) . . .	46
S. 273B —Penalty—Failure to maintain accounts—Reasonable cause—Assessing Officer giving several opportunities to assessee for production of books of account but assessee not producing books of account—Explanation that books of account got damaged by white ants and hard disks corrupted—Not tenable and not reasonable cause—Penalty levied justified—SMT. SANGHAMITRA PATTNAIK <i>v.</i> ITO (Cuttack) . . .	46
Land Acquisition Act, 1894 :	
S. 28 —Exemption—Compulsory acquisition of agricultural land—Enhanced compensation—Assessee entitled to exemption—SUMESH KUMAR <i>v.</i> ITO (Delhi) . . .	2
RULES :	
Income-tax Rules, 1962 :	
R. 8D —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. MINERALS HANDLING P. LTD. <i>v.</i> ASST. CIT (Cuttack) . . .	18

End of Volume 79

**THE
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) . . . 60

	PAGE
Appeal to Appellate Tribunal —Assessing Officer accepting claim of assessee during remand proceeding—Stand taken by Assessing Officer and supervisory officer in remand proceeding is stand of Department—Commissioner (Appeals) deciding issue in view of remand report of Assessing Officer—No infirmity in order on issue—Income-tax Act, 1961—DEPUTY CIT <i>v.</i> PHOENIX LAMPS LTD. (Delhi) . . .	276
—Pronouncement of orders—Time limit for—Exceptional circumstances created owing to spread of coronavirus—Order passed after time limit prescribed—Income-tax (Appellate Tribunal) Rules, 1963, r. 34(5)—DEPUTY CIT <i>v.</i> JSW LTD. (Mumbai) . . .	585
Appeal to Commissioner (Appeals) —Appealable orders—Assessee not withdrawing appeal filed before Commissioner (Appeals) and also filing revision application—Revision not justified when pending—Cost imposed upon assessee—Commissioner (Appeals) to adjudicate issue on merits—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 246A—DIGJAM LTD. <i>v.</i> ASST. CIT (Rajkot) . . .	263
Arm's length price —See INTERNATIONAL TRANSACTIONS . . .	222, 295, 364, 555, 656
Assessment —Notice—Jurisdiction—Limitation—Notice under section 143(2) for commencing scrutiny assessment issued by non-jurisdictional Assessing Officer—Proper jurisdictional Assessing Officer issuing notice beyond period of limitation—Notice invalid—Assessment order void ab initio and liable to be quashed—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 143(2)—MANOJ KUMAR <i>v.</i> ASST. CIT (Delhi) . . .	158
Assessment of third person —See INTERNATIONAL TRANSACTIONS . . .	607
Bad debt —Government agencies and other parties—No documentary evidence—Assessee to provide all required details in respect of debts—Income-tax Act, 1961—ASST. CIT <i>v.</i> NIIT TECHNOLOGIES LTD. (Delhi) . . .	60
—Provision for bad and doubtful debts—Condition precedent for allowance—Provision must be actually debited in profit and loss account by assessee for relevant previous year—Assessee not debiting its profit and loss account sum towards provision for bad and doubtful debts—Not entitled to deduction—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 36(1)(viiia)—JOINT CIT <i>v.</i> KARNATAKA VIKAS GRAMEENA BANK (Bang) . . .	207
Benchmarking transactions —See INTERNATIONAL TRANSACTIONS . . .	364, 656
Bogus purchase —Business expenditure—Figures of purchase shown by assessee in profit and loss account matching figures certified by Sales Tax Department and value added tax return filed by assessee—No	

2020]	GENERAL INDEX	xix
		PAGE
	Bogus purchase (<i>Contd.</i>)—	
	addition could be made on basis of earlier tentative figure shown by assessee as per Sales Tax Department—PABITRA BANERJEE <i>v.</i> ITO (Cuttack) . . .	480
	Books of account —Rejection of—Fall in net profit rate—Assessing Officer satisfied with book results produced during remand proceedings—No specific defects pointed out in books of account—No reason to apply higher net profit rate against assessee—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 145—DEPUTY CIT <i>v.</i> VARUN BEVERAGES LTD. (Delhi) . . .	133
	Business expenditure —Bogus purchase—Figures of purchase shown by assessee in profit and loss account matching figures certified by Sales Tax Department and value added tax return filed by assessee—No addition could be made on basis of earlier tentative figure shown by assessee as per Sales Tax Department—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 37—PABITRA BANERJEE <i>v.</i> ITO (Cuttack) . . .	480
	—Capital or revenue 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—Income-tax Act, 1961—ASST. CIT <i>v.</i> NIIT TECHNOLOGIES LTD. (Delhi) . . .	60
	—Contribution to provident fund—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—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 37—PABITRA BANERJEE <i>v.</i> ITO (Cuttack) . . .	480
	—Demerger—Amortisation of demerger expenses allowable in hands of parent company and not resultant company—Assessee not entitled to deduction—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 35DD—ASST. CIT <i>v.</i> NIIT TECHNOLOGIES LTD. (Delhi) . . .	60
	—Disallowance—Deduction only on actual payment—Employees' State Insurance contribution—Assessee not producing evidence to show that amount deposited before furnishing its return—Disallowance justified—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 43B—SATERN GRIHA NIRMAN P. LTD. <i>v.</i> ITO (Kolkata) . . .	359
	—Disallowance—Payments in cash exceeding specified limit—Duty of assessee to prove whether particular payees incorporated in their books for computing their profits on respective sales—Assessee purchasing gold	

xx

ITR'S TRIBUNAL TAX REPORTS

[VOL. 79

Business expenditure (<i>Contd.</i>)—	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) . . .	322
—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) . . .	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—Tonnage income not form part of normal business income—Income-tax Act, 1961— ESSAR SHIPPING LTD. v. ASST. CIT (Mumbai) . . .	555

2020]	GENERAL INDEX	xxi
		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— <i>RENU JAIN v. ITO</i> (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)— <i>ASST. CIT v. FEROKE BOARDS LTD.</i> (Cochin) . . .	22
	Capital or revenue expenditure —Business expenditure—Composite one-time payment of lease rental charges for period of 90 years—Liability of lease rent relating to relevant year will be one-ninetyth of amount paid and balance amount to be treated as pre-paid advance rent—Assessee entitled to claim one-ninetyth of amount every year till period of lease of 90 years as revenue expenditure— <i>ASST. CIT v. NIIT TECHNOLOGIES LTD.</i> (Delhi) . . .	60
	—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— <i>DEPUTY CIT v. COFFEE DAY GLOBAL LTD.</i> (Bang) . . .	322
	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— <i>SANJEEVA REDDY PAGA v. ITO</i> (Hyderabad) . . .	439
	—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— <i>DEPUTY CIT v. INTERNATIONAL LAND AND DEVELOPERS P. LTD.</i> (Delhi) . . .	441
	Charitable purpose —Exemption—Assessee providing facilities to tourists and pilgrims coming to Kurukshetra throughout year—Maintain-	

	PAGE
Charitable purpose (<i>Contd.</i>)—	
ing 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—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 11—JOINT CIT (OSD) (EXEMPTIONS) <i>v.</i> KURUKSHETRA DEVELOPMENT BOARD (Chandigarh) . . .	31
Coffee making machine —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 <i>v.</i> COFFEE DAY GLOBAL LTD. (Bang) . . .	322
Commission —Search and seizure—Assessment of third person—Sale of property—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 <i>v.</i> DEPUTY CIT (Delhi) . . .	607
Comparable companies —See INTERNATIONAL TRANSACTIONS . . .	364
Concealment of income —See PENALTY 280, 386, 419 See SEARCH AND SEIZURE . . .	386
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—Income-tax Act, 1961, ss. 5, 9(1)(i), 195—Double Taxation Avoidance Agreement between India and the USA, art. 12—VOLKSWAGEN FINANCE P. LTD. <i>v.</i> ITO (Mumbai) . . .	447
—Payments liable to Business expenditure—Disallowance—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—SRI PARAMESWARI PROJECTS P. LTD. <i>v.</i> ITO (Visakhapatnam) . . .	529
—Payments liable to deduction of tax at source—Business expenditure—Disallowance—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—JOINT CIT <i>v.</i> KARNATAKA VIKAS GRAMEENA BANK (Bang) . . .	207
—Statement of tax deducted at source—Amendment enabling levy of late fee for default in furnishing statement brought in with effect from	

2020]	GENERAL INDEX	xxiii
		PAGE
	Deduction of tax at source (<i>Contd.</i>)—	
	1-6-2015—Prospective in nature—Levy of late fees while processing statement of tax deducted at source before amendment—Not sustainable—Income-tax Act, 1961, ss. 200A, 234E—OSWAL COMPUTERS AND AMP CONSULTANTS PVT. LTD. <i>v.</i> ITO (TDS) (Indore) . . .	426
	Deduction only on actual payment —Business expenditure—Disallowance—Employees' State Insurance contribution—Assessee not producing evidence to show that amount deposited before furnishing its return—Disallowance justified—SATERN GRIHA NIRMAN P. LTD. <i>v.</i> ITO (Kolkata) . . .	359
	Deemed dividend —Advances given for business purpose—Not a deemed dividend—DEPUTY CIT <i>v.</i> INTERNATIONAL LAND AND DEVELOPERS P. LTD. (Delhi) . . .	441
	Demerger —Business expenditure—Amortisation of demerger expenses allowable in hands of parent company and not resultant company—Assessee not entitled to deduction—ASST. CIT <i>v.</i> NIIT TECHNOLOGIES LTD. (Delhi) . . .	60
	Depreciation —Actual cost—Acquisition of trade mark—Revaluation of trade mark—Department not producing approval from Joint Commissioner— <i>Explanation 3</i> to section 43(1) not attracted—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 43(1), <i>Expln. 3</i> —PIK STUDIOS P. LTD. <i>v.</i> DEPUTY CIT (Mumbai) . . .	533
	—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—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 32(1)(ia)—DEPUTY CIT <i>v.</i> COFFEE DAY GLOBAL LTD. (Bang) . . .	322
	—Modem is an integral part of a computer—Eligible for higher rate of depreciation at 60 per cent.—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 32—DEPUTY CIT <i>v.</i> ASIANET SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS LTD. (Cochin) . . .	695
	—Trade mark—Revaluation—Depreciation to be claimed on cost incurred and not on revaluation figure—Rate and amount of depreciation applicable for predecessor would be amount of depreciation allowable on item—Total amount of depreciation cannot exceed depreciation to which assessee would be entitled if succession had not taken place—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 32—PIK STUDIOS P. LTD. <i>v.</i> DEPUTY CIT (Mumbai) . . .	533
	Dividend —Deemed dividend—Advances given for business purpose—Not a deemed dividend—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 2(22)(e)—DEPUTY CIT <i>v.</i> INTERNATIONAL LAND AND DEVELOPERS P. LTD. (Delhi) . . .	441
	Double taxation relief —Non-resident—Salary and allowances earned by assessee in respect of employment rendered in Austria due to	

xxiv

ITR'S TRIBUNAL TAX REPORTS

[VOL. 79

	PAGE
Double taxation relief (<i>Contd.</i>)—	
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 <i>v.</i> ITO (Hyderabad) . . .	465
Education cess and secondary and higher education cess —See INTERNATIONAL TRANSACTIONS . . .	222
Employees' State Insurance contribution —Business expenditure—Disallowance—Deduction only on actual payment—Assessee not producing evidence to show that amount deposited before furnishing its return—Disallowance justified—SATERN GRIHA NIRMAN P. LTD. <i>v.</i> ITO (Kolkata) . . .	359
Estimation of income —Assessee a milk supplier earning commission—No change in business for earlier and subsequent year—Assessee could be assessed to tax only on real income and not on any estimation or surmises—Profit to be estimated at seven per cent.—Income-tax Act, 1961—VITHAL BABAN BANGAR <i>v.</i> ITO (Mumbai) . . .	55
Exempt income —See INCOME 1, 322., 585	
Exemption —Capital gains—Long-term capital gains—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—RENU JAIN <i>v.</i> ITO (Jaipur) . . .	621
—Charitable purpose—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) <i>v.</i> KURUKSHETRA DEVELOPMENT BOARD (Chandigarh) . . .	31
—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 —Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 10B—ASST. CIT <i>v.</i> NIIT TECHNOLOGIES LTD. (Delhi) . . .	60
Expenditure on setting up of new outlets an expansion of existing business —Capital or revenue expenditure—Expenditure on salary and conveyance revenue in nature—Allowable—DEPUTY CIT <i>v.</i> COFFEE DAY GLOBAL LTD. (Bang) . . .	322

2020]	GENERAL INDEX	XXV
		PAGE
	Export —Exemption—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 — <i>ASST. CIT v. NIIT TECHNOLOGIES LTD.</i> (Delhi) . . .	60
	Fees for technical services —International transactions—Transfer pricing—Arm's length price—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— <i>JCDECAUX S. A. v. ASST./DEPUTY CIT</i> (Delhi) . . .	222
	—International transactions—Transfer pricing—Arm's length price—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— <i>JCDECAUX S. A. v. ASST./DEPUTY CIT</i> (Delhi) . . .	222
	—International transactions—Transfer pricing—Arm's length price—Secondment of employees to assessee by associated enterprise—Agreement between expatriate employee and assessee for payment by assessee of social security contribution in foreign country and reimbursement by associated enterprise—Assessing Officer to verify agreements and decide issue— <i>JCDECAUX S. A. v. ASST./DEPUTY CIT</i> (Delhi) . . .	222
	Furnishing inaccurate particulars of income —See PENALTY	280, 386
	Housing project —Special deduction—Condition precedent—Completion certificate to be obtained from municipal corporation after completion of project—Completion certificate not obtained for certain flats—Assessee not entitled to deduction in respect of those flats—Development plan road acquired by municipal corporation not be reduced from total land area of project—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 80-IB(10)— <i>DEPUTY CIT v. SHEWALE AND SONS</i> (Pune) . . .	310
	—Special deduction—Interest on bank deposits—Immediate source of interest not business of assessee of developing housing project but investment in bank deposits—Not eligible for deduction—Income by way of transfer fees received by assessee for apartment booking and interest received for delay in payment against flat—Direct connection with business of assessee of developing housing project—Eligible for deduction—Disallowance in respect of interest to be restricted to net interest—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 80-IB(10)— <i>SATERN GRIHA NIRMAN P. LTD. v. ITO</i> (Kolkata) . . .	359

	PAGE
Income —Disallowance of expenditure in relation to exempt income—No exempt income received by assessee during year—Disallowance not justified—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 14A—Income-tax Rules, 1962, r. 8D—DEPUTY CIT <i>v.</i> HIND INDUSTRIES LTD. (Delhi) . . .	1
—Disallowance of expenditure in relation to exempt income—No tax exempt income in relevant previous year—No disallowance—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 14A—Income-tax Rules, 1962, r. 8D(2)(ii)—DEPUTY CIT <i>v.</i> JSW LTD. (Mumbai) . . .	585
—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 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—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 14A—Income-tax Rules, 1962, r. 8D—ASST. CIT <i>v.</i> NIIT TECHNOLOGIES LTD. (Delhi) . . .	60
—Disallowance of expenditure relating to exempt income—No income exempt from tax received in relevant previous year—No disallowance can be made—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 14A—Income-tax Rules, 1962, r. 8D(2)(iii)—DEPUTY CIT <i>v.</i> COFFEE DAY GLOBAL LTD. (Bang) . . .	322
Income deemed to accrue or arise in india —Non-resident—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. <i>v.</i> ASST. CIT (INTERNATIONAL TAXATION) (Mumbai) . . .	489
Industrial undertaking —Special deduction—Disallowance resulted in enhancing deduction—Deduction to be computed taking into account income enhanced owing to disallowance—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 80-IB(8A)—LOTUS LABS P. LTD. <i>v.</i> 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
		PAGE
Interest (<i>Contd.</i>)—		
assessee—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 244A—FIS SOLUTIONS (INDIA) P. LTD. <i>v.</i> DEPUTY CIT (Pune) . . .		656
Interest on bank deposits —Housing project—Special deduction— Immediate source of interest not business of assessee of developing hous- ing project but investment in bank deposits—Not eligible for deduction— Income by way of transfer fees received by assessee for apartment booking and interest received for delay in payment against flat—Direct connection with business of assessee of developing housing project—Eligible for deduction—Disallowance in respect of interest to be restricted to net interest—SATERN GRIHA NIRMAN P. LTD. <i>v.</i> ITO (Kolkata) . . .		359
Interest on borrowed capital —Business expenditure—Interest expenses on amount borrowed for purpose of giving intercorporate deposit to its subsidiary—Investment in group company for strategic pur- pose and not for earning dividend—Interest expenses allowable—ESSAR SHIPPING LTD. <i>v.</i> ASST. CIT (Mumbai) . . .		555
—Business expenditure—Till asset for which loan borrowed put to use, interest not allowable—DEPUTY CIT <i>v.</i> COFFEE DAY GLOBAL LTD. (Bang) . . .		322
International transactions —Transfer pricing—Arm's length price— Assessee advancing sum towards share application money to its wholly owned subsidiary—No shares allotted and full money refunded to asses- see—Transaction a loan and interest chargeable on loan—Rate of interest to be applied on amount at LIBOR—Income-tax Act, 1961—ESSAR SHIP- PING LTD. <i>v.</i> ASST. CIT (Mumbai) . . .		555
—Transfer pricing—Arm's length price—Assessee carrying out busi- ness of drilling oil rigs through subsidiary and advancing borrowed funds as intercorporate deposits to its subsidiary to carry out drilling business— Income on such intercorporate deposits be treated as business income and not income from other sources—Money kept with bank as margin money out of business compulsion—Interest earned on such margin money tax- able as business income—Income-tax Act, 1961—ESSAR SHIPPING LTD. <i>v.</i> ASST. CIT (Mumbai) . . .		555
—Transfer pricing—Arm's length price—Assessee entering into ser- vice agreement with its associated enterprises—Interest on outstanding receivables—Transfer Pricing Officer justified in making adjustment by charging interest for delay in receipt of payment for services rendered— Assessing Officer to recalculate chargeable interest—Interest to be con- fined up to end of year and not thereafter—Income-tax Act, 1961—ESSAR SHIPPING LTD. <i>v.</i> ASST. CIT (Mumbai) . . .		555
—Transfer pricing—Arm's length price—Assessing Officer—Refer- ence to Transfer Pricing Officer—Assessing Officer bound to make refer- ence in case aggregate value of reported international transactions exceeds		

International transactions (<i>Contd.</i>)—	PAGE
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—Income-tax Act, 1961, ss. 92C, 92CA— EXTENTIA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY PVT. LTD. v. DEPUTY CIT (Pune) . . .	364
—Transfer pricing—Arm’s length price—Benchmarking transactions—Comparable companies—Companies in respect of which segmental information not available—Companies whose functions in contrast with assessee’s—Software testing services company—Company rendering whole basket services—Company providing software services to its clients—Not comparables—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 92CA— FIS SOLUTIONS (INDIA) P. LTD. v. DEPUTY CIT (Pune) . . .	656
—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 assessee—Comparable not passing turnover filter—Not comparables—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 92CA— EXTENTIA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY PVT. LTD. v. DEPUTY CIT (Pune) . . .	364
—Transfer pricing—Arm’s length price—Disallowance of particular expense—Not includible in operating expenses for calculating profit margin—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 92CA— EXTENTIA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY PVT. LTD. v. DEPUTY CIT (Pune) . . .	364
—Transfer pricing—Arm’s length price—Education cess and secondary and higher education cess—Not applicable while taxing income on gross basis under tax treaty—Income-tax Act, 1961— JCDECAUX S. A. v. ASST./DEPUTY CIT (Delhi) . . .	222
—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—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 9(1)(vii)— JCDECAUX S. A. v. ASST./DEPUTY CIT (Delhi) . . .	222
—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	

2020]	GENERAL INDEX	xxix
	International transactions (<i>Contd.</i>)—	PAGE
	decide afresh—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 9(1)(vii)—JCDECAUX S. A. v. ASST./DEPUTY CIT (Delhi) . . .	222
	—Transfer pricing—Arm's length price—Fees for technical services—Secondment of employees to assessee by associated enterprise—Agreement between expatriate employee and assessee for payment by assessee of social security contribution in foreign country and reimbursement by associated enterprise—Assessing Officer to verify agreements and decide issue—Income-tax Act, 1961—JCDECAUX S. A. v. ASST./DEPUTY CIT (Delhi) . . .	222
	—Transfer pricing—Arm's length price—Foreign exchange gain or loss arising out of revenue transactions—To be considered as item of operating revenue/cost, both for assessee as well as comparables—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 92CA—EXTENTIA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY PVT. LTD. v. DEPUTY CIT (Pune) . . .	364
	—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—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 92B(2), <i>Expln.</i> —LOTUS LABS P. LTD. v. DEPUTY CIT (Bangalore) . . .	295
	—Transfer pricing—Arm's length price—Provision for doubtful debts—To be included in expenses side of comparable for calculating profit margin—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 92CA—EXTENTIA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY PVT. LTD. v. DEPUTY CIT (Pune) . . .	364
	—Transfer pricing—Arm's length price—Shipping business—Assessee's parent company taking loan from bank—Assessee agreeing not to sell 49 per cent. of its stake in subsidiary without prior consent from bank—Guarantee commission—Assessing Officer to make adjustment by applying 0.25 per cent. to transaction instead of 0.5 per cent.—Income-tax Act, 1961—ESSAR SHIPPING LTD. v. ASST. CIT (Mumbai) . . .	555
	—Transfer pricing—Arm's length price—Shipping business—Tonnage taxation scheme—Interest on purchase of two ships—No application of transfer pricing provisions to income covered under tonnage tax scheme—Income-tax Act, 1961, Chap. XII-G—ESSAR SHIPPING LTD. v. ASST. CIT (Mumbai) . . .	555
	—Transfer pricing—Arm's length price—Transfer Pricing Officer—Powers—Specified domestic transaction—Unreported transaction—No power to determine arm's length price without approval from Principal Commissioner or making reference to him—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 92CA—EXTENTIA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY PVT. LTD. v. DEPUTY CIT (Pune) . . .	364

xxx

ITR'S TRIBUNAL TAX REPORTS

[VOL. 79

PAGE

Jurisdiction —Assessment—Notice—Limitation—Notice under section 143(2) for commencing scrutiny assessment issued by non-jurisdictional Assessing Officer—Proper jurisdictional Assessing Officer issuing notice beyond period of limitation—Notice invalid—Assessment order void ab initio and liable to be quashed— MANOJ KUMAR v. ASST. CIT (Delhi) . . .	158
Limitation —Assessment—Notice—Jurisdiction—Notice under section 143(2) for commencing scrutiny assessment issued by non-jurisdictional Assessing Officer—Proper jurisdictional Assessing Officer issuing notice beyond period of limitation—Notice invalid—Assessment order void ab initio and liable to be quashed— MANOJ KUMAR v. ASST. CIT (Delhi) . . .	158
—Revision—Issues subject to revision pertaining to original assessment and not reopened assessment—Period of limitation would start from original assessment—Original assessment passed on 16-1-2014 and revision could have been taken up to 31-3-2016 but revisional order passed on 26-2-2019—Revision beyond period of limitation— JINDAL STEEL AND POWER LTD. v. PRINCIPAL CIT (Delhi) . . .	636
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— RENU JAIN v. ITO (Jaipur) . . .	621
—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
Loss on account of fluctuation in rate of foreign exchange —Business expenditure—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— DEPUTY CIT v. COFFEE DAY GLOBAL LTD. (Bang) . . .	322
Low gross profit rate —See ACCOUNTING . . .	472
Merger —Revision—Assessee merging with another company—Amalgamated company filing return after merger in its name—Commissioner ought to have remitted record to Commissioner having jurisdiction over	

2020]	GENERAL INDEX	xxx
		PAGE
Merger (<i>Contd.</i>)—		
amalgamated company for taking action—Revision upon non-existent entity—Not valid—SNOWHILL AGENCIES P. LTD. <i>v.</i> PRINCIPAL CIT (Ahd) . . .		176
Milk supplier earning commission —Estimation of income—Assessee a milk supplier earning commission—No change in business for earlier and subsequent year—Assessee could be assessed to tax only on real income and not on any estimation or surmises—Profit to be estimated at seven per cent.—VITHAL BABAN BANGAR <i>v.</i> ITO (Mum) . . .		55
Modem —Depreciation—Modem is an integral part of a computer—Eligible for higher rate of depreciation at 60 per cent.—DEPUTY CIT <i>v.</i> ASIANET SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS LTD. (Cochin) . . .		695
Non-resident —Deduction of tax at source—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. <i>v.</i> ITO (Mumbai) . . .		447
—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—Income-tax Act, 1961, ss. 5(2), 90(4)—Double Taxation Avoidance Agreement between India and Austria, art. 15—SREENIVASA REDDY CHEEMALAMARRI <i>v.</i> ITO (Hyderabad) . . .		465
—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—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 9(1)(i)—Double Taxation Avoidance Agreement between India and Belgium, article, 13(5), (6)—SOFINA S. A. <i>v.</i> ASST. CIT (INTERNATIONAL TAXATION) (Mumbai) . . .		489

xxxii

ITR'S TRIBUNAL TAX REPORTS

[VOL. 79

	PAGE
Notice —See ASSESSMENT . . .	158
See REASSESSMENT . . .	705
Payments in cash exceeding specified limit —Business expenditure—Disallowance—Duty of assessee to prove whether particular payees incorporated in their books for computing their profits on respective sales—Assessee purchasing gold 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— RAJENDRA KUMAR SAHOO v. ASST. CIT (Cuttack) . . .	10
Penalty —Concealment of income—Furnishing inaccurate particulars of income—Additions made by Assessing Officer on account of undisclosed interest income and deposits made in bank account of employees deleted by Tribunal—Tribunal remanding issue of disallowance of certain expenses to Assessing Officer—Penalty levied against additions unsustainable—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 271(1)(c)— DEPUTY CIT v. PRAKASH CHAND SHARMA (Jaipur) . . .	386
—Concealment of income—Furnishing inaccurate particulars of income—Assessing Officer not striking off irrelevant part of show-cause notice—Assessing Officer not definite about charge and default of assessee for which penalty levied—Assessing Officer under obligation to specify charge and make assessee known for what default penalty levied—Penalty unsustainable—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 271(1)(c)— DEPUTY CIT v. PRAKASH CHAND SHARMA (Jaipur) . . .	386
—Concealment of income—Furnishing inaccurate particulars of income—Whether penalty for concealment of income or furnishing inaccurate particulars of income not clear from notice or penalty order—Department precluded from filing appeal in view of monetary limit of filing appeal before Tribunal—Valuation estimate alone cannot justify finding of concealment—Penalty not justified—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 271(1)(c)— ITO v. A. SHIHABUDEEN (Cochin) . . .	280
—Concealment of income—No detailed finding as regards how there was concealment of particulars of income relating to confirmation in respect of unsecured loan or receipt of cash and insurance commission—Commissioner (Appeals) to decide issue by reasoned order—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 271(1)(c)— DEVENDER KUMAR v. ITO (Delhi) . . .	419
—Concealment of income—Search and seizure—Undisclosed income—Assessing Officer not making reference to any incriminating material representing undisclosed material or income declared by assessee—Penalty on account of deemed concealment of income unsustainable— DEPUTY CIT v. PRAKASH CHAND SHARMA (Jaipur) . . .	386

2020]	GENERAL INDEX	xxxiii
		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 COMMUNICATIONS 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 (Cuttack) . . .	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 (Kolkata) . . .	595
	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	

xxxiv

ITR'S TRIBUNAL TAX REPORTS

[VOL. 79

Rejection of books of account (<i>Contd.</i>)—	PAGE
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. <i>v.</i> DEPUTY CIT (Rajkot) . . .	472
Revision —Condition precedent—Appeal pending before Commissioner (Appeals)—No power of revision—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 264—DIGJAM LTD. <i>v.</i> ASST. CIT (Rajkot) . . .	263
—Erroneous and prejudicial to Revenue, meaning of—Lack of enquiry or no enquiry by Assessing Officer—Necessary enquiry conducted regarding accommodation entry—Principal Commissioner not agreeing with manner of enquiry conducted by Assessing Officer—Cannot substitute his own reasons to hold order erroneous and prejudicial to interests of Revenue—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 263—ARIHANT TECHNOLOGY P. LTD. <i>v.</i> PRINCIPAL CIT (Delhi) . . .	119
—Limitation—Issues subject to revision pertaining to original assessment and not reopened assessment—Period of limitation would start from original assessment—Original assessment passed on 16-1-2014 and revision could have been taken up to 31-3-2016 but revisional order passed on 26-2-2019—Revision beyond period of limitation—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 263—JINDAL STEEL AND POWER LTD. <i>v.</i> PRINCIPAL CIT (Delhi) . . .	636
—Merger—Assessee merging with another company—Amalgamated company filing return after merger in its name—Commissioner ought to have remitted record to Commissioner having jurisdiction over amalgamated company for taking action—Revision upon non-existent entity—Not valid—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 263—SNOWHILL AGENCIES P. LTD. <i>v.</i> PRINCIPAL CIT (Ahd) . . .	176
—Scrutiny assessment to examine share application money—Assessing Officer making specific query in relation to details of share premium—Assessee furnishing complete details in respect of share application money received—Share application money received from very same persons from whom share application and share premium amount received in earlier years—No adverse inference drawn in earlier years in 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 as erroneous and prejudicial to interests of the Revenue—Revision not valid—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 263—SUNRAY COTSPIN (P.) LTD. <i>v.</i> PRINCIPAL CIT (Delhi) . . .	193

2020]	GENERAL INDEX	XXXV
		PAGE
	Royalty —Deduction of tax at source—Non-resident—Taxability in India—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. <i>v.</i> ITO (Mumbai) . . .	447
	Salary and allowances —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 <i>v.</i> ITO (Hyderabad) . . .	465
	Sale of property —See INTERNATIONAL TRANSACTIONS . . .	607
	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—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 153A—SUMMIT MITTAL <i>v.</i> DEPUTY CIT (Delhi) . . .	607
	—Penalty—Concealment of income—Undisclosed income—Assessing Officer not making reference to any incriminating material representing undisclosed material or income declared by assessee—Penalty on account of deemed concealment of income unsustainable—Income-tax Act, 1961, ss. 153A, 271(1)(c), <i>Expln.</i> 5A—DEPUTY CIT <i>v.</i> PRAKASH CHAND SHARMA (Jaipur) . . .	386
	Secondment of employees —See INTERNATIONAL TRANSACTIONS . . .	222
	Share premium —Cash credits—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—DEPUTY CIT <i>v.</i> INTERNATIONAL LAND AND DEVELOPERS P. LTD. (Delhi) . . .	441

xxxvi

ITR'S TRIBUNAL TAX REPORTS

[VOL. 79

	PAGE
Shipping business —Business expenditure—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— <i>SSAR SHIPPING LTD. v. ASST. CIT</i> (Mumbai) . . .	555
—Business income—Tonnage tax scheme—Tonnage income not form part of normal business income— <i>ESSAR SHIPPING LTD. v. ASST. CIT</i> (Mumbai) . . .	555
—International transactions—Transfer pricing—Arm's length price—Assessee's parent company taking loan from bank—Assessee agreeing not to sell 49 per cent. of its stake in subsidiary without prior consent from bank—Guarantee commission—Assessing Officer to make adjustment by applying 0.25 per cent. to transaction instead of 0.5 per cent.— <i>ESSAR SHIPPING LTD. v. ASST. CIT</i> (Mumbai) . . .	555
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— <i>ASST. CIT v. FERROKE BOARDS LTD.</i> (Cochin) . . .	22
Special deduction —Housing project—Condition precedent—Completion certificate to be obtained from municipal corporation after completion of project—Completion certificate not obtained for certain flats—Assessee not entitled to deduction in respect of those flats—Development plan road acquired by municipal corporation not be reduced from total land area of project— <i>DEPUTY CIT v. SHEWALE AND SONS</i> (Pune) . . .	310
—Housing project—Interest on bank deposits—Immediate source of interest not business of assessee of developing housing project but investment in bank deposits—Not eligible for deduction—Income by way of transfer fees received by assessee for apartment booking and interest received for delay in payment against flat—Direct connection with business of assessee of developing housing project—Eligible for deduction—Disallowance in respect of interest to be restricted to net interest— <i>SATERN GRIHA NIRMAN P. LTD. v. ITO</i> (Kolkata) . . .	359
—Industrial undertaking—Disallowance resulted in enhancing deduction to be computed taking into account income enhanced owing to disallowance— <i>LOTUS LABS P. LTD. v. DEPUTY CIT</i> (Bang) . . .	295

2020]	GENERAL INDEX	xxxvii
Special deduction (<i>Contd.</i>)—		PAGE
—Tax savings investment—Cash credit—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 <i>v.</i> ITO (Hyderabad) . . .		439
Suppression of sales —See ACCOUNTING . . .		472
Tax savings investment —Special deduction—Cash credit—Assessee not able to produce sufficient evidence to justify claim—Financial strain and nature of additions considered—Assessing Officer to consider afresh—Income-tax Act, 1961, ss. 68, 80C—SANJEEVA REDDY PAGA <i>v.</i> ITO (Hyderabad) . . .		439
Taxability in India —See DEDUCTION OF TAX AT SOURCE . . .		447
Tonnage tax scheme —Business expenditure—Shipping business—Tonnage and non-tonnage activity—Common interest expenditure—To be apportioned on basis of cost of financing and not on basis of turnover—SSAR SHIPPING LTD. <i>v.</i> ASST. CIT (Mumbai) . . .		555
—Business income—Shipping business—Tonnage income not form part of normal business income—ESSAR SHIPPING LTD. <i>v.</i> ASST. CIT (Mumbai) . . .		555
Trade mark —Acquisition of trade mark—Depreciation—Actual cost—Revaluation of trade mark—Department not producing approval from Joint Commissioner— <i>Explanation 3</i> to section 43(1) not attracted—PIK STUDIOS P. LTD. <i>v.</i> DEPUTY CIT (Mumbai) . . .		533
—Depreciation—Revaluation—Depreciation to be claimed on cost incurred and not on revaluation figure—Rate and amount of depreciation applicable for predecessor would be amount of depreciation allowable on item—Total amount of depreciation cannot exceed depreciation to which assessee would be entitled if succession had not taken place—PIK STUDIOS P. LTD. <i>v.</i> DEPUTY CIT (Mumbai) . . .		533
Transfer of shares in foreign company —See NON-RESIDENT . . .		489
Transfer pricing —See INTERNATIONAL TRANSACTIONS . . .	222, 295, 364, 555, 656	
Transfer Pricing Officer —Powers—Specified domestic transaction—Unreported transaction—No power to determine arm's length price without approval from Principal Commissioner or making reference to him—EXTENTIA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY PVT. LTD. <i>v.</i> DEPUTY CIT (Pune) . . .		364
Undisclosed income —Search and seizure—Penalty—Concealment of income—Assessing Officer not making reference to any incriminating material representing undisclosed material or income declared by assessee—Penalty on account of deemed concealment of income unsustainable—DEPUTY CIT <i>v.</i> PRAKASH CHAND SHARMA (Jaipur) . . .		386

	PAGE
Unexplained expenditure —Unverifiable purchases—Sales not doubted—Quantitative tally of purchases of meat and exports furnished and purchases reflected in credit column of bank account of assessee—No case that purchases made outside books of account—Addition not justified—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 69C—DEPUTY CIT <i>v.</i> HIND INDUSTRIES LTD. (Delhi) . . .	1
Vending machine —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 <i>v.</i> COFFEE DAY GLOBAL LTD. (Bang) . . .	322
Words and phrases	
erroneous and prejudicial to Revenue . . .	119
financial asset . . .	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

xl

ITR'S TRIBUNAL TAX REPORTS

[VOL. 79

PAGE

ACTS :**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* (Hyderabad) . . . 465
- 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* (Mumbai) . . . 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— <i>SOFINA S. A. v. ASST. CIT (INTERNATIONAL TAXATION)</i> (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— <i>JCDECAUX S. A. v. ASST./DEPUTY CIT</i> (Delhi) . . .	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— <i>JCDECAUX S. A. v. ASST./DEPUTY CIT</i> (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— <i>ASST. CIT v. NIIT TECHNOLOGIES LTD.</i> (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— <i>JOINT CIT (OSD) (EXEMPTIONS) v. KURUKSHETRA DEVELOPMENT BOARD</i> (Chandigarh) . . .	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	

	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— <i>ASST. CIT v. NIIT TECHNOLOGIES LTD.</i> (Delhi) . . .	60
—Income—Disallowance of expenditure in relation to exempt income—No exempt income received by assessee during year—Disallowance not justified— <i>DEPUTY CIT v. HIND INDUSTRIES LTD.</i> (Delhi) . . .	1
—Income—Disallowance of expenditure in relation to exempt income—No tax exempt income in relevant previous year—No disallowance— <i>DEPUTY CIT v. JSW LTD.</i> (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— <i>DEPUTY CIT v. COFFEE DAY GLOBAL LTD.</i> (Bang) . . .	322
S. 32 —Depreciation—Modem is an integral part of a computer—Eligible for higher rate of depreciation at 60 per cent.— <i>DEPUTY CIT v. ASI-ANET SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS LTD.</i> (Cochin) . . .	695
—Depreciation—Trade mark—Revaluation—Depreciation to be claimed on cost incurred and not on revaluation figure—Rate and amount of depreciation applicable for predecessor would be amount of depreciation allowable on item—Total amount of depreciation cannot exceed depreciation to which assessee would be entitled if succession had not taken place— <i>PIK STUDIOS P. LTD. v. DEPUTY CIT</i> (Mumbai) . . .	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— <i>DEPUTY CIT v. COFFEE DAY GLOBAL LTD.</i> (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— <i>ASST. CIT v. NIIT TECHNOLOGIES LTD.</i> (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— <i>ESSAR SHIPPING LTD. v. ASST. CIT</i> (Mumbai) . . .	555
—Business expenditure—Interest on borrowed capital—Till asset for which loan borrowed put to use, interest not allowable— <i>DEPUTY CIT v. COFFEE DAY GLOBAL LTD.</i> (Bang) . . .	322

2020]	GENERAL INDEX	xliii
		PAGE
	S. 36(1)(viiia) —Bad debt—Provision for bad and doubtful debts—Condition precedent for allowance—Provision must be actually debited in profit and loss account by assessee for relevant previous year—Assessee not debiting its profit and loss account sum towards provision for bad and doubtful debts—Not entitled to deduction— JOINT CIT v. KARNATAKA VIKAS GRAMEENA BANK (Bang) . . .	207
	S. 37 —Business expenditure—Bogus purchase—Figures of purchase shown by assessee in profit and loss account matching figures certified by Sales Tax Department and value added tax return filed by assessee—No addition could be made on basis of earlier tentative figure shown by assessee as per Sales Tax Department— PABITRA BANERJEE v. ITO (Cuttack) . . .	480
	—Business expenditure—Contribution to provident fund—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 (Cuttack) . . .	480
	—Business expenditure—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— DEPUTY CIT v. COFFEE DAY GLOBAL LTD. (Bang) . . .	322
	—Business expenditure—Prior period expenses—Interest for delayed payment of pole rental charges—Not prior period expenses but compensatory in nature—Deductible— DEPUTY CIT v. ASIANET SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS LTD. (Cochin) . . .	695
	—Business expenditure—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— ESSAR SHIPPING LTD. v. ASST. CIT (Mumbai) . . .	555
	S. 40(a)(ia) —Business expenditure—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— SRI PARAMESWARI PROJECTS P. LTD. v. ITO (Visakhapatnam) . . .	529
	—Business expenditure—Disallowance—Payments liable to deduction of tax at source—Tax not deducted at source from interest payments	

xliv

ITR'S TRIBUNAL TAX REPORTS

[VOL. 79

	PAGE
on basis of form 15G or 15H obtained from depositors—No disallowance merely forms not submitted before Commissioner— JOINT CIT v. KARNATAKA VIKAS GRAMEENA BANK (Bang) . . .	207
S. 40A(3) —Business expenditure—Disallowance—Payments in cash exceeding specified limit—Duty of assessee to prove whether particular payees incorporated in their books for computing their profits on respective sales—Assessee purchasing gold 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— RAJENDRA KUMAR SAHOO v. ASST. CIT (Cuttack) . . .	10
S. 43(1), Explan. 3 —Depreciation—Actual cost—Acquisition of trade mark—Revaluation of trade mark—Department not producing approval from Joint Commissioner— <i>Explanation 3</i> to section 43(1) not attracted— PIK STUDIOS P. LTD. v. DEPUTY CIT (Mumbai) . . .	533
S. 43B —Business expenditure—Disallowance—Deduction only on actual payment—Employees' State Insurance contribution—Assessee not producing evidence to show that amount deposited before furnishing its return—Disallowance justified— SATERN GRIHA NIRMAN P. LTD. v. ITO (Kolkata) . . .	359
S. 49(1) —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. 54F —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— RENU JAIN v. ITO (Jaipur) . . .	621
S. 68 —Cash credits—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 unex-	

2020]	GENERAL INDEX	xliv
		PAGE
plained cash credit—DEPUTY CIT <i>v.</i> INTERNATIONAL LAND AND DEVELOPERS P. LTD.	(Delhi) . . .	441
—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. <i>v.</i> ITO	(Kolkata) . . .	705
—Tax savings investment—Special deduction—Cash credit—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 <i>v.</i> ITO	(Hyderabad) . . .	439
S. 69C —Unexplained expenditure—Unverifiable purchases—Sales not doubted—Quantitative tally of purchases of meat and exports furnished and purchases reflected in credit column of bank account of assessee—No case that purchases made outside books of account—Addition not justified—DEPUTY CIT <i>v.</i> HIND INDUSTRIES LTD.	(Delhi) . . .	1
S. 80C —Tax savings investment—Special deduction—Cash credit—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 <i>v.</i> ITO	(Hyderabad) . . .	439
S. 80-IB(8A) —Industrial undertaking—Special deduction—Disallowance resulted in enhancing deduction—Deduction to be computed taking into account income enhanced owing to disallowance—LOTUS LABS P. LTD. <i>v.</i> DEPUTY CIT	(Bang) . . .	295
S. 80-IB(10) —Housing project—Special deduction—Condition precedent—Completion certificate to be obtained from municipal corporation after completion of project—Completion certificate not obtained for certain flats—Assessee not entitled to deduction in respect of those flats—Development plan road acquired by municipal corporation not be reduced from total land area of project—DEPUTY CIT <i>v.</i> SHEWALE AND SONS	(Pune) . . .	310
—Housing project—Special deduction—Interest on bank deposits—Immediate source of interest not business of assessee of developing housing project but investment in bank deposits—Not eligible for deduction—Income by way of transfer fees received by assessee for apartment booking and interest received for delay in payment against flat—Direct connection with business of assessee of developing housing project—Eligible for deduction—Disallowance in respect of interest to be restricted to net interest—SATERN GRIHA NIRMAN P. LTD. <i>v.</i> 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 assessee—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 INDEX	xlvi
		PAGE
	in respect of which segmental information not available—Companies whose functions in contrast with assessee's—Software testing services company—Company rendering whole basket services—Company providing software services to its clients—Not comparables—FIS SOLUTIONS (INDIA) P. LTD. <i>v.</i> DEPUTY CIT (Pune) . . .	656
	—International transactions—Transfer pricing—Arm's length price—Disallowance of particular expense—Not includible in operating expenses for calculating profit margin —EXTENTIA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY PVT. LTD. <i>v.</i> DEPUTY CIT (Pune) . . .	364
	—International transactions—Transfer pricing—Arm's length price—Foreign exchange gain or loss arising out of revenue transactions—To be considered as item of operating revenue/cost, both for assessee as well as comparables—EXTENTIA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY PVT. LTD. <i>v.</i> DEPUTY CIT (Pune) . . .	364
	—International transactions—Transfer pricing—Arm's length price—Provision for doubtful debts—To be included in expenses side of comparable for calculating profit margin —EXTENTIA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY PVT. LTD. <i>v.</i> DEPUTY CIT (Pune) . . .	364
	—International transactions—Transfer pricing—Arm's length price—Transfer Pricing Officer—Powers—Specified domestic transaction—Unreported transaction—No power to determine arm's length price without approval from Principal Commissioner or making reference to him—EXTENTIA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY PVT. LTD. <i>v.</i> DEPUTY CIT (Pune) . . .	364
	Chap. XII-G —International transactions—Transfer pricing—Arm's length price—Shipping business—Tonnage taxation scheme—Interest on purchase of two ships—No application of transfer pricing provisions to income covered under tonnage tax scheme—ESSAR SHIPPING LTD. <i>v.</i> ASST. CIT (Mumbai) . . .	555
	S. 143(2) —Assessment—Notice—Jurisdiction—Limitation—Notice under section 143(2) for commencing scrutiny assessment issued by non-jurisdictional Assessing Officer—Proper jurisdictional Assessing Officer issuing notice beyond period of limitation—Notice invalid—Assessment order void ab initio and liable to be quashed—MANOJ KUMAR <i>v.</i> ASST. CIT (Delhi) . . .	158
	S. 145 —Books of account—Rejection of—Fall in net profit rate—Assessing Officer satisfied with book results produced during remand proceedings—No specific defects pointed out in books of account—No reason to apply higher net profit rate against assessee—DEPUTY CIT <i>v.</i> VARUN BEVERAGES LTD. (Delhi) . . .	133
	S. 145(3) —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—PANCHSHIL EXIM P. LTD. <i>v.</i> 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. <i>v.</i> 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. <i>v.</i> 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. <i>v.</i> 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. <i>v.</i> 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 <i>v.</i> DEPUTY CIT (Delhi) . . .	607

2020]	GENERAL INDEX	xlix
		PAGE
	—Search and seizure—Penalty—Concealment of income—Undisclosed income—Assessing Officer not making reference to any incriminating material representing undisclosed material or income declared by assessee—Penalty on account of deemed concealment of income unsustainable—DEPUTY CIT <i>v.</i> PRAKASH CHAND SHARMA (Jaipur) . . .	386
	S. 195 —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. <i>v.</i> ITO (Mumbai) . . .	447
	S. 200A —Deduction of tax at source—Statement of tax deducted at source—Amendment enabling levy of late fee for default in furnishing statement brought in with effect from 1-6-2015—Prospective in nature—Levy of late fees while processing statement of tax deducted at source before amendment—Not sustainable—OSWAL COMPUTERS AND AMP CONSULTANTS PVT. LTD. <i>v.</i> ITO (TDS) (Indore) . . .	426
	S. 234E —Deduction of tax at source—Statement of tax deducted at source—Amendment enabling levy of late fee for default in furnishing statement brought in with effect from 1-6-2015—Prospective in nature—Levy of late fees while processing statement of tax deducted at source before amendment—Not sustainable—OSWAL COMPUTERS AND AMP CONSULTANTS PVT. LTD. <i>v.</i> ITO (TDS) (Indore) . . .	426
	S. 244A —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 assessee—FIS SOLUTIONS (INDIA) P. LTD. <i>v.</i> DEPUTY CIT (Pune) . . .	656
	S. 246A —Appeal to Commissioner (Appeals)—Appealable orders—Assessee not withdrawing appeal filed before Commissioner (Appeals) and also filing revision application—Revision not justified when pending—Cost imposed upon assessee—Commissioner (Appeals) to adjudicate issue on merits—DIGJAM LTD. <i>v.</i> ASST. CIT (Rajkot) . . .	263
	S. 263 —Revision—Erroneous and prejudicial to Revenue, meaning of—Lack of enquiry or no enquiry by Assessing Officer—Necessary enquiry conducted regarding accommodation entry—Principal Commissioner not agreeing with manner of enquiry conducted by Assessing Officer—Cannot substitute his own reasons to hold order erroneous and prejudicial to interests of Revenue—ARIHANT TECHNOLOGY P. LTD. <i>v.</i> PRINCIPAL CIT (Delhi) . . .	119

1	ITR'S TRIBUNAL TAX REPORTS	[VOL. 79
		PAGE
	—Revision—Limitation—Issues subject to revision pertaining to original assessment and not reopened assessment—Period of limitation would start from original assessment—Original assessment passed on 16-1-2014 and revision could have been taken up to 31-3-2016 but revisional order passed on 26-2-2019—Revision beyond period of limitation— JINDAL STEEL AND POWER LTD. v. PRINCIPAL CIT (Delhi) . . .	636
	—Revision—Merger—Assessee merging with another company—Amalgamated company filing return after merger in its name—Commissioner 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 CIT (Ahd) . . .	176
	—Revision—Scrutiny assessment to examine share application money—Assessing Officer making specific query in relation to details of share premium—Assessee furnishing complete details in respect of share application money received—Share application money received from very same persons from whom share application and share premium amount received in earlier years—No adverse inference drawn in earlier years in 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 as erroneous and prejudicial to interests of the Revenue—Revision not valid— SUNRAY COTSPIN (P.) LTD. v. PRINCIPAL CIT (Delhi) . . .	193
	S. 264 —Revision—Condition precedent—Appeal pending before Commissioner (Appeals)—No power of revision— DIGJAM LTD. v. ASST. CIT (Rajkot) . . .	263
	S. 271(1)(c) —Penalty—Concealment of income—Furnishing inaccurate particulars of income—Additions made by Assessing Officer on account of undisclosed interest income and deposits made in bank account of employees deleted by Tribunal—Tribunal remanding issue of disallowance of certain expenses to Assessing Officer—Penalty levied against additions unsustainable— DEPUTY CIT v. PRAKASH CHAND SHARMA (Jaipur) . . .	386
	—Penalty—Concealment of income—Furnishing inaccurate particulars of income—Assessing Officer not striking off irrelevant part of show-cause notice—Assessing Officer not definite about charge and default of assessee for which penalty levied—Assessing Officer under obligation to specify charge and make assessee known for what default penalty levied—Penalty unsustainable— DEPUTY CIT v. PRAKASH CHAND SHARMA (Jaipur) . . .	386

2020]	GENERAL INDEX	li
		PAGE
	—Penalty—Concealment of income—Furnishing inaccurate particulars of income—Whether penalty for concealment of income or furnishing inaccurate particulars of income not clear from notice or penalty order—Department precluded from filing appeal in view of monetary limit of filing appeal before Tribunal—Valuation estimate alone cannot justify finding of concealment—Penalty not justified—ITO <i>v. A. SHIHABUDEEN</i> (Cochin) . . .	280
	—Penalty—Concealment of income—No detailed finding as regards how there was concealment of particulars of income relating to confirmation in respect of unsecured loan or receipt of cash and insurance commission—Commissioner (Appeals) to decide issue by reasoned order—DEVENDER KUMAR <i>v. ITO</i> (Delhi) . . .	419
	S. 271(1)(c), Expln. 5A —Search and seizure—Penalty—Concealment of income—Undisclosed income—Assessing Officer not making reference to any incriminating material representing undisclosed material or income declared by assessee—Penalty on account of deemed concealment of income unsustainable—DEPUTY CIT <i>v. PRAKASH CHAND SHARMA</i> (Jaipur) . . .	386
	S. 271E —Penalty—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—SUDHA AGRO OIL AND CHEMICAL INDUSTRIES LTD. <i>v. ADDL. CIT</i> (Visakhapatnam) . . .	520
	RULES :	
	Income-tax Rules, 1962 :	
	R. 6DD(j), (k) —Business expenditure—Disallowance—Payments in cash exceeding specified limit—Duty of assessee to prove whether particular payees incorporated in their books for computing their profits on respective sales—Assessee purchasing gold 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—RAJENDRA KUMAR SAHOO <i>v. ASST. CIT</i> (Cuttack) . . .	10
	R. 8D —Income—Disallowance of expenditure in relation to exempt income—No exempt income received by assessee during year—Disallowance not justified—DEPUTY CIT <i>v. HIND INDUSTRIES LTD.</i> (Delhi) . . .	1

lii

ITR'S TRIBUNAL TAX REPORTS

[VOL. 79

PAGE

—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 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— <i>ASST. CIT v. NIIT TECHNOLOGIES LTD.</i> (Delhi) . . .	60
R. 8D(2)(ii) —Income—Disallowance of expenditure in relation to exempt income—No tax exempt income in relevant previous year—No disallowance— <i>DEPUTY CIT v. JSW LTD.</i> (Mumbai) . . .	585
R. 8D(2)(iii) —Income—Disallowance of expenditure relating to exempt income—No income exempt from tax received in relevant previous year—No disallowance can be made— <i>DEPUTY CIT v. COFFEE DAY GLOBAL LTD.</i> (Bang) . . .	322
Income-tax (Appellate Tribunal) Rules, 1963 :	
R. 34(5) —Appeal to Appellate Tribunal—Pronouncement of orders—Time limit for—Exceptional circumstances created owing to spread of coronavirus—Order passed after time limit prescribed— <i>DEPUTY CIT v. JSW LTD.</i> (Mumbai) . . .	585

End of Volume 79