

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] 81 ITR (Trib) (St.)
Reports : [2020] 81 ITR (Trib)
Short Notes : [2020] 81 ITR (Trib) (S.N.)

VOLUME 81

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 — iv
2. TABLE OF CASES JUDICIALLY NOTICED SHORT NOTES CASES . . .	v — vi
3. TABLE OF CASES REPORTED . . .	vii — viii
4. TABLE OF CASES CITED . . .	ix — xx
5. REPORTS OF SHORT NOTES CASES . . .	1 — 96
6. REPORTS OF CASES . . .	1 — 656
7. SUBJECT INDEX OF SHORT NOTES CASES . . .	i — xxi
8. SECTIONWISE INDEX OF SHORT NOTES CASES . . .	xxii — xxxiv
9. SUBJECT INDEX . . .	xxxv — l
10. SECTIONWISE INDEX . . .	li — lx



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 81 — 2020
SHORT NOTES

TABLE OF CASES REPORTED

	PAGE
A. J. Mill Store Agency Pvt. Ltd. <i>v.</i> ITO (Kolkata)	64
American Express (I) P. Ltd. <i>v.</i> Deputy CIT (Delhi)	89
Arjun Dada Kharate <i>v.</i> Deputy CIT (Pune)	68
Aruna Kommuri <i>v.</i> Asst. CIT (Hyderabad)	20
Ashok Kumar Dusad <i>v.</i> ITO (Jaipur)	19
Baidya Nath Dey <i>v.</i> ITO (Kolkata)	28
Bhagatram <i>v.</i> Asst. CIT (Hyderabad)	59
Bhima Dada Kharate <i>v.</i> Deputy CIT (Pune)	68
Bhup Singh <i>v.</i> ITO (Jaipur)	44
Boeing India Pvt. Ltd. <i>v.</i> Asst. CIT (Delhi)	94
Bureau Veritas Consumer Products Services (India) P. Ltd. <i>v.</i> Asst. CIT (Delhi)	73
Commissioner of Income-tax (Deputy) <i>v.</i> Cadence Design Systems (India) P. Ltd. (Delhi)	35
CIT (Deputy) <i>v.</i> Chhotabhai Jethabhai Patel and Co. (Ahmedabad)	5
CIT (Deputy) (Exemptions) <i>v.</i> Gandhinagar Urban Development Authority (Ahmedabad)	51

ii	ITR'S TRIBUNAL TAX REPORTS	[VOL. 81
		PAGE
CIT (Deputy) <i>v.</i> H. B. Associates	(Pune)	38
CIT (Deputy) <i>v.</i> Jaipur Vidyut Vitaran Nigam Ltd.	(Jaipur)	72
CIT (Asst.) <i>v.</i> Kedia Exports P. Ltd.	(Jaipur)	83
CIT (Asst.) <i>v.</i> Oscar Investment Ltd.	(Delhi)	81
Confederation of Indian Textile Industry <i>v.</i> ITO (Exemption)	(Mumbai)	12
DE Diamond Electric India Pvt. Ltd. <i>v.</i> Asst. CIT	(Delhi)	32
Deem Roll Tech Ltd. <i>v.</i> Deputy CIT	(Ahmedabad)	82
Dipesh Ramesh Vardhan <i>v.</i> Deputy CIT	(Mumbai)	91
Dr. D. John Ponnudurai Educational Trust <i>v.</i> Addl. DIT	(Chennai)	69
Electro Urban Co-operative Credit Society Ltd. <i>v.</i> Principal CIT	(Kolkata)	17
Gujarat Guardian Ltd. <i>v.</i> Deputy CIT	(Delhi)	61
Gujarat Mineral Development Corporation Ltd. <i>v.</i> Asst. CIT	(Ahmedabad)	57
HCL Foundation <i>v.</i> CIT (Exemptions)	(Delhi)	7
Hindumal Balmukund Investment Co. Pvt. Ltd. <i>v.</i> Principal CIT	(Pune)	48
ITO <i>v.</i> Kailash Chand Bangur	(Jaipur)	88
ITO <i>v.</i> Smt. Rekha Shetty	(Chennai)	1
Jaidurga Minerals <i>v.</i> Principal CIT	(Cuttack)	67

2020] TABLE OF CASES REPORTED (SHORT NOTES)		iii
		PAGE
Joginder Dahiya <i>v.</i> ITO	(Delhi)	31
John (N. S.) <i>v.</i> ITO	(Cochin)	76
Karmic Labs P. Ltd. <i>v.</i> ITO	(Mumbai)	78
Kedia Exports P. Ltd. <i>v.</i> Asst. CIT	(Jaipur)	83
Maharishi Dayanand Educational Society <i>v.</i> ITO (Exemptions)	(Delhi)	86
Mahavir Steel Industries Ltd. <i>v.</i> Asst. CIT	(Pune)	34
Mukesh Chand Garg <i>v.</i> ITO	(Delhi)	22
Pankaj Ladha <i>v.</i> Deputy CIT	(Jaipur)	42
Perfetti Van Melle (India) Pvt. Ltd. <i>v.</i> Asst. CIT	(Delhi)	79
R. K. Agro Products <i>v.</i> Asst. CIT	(Pune)	50
Raj Bala <i>v.</i> ITO	(Delhi)	31
Rajlaxmi Cotton Mills P. Ltd. <i>v.</i> Deputy CIT	(Kolkata)	52
Ravindra Anant Bhuskute <i>v.</i> ITO	(Pune)	40
Regunathan Venkata Rajendran <i>v.</i> Asst. CIT	(Bangalore)	71
Roop Kishore Madan <i>v.</i> Deputy CIT	(Delhi)	55
S. Vinodkumar Diamonds P. Ltd. <i>v.</i> Deputy CIT	(Mumbai)	46
Sarla Mundra (Smt.) <i>v.</i> Deputy CIT	(Jaipur)	65
Silburn Papers Pvt. Ltd. <i>v.</i> ITO	(Delhi)	85
Star India P. Ltd. <i>v.</i> Asst. CIT	(Mumbai)	8
Sulekh Chand Singhal <i>v.</i> Asst. CIT	(Delhi)	26

iv	ITR'S TRIBUNAL TAX REPORTS	[VOL. 81
		PAGE
	Surekha Builders and Developers Pvt. Ltd. <i>v.</i> Principal CIT	(Cuttack) 24
	Telekon Media India P. Ltd. <i>v.</i> ITO	(Delhi) 3
	The Rajlaxmi Cotton Mills P. Ltd. <i>v.</i> Deputy CIT	(Kolkata) 52
	Thomson Press India Ltd. <i>v.</i> Asst. CIT	(Delhi) 63
	Virendra Verma <i>v.</i> ITO	(Delhi) 16
	Vitech Systems Asia Pvt. Ltd. <i>v.</i> ITO	(Hyderabad) 58
	Wilhelmsen Ship Management India Pvt. Ltd. <i>v.</i> Deputy CIT	(Mumbai) 14

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

	PAGE
Agilant Technologies International (P.) Ltd. v. Asst. CIT [2013] 36 CCH 187 (Delhi-Trib) <i>followed</i>	35
All India Rubber Industries Association v. Addl. DIT (Exemptions) [2018] 173 ITD 615 (Mumbai) <i>followed</i>	12
Andaman Timber Industries v. CCE [2016] 38 GSTR 117 (SC) <i>relied on</i>	26
B. D. Mundra and Sons v. Dy. CIT I. T. A. No. 826/Jaipur/2019 dated October 25, 2019) <i>distinguished</i>	65
CIT v. BSES Yamuna Powers Ltd. [2013] 358 ITR 47 (Delhi) <i>relied on</i>	35
CIT v. D. Chetan and Co. [2017] 390 ITR 36 (Bom) <i>relied on</i>	46
CIT v. G. E. Capital Services Ltd. [2008] 300 ITR 420 (Delhi) <i>relied on</i>	35
CIT (Asst.) v. Gitanjali Exports Corporation Ltd. [2017] 81 taxmann.com 452 (Mum) <i>followed</i>	46
CIT v. HDFC Bank Ltd. [2014] 366 ITR 505 (Bom) <i>relied on</i>	46
CIT (Asst.) v. Motherson Sumi Infotech and Design Ltd. [2015] 155 ITD 8 (Delhi) <i>followed</i>	35
CIT (Dy.) v. Ozoneland Agro Pvt. Ltd. [2018] 64 ITR (Trib) (S.N.) 6 (Mumbai) <i>followed</i>	78
CIT v. Reliance Utility and Power Ltd. [2009] 313 ITR 340 (Bom) <i>relied on</i>	46
CIT v. Times Global Broadcasting Co. Ltd. (I. T. A. No. 399 of 2016 dated August 14, 2018) <i>relied on</i>	8
CIT v. UTV Entertainment Television Ltd. [2017] 399 ITR 443 (Bom) <i>relied on</i>	8
CIT (Asst.) v. Vireet Investment Pvt. Ltd. [2017] 58 ITR (Trib) 313 (Delhi) [SB] <i>followed</i>	57
FedEx Express Transportation and Supply Chain Services (India) (P.) Ltd. v. Dy. CIT (I. T. A. No. 857/Mum/2016 dated July 11, 2019) <i>followed</i>	94

vi	ITR'S TRIBUNAL TAX REPORTS	[VOL. 81
	Godrej and Boyce Manufacturing Company Ltd. v. Dy. CIT [2017] 394 ITR 449 (SC) <i>applied</i>	61
	Hyundai Motor India Engineering Pvt. Ltd. v. Dy. CIT (I. T. A. No. 1807/Hyd/2017 dated August 9, 2018) <i>followed</i>	73
	Kedia Exports Pvt. Ltd. v. Asst. CIT [2020] 81 ITR (Trib) (S.N.) 83 (Jaipur) <i>followed</i>	85
	Kishinchand Chellaram v. CIT [1980] 125 ITR 713 (SC) <i>relied on</i>	26
	Maxopp Investment Ltd. v. CIT [2012] 347 ITR 272 (Delhi) <i>applied</i>	61
	Mukesh Chand Garg v. ITO [2019] 76 ITR (Trib) 344 (Delhi) <i>followed</i>	22
	Nokia India Pvt. Ltd. v. Dy. CIT [2013] TIL-224-ITAT-DEL-TP <i>followed</i>	35
	Ranbaxy Laboratories Ltd. v. CIT [2011] 336 ITR 136 (Delhi) <i>relied on</i>	31
	Sesa Goa Ltd. v. Jt. CIT [2020] 423 ITR 426 (Bom) <i>relied on</i>	63
	Sheveta Construction Co. Pvt. Ltd. v. ITO (D. B. I. T. Appeal No. 534 of 2008 dated December 6, 2016 (Raj)) <i>distinguished</i>	65
	Star India P. Ltd. v. Addl. CIT (I. T. A. Nos. 4818 and 4675/Mum/2010 dated April 1, 2016) <i>followed</i>	8
	Star India P. Ltd. v. Asst. CIT (I. T. A. Nos. 1901/Mum/2016 and 1048/Mum/2017 dated August 1, 2019) <i>followed</i>	8
	Venkata Dilip Kumar v. CIT [2019] 419 ITR 298 (Mad) <i>relied on</i>	1
	Vodafone M-Pesa Ltd v. Dy. CIT [2020] 114 taxmann.com 323 (Mumbai-Trib) <i>followed</i>	78

THE
ITR'S TRIBUNAL TAX REPORTS
VOLUME 81 — 2020

TABLE OF CASES REPORTED

	PAGE
ABC Exports <i>v.</i> Asst. CIT	(Jaipur) 99
Alankar Sapphire Developers <i>v.</i> Deputy CIT	(Delhi) 549
Arvind Metals and Minerals P. Ltd. <i>v.</i> Asst. CIT	(Kolkata) 648
Ashapura Minechem Ltd. <i>v.</i> Deputy CIT	(Mumbai) 111
Blue Coast Infrastructure Development P. Ltd. <i>v.</i> Deputy CIT	(Chandigarh) 419
Commissioner of Income-tax (Deputy) <i>v.</i> Bal- mukhi Textiles P. Ltd.	(Chandigarh) 507
CIT (Asst.) <i>v.</i> Emaar MGF Construction P. Ltd.	(Delhi) 30
CIT (Asst.) <i>v.</i> Jojo Frozen Foods P. Ltd.	(Cochin) 90
CIT (Addl.) <i>v.</i> PNB Gilts Ltd.	(Delhi) 224
CIT (Asst.) <i>v.</i> Padma Logistics and Khanij Pvt. Ltd.	(Kolkata) 61
CIT (Deputy) <i>v.</i> Rajinder Kumar	(Chandigarh) 507
CIT (Deputy) <i>v.</i> Reckitt Benckiser (I.) Pvt. Ltd.	(Kolkata) 577
CIT (Deputy) <i>v.</i> Shiva Spinfab P. Ltd.	(Chandigarh) 507
CIT (Asst.) <i>v.</i> Shri Ram Murti Smarak Trust	(Lucknow) 194
CIT (Deputy) <i>v.</i> Vasu Kalia	(Chandigarh) 507
Dev Milk Foods Pvt. Ltd. <i>v.</i> Addl. CIT	(Delhi) 178
Dev Murti <i>v.</i> Asst. CIT	(Lucknow) 194

viii	ITR'S TRIBUNAL TAX REPORTS	[VOL. 81
		PAGE
DIT (Deputy) <i>v.</i> Yum! Restaurants (Asia) Pte. Ltd.	(Delhi)	440
Eid Mohammad Nizamuddin <i>v.</i> ITO (TDS)	(Jaipur)	127
Emaar MGF Construction P. Ltd. <i>v.</i> CIT (Asst.)	(Delhi)	30
Gurusamy Ramamurthy <i>v.</i> ITO	(Chennai)	9
Harshvardhan Constructions <i>v.</i> ITO	(Mumbai)	299
ITO (TDS) <i>v.</i> Eid Mohammad Nizamuddin	(Jaipur)	127
ITO <i>v.</i> Harshvardhan Constructions	(Mumbai)	299
Indo Global Techno Trade Ltd. <i>v.</i> ITO	(Chandigarh)	493
Manjit Singh <i>v.</i> Deputy CIT (International Taxation)	(Chandigarh)	454
Reckitt Benckiser (I.) Pvt. Ltd. <i>v.</i> Deputy CIT	(Kolkata)	577
Rohit Kumar Jindal (HUF) <i>v.</i> ITO	(Chandigarh)	469
Sanjay Singhal (HUF) <i>v.</i> Deputy CIT	(Chandigarh)	377
Shalom Charitable Ministries of India <i>v.</i> Asst. CIT	(Cochin)	20
Shri Ram Murti Smarak Trust <i>v.</i> Asst. CIT	(Lucknow)	194
Suresh Kumar Sharma <i>v.</i> ITO	(Jaipur)	1
Sushil Kumar Bhati <i>v.</i> ITO	(Delhi)	218
Tarlok Kumar <i>v.</i> Asst. CIT	(Amritsar)	462
The Chombal Service Co-operative Bank Ltd. <i>v.</i> ITO	(Cochin)	13
Vinod Bhandari <i>v.</i> Principal CIT	(Indore)	237
Windsor Machines Ltd. <i>v.</i> Deputy CIT	(Mumbai)	41

TABLE OF CASES CITED

	PAGE
Adarsh Agrawal <i>v.</i> ITO [2020] 77 ITR (Trib) (S.N.) 52 (Delhi) <i>followed</i>	377
AGR Investment Ltd. <i>v.</i> Addl. CIT [2011] 333 ITR 146 (Delhi)	111
Alcatel Lucent France <i>v.</i> Asst. DIT [2016] 384 ITR 113 (Delhi)	90
All Cargo Global Logistics Ltd. <i>v.</i> Dy. CIT [2012] 18 ITR (Trib) 106 (Mumbai) [SB]	577
Amal Kumar Ghosh <i>v.</i> Asst. CIT [2014] 361 ITR 458 (Cal) <i>followed</i>	178
Anaikar Trades and Estates (P.) Ltd. (No. 2) <i>v.</i> CIT [1990] 186 ITR 313 (Mad)	127
Anantharam Veerasinghaiah and Co. <i>v.</i> CIT [1980] 123 ITR 457 (SC) <i>followed</i>	237
Anil Rai <i>v.</i> State of Bihar [2001] 7 SCC 318 ; [2002] 3 BCR 360 (SC) 41, 111, 299, 377, 462	
Antony Pattukulangara <i>v.</i> E. N. Appukuttan Nair [2012] (3) KHC 726	13
ANZ Grindlays Bank PLC <i>v.</i> CIT [2000] 241 ITR 269 (Cal)	99
Apollo Tyres Ltd. <i>v.</i> CIT [2002] 255 ITR 273 (SC)	41
Arun Kala <i>v.</i> Asst. CIT [2005] 98 TTJ (Jaipur) 1046 <i>followed</i>	237
Ashiana Amar Developers <i>v.</i> ITO [2016] 46 ITR (Trib) 17 (Kol) <i>distinguished</i>	299
Ashok Pai (T.) <i>v.</i> CIT [2007] 292 ITR 11 (SC) <i>relied on</i>	237
Associated Stone Industries (Kotah) Ltd. <i>v.</i> CIT [1997] 224 ITR 560 (SC)	99
Babulal Lath <i>v.</i> Asst. CIT [2002] 83 ITD 691 (Mum)	377
Bakelite Hylam Ltd. <i>v.</i> CIT [1988] 171 ITR 344 (AP)	99
Balaram (T. S.), ITO <i>v.</i> Volkart Brothers [1971] 82 ITR 50 (SC)	13
Ballarpur Industries Ltd. <i>v.</i> CIT (No. 2) [2017] 398 ITR 145 (Bom)	41
Berger Paints India Ltd. <i>v.</i> CIT [2004] 266 ITR 99 (SC)	127
Bombardier Transportation India Pvt. Ltd. <i>v.</i> Dy. CIT (I.T.A. No. 1626/Delhi/2015 dated September 14, 2017)	577
Brahma Associates <i>v.</i> Jt. CIT [2009] 315 ITR (A.T.) 268 (Pune) [SB] <i>followed</i>	299
Brij Bhushan Singal <i>v.</i> Asst. CIT [2019] 14 ITR (Trib)-OL 209 (Delhi)	377
British Bank of the Middle East <i>v.</i> CIT [2004] 266 ITR 269 (Bom)	99

x	ITR'S TRIBUNAL TAX REPORTS	[VOL. 81
		PAGE
Burt Hill Design (P.) Ltd. v. Dy. DIT (I. T.) [2017] 164 ITD 697 (Ahd)		440
Cadbury India Ltd. v. Addl. CIT (I. T. A. No. 7408/Mum/2010 and I.T. A. No. 7641/Mum/2010 dated November 13, 2013)		577
Calcutta Discount Co. Ltd. v. ITO [1961] 41 ITR 191 (SC)	111, 299,	377
Caltex Oil Refining (India) Ltd. v. CIT [1993] 202 ITR 375 (Bom)		99
Cargo Cleaning Agency (Gujarat) v. Jt. CIT [2008] 307 ITR 1 (Guj)		377
CCI Ltd. v. Jt. CIT [2012] 20 taxmann.com 196 (Karn)		224
Central Provinces Manganese Ore Co. Ltd. v. CIT [1986] 160 ITR 961 (SC)		99
Central Provinces Manganese Ore Co. Ltd. v. ITO [1991] 191 ITR 662 (SC)		111
Centrica India Offshore Pvt. Ltd. v. CIT [2014] 364 ITR 336 (Delhi) <i>distinguished</i>		440
Chambal Fertilisers and Chemicals Ltd. v. Jt. CIT (I. T. A. No. 52/Jaipur/2018 dated July 31, 2018)		577
Chandmal Sancheti v. ITO [2016] 181 TTJ 906 (Jaipur)		127
Chaube Jagdish Prasad v. Ganga Prasad Chaturvedi [1959] AIR 1959 SC 492		127
Chirakkal Service Co-operative Bank Ltd. v. CIT [2016] 384 ITR 490 (Ker)		13
Coates of India Ltd v. Dy. CIT (No. 1) [1995] 214 ITR 498 (Cal)		61
Commissioner of Customs v. Dilip Kumar and Co. [2018] 6 GSTR-OL 46 (SC) <i>applied</i>		299
Commissioner of Income-tax v. A. Raman and Co. [1968] 67 ITR 11 (SC)	111,	493
CIT (Pr.) v. Aarham Softronics [2019] 412 ITR 623 (SC)		299
CIT v. Abhinandan Investment Ltd. [2016] 6 ITR-OL 139 (Delhi)		577
CIT (Dy.) v. Ace Multi Axes Systems Ltd. [2018] 400 ITR 141 (SC)		13
CIT v. Adisankara Spinning Mills (P.) Ltd. [2014] 362 ITR 233 (Mad)		127
CIT (Dy.) v. Air Liquide Engineering India P. Ltd. [2014] 31 ITR (Trib) 205 (Hyd)		577
CIT v. Amalgamations Ltd. [1999] 238 ITR 963 (Mad)		237
CIT v. Amaltas Associates [2016] 389 ITR 175 (Guj) <i>relied on</i>		299
CIT v. Amit Corporation [2013] 213 Taxman 19 (Guj) (Mag.)		237
CIT v. Anil Kumar Bhatia [2013] 352 ITR 493 (Delhi)		377
CIT v. Anil Kumar Sharma [2011] 335 ITR 83 (Delhi)		237
CIT v. Anjum M. H. Ghaswala [2001] 252 ITR 1 (SC)		440
CIT v. Arvind Jewellers [2003] 259 ITR 502 (Guj) <i>applied</i>		237

2020]	TABLE OF CASES CITED	xi
		PAGE
	CIT <i>v.</i> Ashish Rajpal [2010] 320 ITR 674 (Delhi)	237
	CIT (TDS) <i>v.</i> Bharat Hotels Ltd. [2016] 384 ITR 77 (Karn)	127
	CIT (Dy.) <i>v.</i> Brigade Enterprises Pvt. Ltd. [2008] 119 TTJ 269 (Bang) <i>followed</i>	299
	CIT <i>v.</i> Burlop Dealers Ltd. [1971] 79 ITR 609 (SC)	299
	CIT (Dy.) (LTU) <i>v.</i> CLSA India Ltd. [2013] 33 taxmann.com 260 (Mum)	577
	CIT <i>v.</i> Chetan Das Lachman Das [2012] 254 CTR 392 (Delhi)	377
	CIT (TDS) <i>v.</i> Chhaganbhai K Sanghani [2018] 94 taxmann.com 459 (Guj)	127
	CIT <i>v.</i> Classic Binding Industries [2018] 407 ITR 429 (SC)	299
	CIT <i>v.</i> Darshan Talkies [1996] 217 ITR 744 (MP)	549
	CIT (Pr.) <i>v.</i> Delhi Airport Metro Express Pvt. Ltd. [2017] 398 ITR 8 (Delhi)	237
	CIT <i>v.</i> Design and Automation Engineers (Bombay) P. Ltd. [2010] 323 ITR 632 (Bom)	237
	CIT <i>v.</i> Development Credit Bank Ltd. [2010] 323 ITR 206 (Bom)	237
	CIT (Addl.) <i>v.</i> Dharamdas Agarwal [1983] 144 ITR 143 (MP) <i>fol- lowed</i>	237
	CIT <i>v.</i> DLF Ltd. [2013] 350 ITR 555 (Delhi) <i>applied</i>	237
	CIT <i>v.</i> Durga Prasad More [1971] 82 ITR 540 (SC)	493
	CIT <i>v.</i> EKL Appliances Ltd. [2012] 345 ITR 241 (Delhi) <i>relied on</i>	577
	CIT (Asst.) <i>v.</i> Ekta Sankalp Developers [2015] 152 ITD 805 (Mum)	299
	CIT <i>v.</i> Elegant Estates [2016] 383 ITR 49 (Mad) <i>followed</i>	299
	CIT <i>v.</i> Fair Finvest Ltd. [2013] 357 ITR 146 (Delhi)	377
	CIT (Pr.) <i>v.</i> G and G Pharma India Ltd. [2016] 384 ITR 147 (Delhi)	377
	CIT <i>v.</i> Gabriel India Ltd. [1993] 203 ITR 108 (Bom)	237
	CIT <i>v.</i> Gangeshwari Metal P. Ltd. [2014] 361 ITR 10 (Delhi)	377
	CIT <i>v.</i> Goel Sons Golden Estate Pvt. Ltd. (I. T. A. No. 212 of 2012 dated April 11, 2012)	377
	CIT <i>v.</i> Goetze (India) Ltd. [2014] 361 ITR 505 (Delhi)	237
	CIT <i>v.</i> Hari Singh and Associates [2014] 267 CTR 442 (Raj)	237
	CIT <i>v.</i> HDFC Bank Ltd. [2014] 366 ITR 505 (Bom)	224
	CIT <i>v.</i> Hero Auto Ltd. [2012] 343 ITR 342 (Delhi)	237
	CIT (Dy.) <i>v.</i> Himanshu B. Kanakia [2016] 46 ITR (Trib) 756 (Mum)	377
	CIT <i>v.</i> Himgiri Foods Ltd. [2010] 231 CTR 470 (Guj)	61
	CIT <i>v.</i> Hindustan Latex Ltd. [2016] 389 ITR 407 (Ker)	90
	CIT <i>v.</i> Hindustan Samuh Awas Ltd. [2015] 377 ITR 150 (Bom) <i>dis- tinguished</i>	299

xii	ITR'S TRIBUNAL TAX REPORTS	[VOL. 81
		PAGE
CIT <i>v.</i> International Travel House Ltd. [2012] 344 ITR 554 (Delhi)		237
CIT (Dy.) <i>v.</i> JSW Ltd. [2020] 79 ITR (Trib) 585 (Mum)		61, 194, 299, 377, 462, 577
do. <i>v.</i> do.	<i>relied on</i>	648
do. <i>v.</i> do.	<i>followed</i>	41
CIT (Asst.) <i>v.</i> Jeppiar Educational Trust (I. T. A. Nos. 1333, 1334, 1591 to 1595/Mds/2010 dated June 15, 2011)		20
CIT (Dy.) <i>v.</i> Jojo Frozen Foods P. Ltd. (I. T. A. No. 311/Cochin/2013 dated July 29, 2013)		90
CIT <i>v.</i> K. S. M. Guruswamy Nadar and Sons [1984] 149 ITR 127 (Mad) <i>followed</i>		237
CIT <i>v.</i> Kabul Chawla [2016] 380 ITR 573 (Delhi)		377
do. <i>v.</i> do.	<i>relied on</i>	549
CIT <i>v.</i> Kelvinator of India Ltd. [2002] 256 ITR 1 (Delhi) [FB]		377
CIT <i>v.</i> Kelvinator of India Ltd. [2010] 320 ITR 561 (SC)		299, 493
CIT <i>v.</i> Krishnaveni Ammal [1986] 158 ITR 826 (Mad)		237
CIT <i>v.</i> Mahabir Prashad and Sons [1980] 125 ITR 165 (Delhi)		99
CIT <i>v.</i> Mahalakshmi Housing [2014] 222 Taxman 356 (Mad) ; [2014] 41 taxmann.com 146 (Mad)		299
CIT <i>v.</i> Makal Suta Cotton Co. P. Ltd. [2005] 275 ITR 54 (MP)		237
CIT <i>v.</i> Maltibai R. Kadu (Smt.) [2015] 374 ITR 531 (Bom)		419
CIT <i>v.</i> Max India Ltd. [2007] 295 ITR 282 (SC)		237
CIT (Pr.) <i>v.</i> Meenakshi Overseas (P.) Ltd. [2017] 395 ITR 677 (Delhi)		377
CIT (Pr.) <i>v.</i> Meeta Gutgutia prop. M/s. Ferns "N" Petals [2017] 395 ITR 526 (Delhi)		549
CIT (Pr.) <i>v.</i> Meeta Gutgutia [2018] 405 ITR (St.) 28 (SC)		549
CIT <i>v.</i> Mehrotra Brothers [2004] 270 ITR 157 (MP)		237
CIT <i>v.</i> Minalben S. Parikh (Smt.) [1995] 215 ITR 81 (Guj)		237
CIT (Pr.) <i>v.</i> Modicare Ltd. (I. T. A. No. 759/2017)		237
CIT <i>v.</i> Multiplex Trading and Industrial Co. Ltd. [2015] 378 ITR 351 (Delhi)		377
CIT <i>v.</i> N. C. Budharaja and Co. [1993] 204 ITR 412 (SC)		299
CIT <i>v.</i> Nagesh Knitwears Pvt. Ltd. [2012] 345 ITR 135 (Delhi)		237
CIT (Pr.) <i>v.</i> Narayan Balmukund Dubey [2017] 30 ITJ 335 (MP)		237
CIT <i>v.</i> Nawanshahar Central Co-operative Bank Ltd. [2007] 289 ITR 6 (SC)		224
CIT <i>v.</i> Oasis Hospitalities (P.) Ltd. [2011] 333 ITR 119 (Delhi)		377
CIT <i>v.</i> Orient Craft Ltd. [2013] 354 ITR 536 (Delhi)		493

2020]	TABLE OF CASES CITED	xiii
		PAGE
CIT (Dy.) v. PNB Gilts Ltd. (I. T. A. No. 810/Delhi/2015 dated February 22, 2018)		224
CIT v. Paramjit Kaur (Smt.) [2009] 311 ITR 38 (P&H)		377, 493
CIT v. Pitambardas Dulichand [2005] 273 ITR 271 (MP) <i>followed</i>		218
CIT v. R. K. Construction Co. [2009] 313 ITR 65 (Guj)		237
CIT (Pr.) v. RMG Polyvinyl (I.) Ltd. [2017] 396 ITR 5 (Delhi)		377
CIT (Pr.) v. Rajasthan Explosives and Chemicals Ltd. [2017] 398 ITR 736 (Delhi)		41
CIT v. Rajendra Prasad Moody [1978] 115 ITR 519 (SC)		577
CIT (Asst.) v. Rajesh Jhaveri Stock Brokers Pvt. Ltd. [2007] 291 ITR 500 (SC)	61, 111,	299, 493
CIT v. Ratlam Coal Ash Co. [1988] 171 ITR 141 (MP)		237
CIT v. Raviraj Kothari Punjabi Associates (I. T. A. No. 1628 of 2013, dated April 24, 2015—(Bom))		299
CIT v. Reliance Utilities and Power Ltd. [2009] 313 ITR 340 (Bom)	61,	224
CIT v. Sania Mirza (I. T. A. No. 526 of 2011 dated December 9, 2012—AP)		218
CIT v. Sarkar Builders [2015] 375 ITR 392 (SC)		299
CIT v. Sasikumar (Dr.) (P.) [2016] 387 ITR 8 (Ker)		549
CIT v. Satinder Pal Singh [2010] 188 Taxman 54 (P&H)		419
CIT v. Satya Setia (Kum.) [1983] 143 ITR 486 (MP)		127
CIT v. SFIL Stock Broking Ltd. [2010] 325 ITR 285 (Delhi)		377
CIT (Asst.) v. Sheth Developers Pvt. Ltd. [2009] 33 SOT 277 (Mum) <i>followed</i>		299
CIT v. Shri Govindram Seksaryia Charity Trust [1987] 166 ITR 580 (MP)		237
CIT v. Sidhartha Enterprises [2010] 322 ITR 80 (P&H)		218
CIT v. Sinhgad Technical Education Society [2015] 378 ITR 84 (Bom)		549
CIT v. Sinhgad Technical Education Society [2017] 397 ITR 344 (SC)		549
CIT v. Sitaldas Tirathdas [1961] 41 ITR 367 (SC)		30
CIT (TDS) v. Siyaram Metal Udyog (P.) Ltd. [2016] 71 taxmann.com 204 (Guj)		127
CIT v. Software Consultants [2012] 341 ITR 240 (Delhi)		237
CIT (Asst.) v. Som Nath Maini [2006] 100 TTJ 917 (Chand)		493
CIT v. Soorajmull Nagarmull [1981] 129 ITR 169 (Cal) <i>relied on</i>		648
CIT v. Srinivasa Setty (B. C.) [1981] 128 ITR 294 (SC)		577
CIT (Pr.) v. State Bank of Patiala [2017] 391 ITR 218 (P&H)		224

xiv	ITR'S TRIBUNAL TAX REPORTS	[VOL. 81
		PAGE
CIT v. Sunbeam Auto Ltd. [2011] 332 ITR 167 (Delhi)		237
CIT (Asst.) v. Sunil G. Mathreja (I. T. A. No. 6562/Mumbai/2011 dated March 7, 2014)		419
CIT v. Tarnetar Corporation [2014] 362 ITR 174 (Guj) <i>distinguished</i>		299
CIT v. Thanthi Trust [1999] 239 ITR 502 (SC)		20
CIT v. Tube Investments of India Ltd. [2012] 341 ITR 199 (Mad) <i>distinguished</i>		41
CIT v. Ummer (K. P.), Prop. Star Rolling Mill [2019] 413 ITR 251 (Ker)		549
CIT v. Valibhai Khanbhai Mankad [2013] 261 CTR 538 (Guj)		127
CIT v. Vatika Township P. Ltd. [2014] 367 ITR 466 (SC)		237
CIT v. Vikas Polymers [2012] 341 ITR 537 (Delhi)		237
CIT v. Vodafone Essar South Ltd. [2013] 212 Taxman 184 (Delhi)		237
CIT v. Vrindavan Farms (P.) Ltd. [2016] 6 ITR-OL 502 (Delhi)		377
CIT v. Walchand and Co. Pvt. Ltd. [1967] 65 ITR 381 (SC)		577
CIT v. Walfort Share and Stock Brokers P. Ltd. [2010] 326 ITR 1 (SC)		61, 224
CIT v. Zaveri (A. J.) [1968] 68 ITR 594 (Bom)		493
D. D. Agro Industries Ltd. v. Asst. CIT (I. T. A. Nos. 349 and 350/Chd/2017 dated September 7, 2017) <i>followed</i>		493
Dalmia Cement Ltd. v. CIT [1999] 237 ITR 617 (SC)		30
Dalmia Power Ltd v. Asst. CIT [2020] 420 ITR 339 (SC) <i>applied</i>		61
Dass Muni Reddy (P.) v. Appa Rao (P.) [1974] AIR 1974 SC 2089		127
Dayawanti (Smt.) v. CIT [2017] 390 ITR 496 (Delhi)		549
Deepraj Hospital (P.) Ltd. v. ITO [2018] 65 ITR (Trib) 663 (Agra)		377
Devansh Exports v. Asst. CIT (I. T. A. No. 2178/Kol/2017, dated October 15, 2018)		377
DIT (Asst.) v. E-funds IT Solutions Inc. [2017] 399 ITR 34 (SC)		440
DIT v. Jacobs Civil Incorporated [2011] 330 ITR 578 (Delhi)		440
DIT v. Jyoti Foundation [2013] 357 ITR 388 (Delhi)		237
DIT (International Taxation) v. Morgan Stanley and Co. Inc. [2007] 292 ITR 416 (SC)		440
DIT (Dy.) (I. T) v. Thoresen Chartering Singapore (Pte.) Ltd. [2008] 15 DTR (A.T.) 395 (Mum)		127
Disha India Micro Credit v. CIT (I. T. A. No. 1374/Delhi/2010 dated January 28, 2011)		20
Durgabati (Smt.) v. CIT [1956] 30 ITR 101 (Patna)		377

2020]	TABLE OF CASES CITED	xv
		PAGE
Dwarka Gems Ltd. v. Dy. CIT (I. T. A. No. 71/Jaipur/2017, dated March 27, 2018)		377
Eastern Investments Ltd. v. CIT [1951] 20 ITR 1 (SC)		577
Eid Mohd. Nizamuddin v. ITO (TDS) (I. T. A. No. 394/Jaipur/2016 dated September 28, 2018)		127
Eli Lilly v. Commissioner [1985] 84 TC 996		577
Emaar MGF Construction P. Ltd. v. Asst. CIT [2020] 113 taxmann.com 275 (Delhi)		30
Empire Industries Ltd. v. CIT [1992] 193 ITR 295 (Bom)		99
Export Credit Guarantee Corporation of India Ltd. v. Addl. CIT [2013] 350 ITR 651 (Bom)		299
Fenner (India) Ltd. v. CIT (No. 2) [2000] 241 ITR 803 (Mad)		577
Fomento Resources (P.) Ltd. v. Union of India (W. P. No. 606 of 2014, dated July 2, 2019)		111
Frigoglas India P. Ltd. v. Dy. CIT [2016] 180 TTJ 401 (Delhi) <i>relied on</i>		577
Gadgil (S. S.) v. Lal and Co. [1964] 53 ITR 231 (SC)		237
Gee Cee Cycle Balls Pvt. Ltd. v. ITO (I. T. A. No. 867/Delhi/2013 dated October 30, 2015)		377
Gee Vee Enterprises v. Addl. CIT [1975] 99 ITR 375 (Delhi)		237
GKN Driveshafts (India) Ltd. v. ITO [2003] 259 ITR 19 (SC)		377
GKN Sinter Metals Ltd. v. Ms. Ramapriya Raghavan, Asst. CIT [2015] 371 ITR 225 (Bom) <i>distinguished</i>		299
Gopakumar (E. N.) v. CIT [2017] 390 ITR 131 (Ker)		549
H. H. Maharaja Raja Pawan Dewas v. CIT [1982] 138 ITR 518 (MP)		237
Hari Iron Trading Co. v. CIT [2003] 263 ITR 437 (P&H)		237
Harshvardhan Constructions v. ITO (CWP (Lodg No.) 3499 of 2015)		299
Hindustan Coca Cola Beverage P. Ltd. v. CIT [2007] 293 ITR 226 (SC)		127
Hindustan Lever Ltd. v. R. B. Wadkar, Asst. CIT (No. 1) [2004] 268 ITR 332 (Bom)		111
Hughes (Inspector of Taxes) v. Bank of New Zealand [1938] 6 ITR 636 (HL)		577
I. P. Patel and Co. v. Dy. CIT [2012] 346 ITR 207 (Guj)		111

xvi	ITR'S TRIBUNAL TAX REPORTS	[VOL. 81
		PAGE
IBS Software Services P. Ltd. v. Union of India [2015] 379 ITR 66 (Ker)		90
ITO v. AIR Developers [2009] 319 ITR (A.T.) 167 (Nag) <i>followed</i>		299
ITO v. Arun Kumar Kapoor [2011] 140 TTJ 249 (Asr)		377
ITO v. Chaganlal Lalji Aswin (I. T. A. No. 857/Mds/2011 dated October 21, 2011)		419
ITO v. DG Housing Projects Ltd. [2012] 343 ITR 329 (Delhi)		237
ITO v. Lakhmani Mewal Das [1976] 103 ITR 437 (SC)	111, 377, 419, 493	
ITO v. Ranjit Rattan Mehra (HUF) (I. T. A. No. 442/Asr/2011 dated July 18, 2012)		419
ITO v. Selected Dalurband Coal Co. (P.) Ltd. [1996] 217 ITR 597 (SC)		111
ITO v. Siddhivinayak Homes (I. T. A. Nos. 8726/Mum/2010 and 5986/Mum/2011 dated September 26, 2012)		299
do. v. do. <i>followed</i>		299
ITO v. Softline Creations (P.) Ltd. [2016] 51 ITR (Trib) 460 (Delhi)		377
ITO v. Techspan India P. Ltd. [2018] 404 ITR 10 (SC)		90
ITO (TDS) v. Eid Mohd. Nizamuddin (I. T. A. No. 316/Jaipur/2018 dated August 29, 2018)		127
Indo Java and Co. v. IAC [1989] 30 ITD 161 (Delhi) [SB]		127
IPCA Laboratory Ltd. v. Dy. CIT [2004] 266 ITR 521 (SC)		299
ITC Ltd. v. Asst. CIT (I. T. A. No. 685/Kol/2014 dated November 27, 2018)		577
J. P. Srivastava and Sons (Kanpur) Ltd. v. CIT [1978] 111 ITR 326 (All)		237
Jagadamba Construction Co. v. ITO [2004] 3 SOT 670 (Jodh) <i>followed</i>		237
Janalakshmi Social Services v. DIT (Exemptions) [2009] 33 SOT 197 (Bang)		20
Jaswant Rai v. CWT [1977] 107 ITR 477 (P&H) <i>followed</i>		237
Jindal Mittal Griha Nirman Pvt. Ltd. v. ITO [2017] 51 CCH 240 (Pune) <i>followed</i>		299
Kali Charan Ram Chander v. CIT [1978] 112 ITR 405 (Cal)		127
Kalimati Investment Co. Ltd. v. ITO (I. T. A. Nos. 2706 and 4508/ Mumbai/2010 and 2552 and 2553/Mumbai/2011 dated May 9, 2012)		577
Karnataka Forest Development Corporation Ltd. v. ITO [2015] ITR 1007 (Bang)		127

2020]	TABLE OF CASES CITED	xvii
		PAGE
Karwat Steel Traders v. ITO [2013] 37 taxmann.com 190 (Mum)		127
Khatri Projects P. Ltd. v. ITO (I. T. A. No. 4353/Delhi/2016, dated December 16, 2016)		377
Kil Kotagiri Tea and Coffee Estates Co. Ltd. v. ITAT [1988] 174 ITR 579 (Ker)		13
Kishinchand Chellaram v. CIT [1980] 125 ITR 713 (SC)		419
Kizhathadiyoor Service Co-operative Bank Ltd. v. ITO (I. T. A. No. 525/Cochin/2014 dated July 20, 2016) <i>followed</i>		13
Kooka Sidhwa and Co. v. CIT [1964] 54 ITR 54 (Cal)		99
Koteswara Rao (G.) v. Dy. CIT [2015] 64 taxmann.com 159 (Vizag)		377
Krishnamurthy (V. G.) v. CIT [1985] 152 ITR 683 (Karn)		237
Kumar Builders Consortium v. Asst. CIT 7 Taxcorp (AT) 32844 (Pune) <i>followed</i>		299
L. G. Electronics India P. Ltd. v. Asst. CIT [2013] 22 ITR (Trib) 1 (Delhi) [SB]		577
Lark Chemicals P. Ltd. v. Asst. CIT (I. T. A. No. 2636/Mum/2013 dated February 6, 2015)		493
Lumax Industries Ltd. v. Asst. CIT (I. T. A. No. 5252/Delhi/2011 dated July 12, 2013)		577
Maharaj Kumar Kamal Singh v. CIT [1959] 35 ITR 1 (SC)		493
Maithan International v. Asst. CIT [2012] 134 ITD 393 (Kolkata-Trib)		237
Mala Builders (P.) Ltd. v. Asst. CIT [2016] 51 ITR (Trib) 272 (Chand)		377
Malabar Industrial Co. Ltd. v. CIT [2000] 243 ITR 83 (SC) <i>applied</i>		237
Manish Kumar v. CIT [2012] 134 ITD 27 (Indore-Trib)		237
Manish Maheshwari v. Asst. CIT [2007] 289 ITR 341 (SC)		377
Marshall Sons and Co. (India) Ltd. v. ITO [1997] 223 ITR 809 (SC)		61
Maruti Suzuki India Ltd. v. CIT [2016] 381 ITR 117 (Delhi) <i>relied on</i>		577
Master Vijay R. Oswal v. ITO [2003] 87 ITD 98 (Rajkot-Trib)		237
Mavilayi Service Co-operative Bank Ltd. v. CIT [2019] 414 ITR 67 (Ker) [FB] <i>followed</i>		13
Maxopp Investment Ltd. v. CIT [2018] 402 ITR 640 (SC)		61, 224
Mepco Industries Ltd. v. CIT [2009] 319 ITR 208 (SC)		13
Metrani (P. R.) v. CIT [2006] 287 ITR 209 (SC)		194
Modi Builders and Realtors (P.) Ltd. v. Asst. CIT [2011] 12 taxmann.com 129 (Hyd) <i>followed</i>		299
Moti Adhesive P. Ltd. v. ITO (I. T. A. No. 3133/Delhi/2018, dated June 25, 2018)		377

xviii	ITR'S TRIBUNAL TAX REPORTS	[VOL. 81
		PAGE
Mukesh Sharma <i>v.</i> CIT 25 ITJ 341 (Indore ITAT)		237
Narayan Tatu Rane <i>v.</i> ITO [2016] 70 taxmann.com 227 (Mum-ITAT)		237
Narayanappa (S.) <i>v.</i> CIT [1967] 63 ITR 219 (SC)		299, 377
Narmadabala Gupta (Smt.) <i>v.</i> CIT [1956] 30 ITR 101 (Patna)		377
National Thermal Power Co. Ltd. <i>v.</i> CIT [1998] 229 ITR 383 (SC)		549, 577
Navrattan Kothari <i>v.</i> Asst. CIT (I. T. A. No. 425/Jaipur/2017 dated December 13, 2017)		1
Nirmala Agarwal <i>v.</i> Asst. CIT [2018] 64 ITR (Trib) 658 (Jaipur)		377
Otters Club <i>v.</i> DIT (Exemption) [2017] 392 ITR 244 (Bom) 41, 111, 299, 377, 462		
Pandian Chemicals Ltd. <i>v.</i> CIT [2003] 262 ITR 278 (SC)		299
Paramjit Singh (Lt. Col.) <i>v.</i> CIT [1996] 220 ITR 446 (P&H)		454
Pari Mangaldas Girdhardas <i>v.</i> CIT [1977] CTR (Guj) 647		127
Payal Kumari (Mrs.) <i>v.</i> ITO (I. T. A. No. 23/Chd/2011 dated February 24, 2011) <i>followed</i>		178
Peerless General Finance and Investment Co. Ltd. <i>v.</i> Dy. CIT [2019] 76 ITR (Trib) 356 (Kolkata)		577
Perinthalmanna Service Co-operative Bank Ltd. <i>v.</i> ITO [2014] 363 ITR 268 (Ker)		13
Petron Engineering Construction P. Ltd. <i>v.</i> CBDT [1989] 175 ITR 523 (SC)		299
Philips India Ltd. <i>v.</i> Asst. CIT (I. T. A. No. 2489/Kol/2017 dated April 4, 2018)		577
Phool Chand Bajrang Lal <i>v.</i> ITO [1993] 203 ITR 456 (SC)		111
PNB Finance Ltd. <i>v.</i> CIT [2008] 307 ITR 75 (SC)		577
Prabha (Smt.) <i>v.</i> Ramprakash Kalra [1987] Suppl. 339 (SC)		549
Puran Ratilal Mehta <i>v.</i> Asst. CIT [2019] 102 taxmann.com 187 (Mum) <i>distinguished</i>		299
R. B. Bansilal Abirchand Firm <i>v.</i> CIT [1968] 70 ITR 74 (SC)		493
R. S. S. Shanmugham Pillai and Sons <i>v.</i> CIT [1974] 95 ITR 109 (Mad)		127
Radhasoami Satsang <i>v.</i> CIT [1992] 193 ITR 321 (SC) <i>applied</i>		577
Raja Yadendra Datt Dube <i>v.</i> State of U. P. [1964] 54 ITR 506 (All)		377
Rajmoti Industries <i>v.</i> ITO [1995] 52 ITD 286 (Ahd)		127
Ram Prasad Sharma <i>v.</i> CIT [1979] 119 ITR 867 (All)		127
Rashmi Wadhwa (Smt.) <i>v.</i> Dy. CIT (I. T. A. No. 5184/Delhi/2014 dated January 18, 2016)		377

2020]	TABLE OF CASES CITED	xix
		PAGE
Rattan Gupta <i>v.</i> Union of India [1998] 234 ITR 220 (Delhi)		111
Raviraj Kothari Punjabi Associates <i>v.</i> Dy. CIT [2013] 57 SOT 71 (Pune) <i>followed</i>		299
Raymond Woollen Mills Ltd. <i>v.</i> ITO [1999] 236 ITR 34 (SC)		111
Raza Textiles Ltd. <i>v.</i> ITO [1973] 87 ITR 539 (SC)		127
Reckitt Benckiser (India) Ltd. <i>v.</i> Addl. CIT (G.A. No. 1420 of 2014, I. T. A. T. No. 41 of 2014 dated December 23, 2014) (Cal)		577
Reckitt Benckiser (India) Ltd. <i>v.</i> Dy. CIT (L. T. A. No. 2138/Kol/2009 dated April 20, 2018)		577
Redhey Shyam Tanwar <i>v.</i> Asst. CIT [2002] 77 TTJ (Jodh) 505 <i>followed</i>		237
Reebok India Co. <i>v.</i> Addl. CIT (I. T. A. No. 5857/Delhi/2012 dated June 14, 2013)		577
REI Agro Ltd. <i>v.</i> Dy. CIT [2013] 36 CCH 360 (Kol.-Trib.)		61
Reliance Corporation <i>v.</i> ITO [2017] 55 ITR (Trib) (S.N.) 69 (Mum)		377
Runwal Multihousing Pvt. Ltd. <i>v.</i> Asst. CIT (I. T. A. Nos. 1015, 1016 and 1017/Pune/2011) <i>followed</i>		299
Sanjay Aggarwal <i>v.</i> Dy. CIT [2014] 150 ITD 692 (Delhi)		377
Sanjeev Woolen Mills <i>v.</i> CIT [2005] 279 ITR 434 (SC)		224
Sant Baba Mohan Singh <i>v.</i> CIT [1973] 90 ITR 197 (All)		127
Santhanam (T. S.) <i>v.</i> Expenditure-tax Officer [1973] 87 ITR 582 (Mad)		549
Sarala Devi (K.) (Smt.) <i>v.</i> CIT [1996] 222 ITR 211 (Ker)		30
Sarthak Securities Co. (P.) Ltd. <i>v.</i> ITO [2010] 329 ITR 110 (Delhi)		377
Sassoon J. David and Co. (P.) Ltd. <i>v.</i> CIT [1979] 118 ITR 261 (SC)		577
SC Enviro Agro India Ltd. <i>v.</i> Dy. CIT [2013] 143 ITD 195 (Mum)		577
Sesa Goa Ltd. <i>v.</i> Jt. CIT (I. T. A. No. 72/Panaji/2012 dated March 8, 2013)		577
Sesa Sterlite Ltd. <i>v.</i> Asst. CIT [2019] 417 ITR 334 (Bom) <i>relied on</i>		111
Shailesh S. Patel <i>v.</i> ITO [2018] 97 taxmann.com 570 (Ahd.-Trib)		377
Shalom Charitable Ministries of India <i>v.</i> Asst. CIT (I. T. A. Nos. 79 and 80/Cochin/2017 dated April 25, 2018) <i>followed</i>		20
Sheo Nath Singh <i>v.</i> AAC of I.T. [1971] 82 ITR 147 (SC)		377
Shivalik Venture Pvt. Ltd. <i>v.</i> Dy. CIT (I. T. A. No. 2008/Mum/2012 dated August 19, 2015)		41
Shivsagar Veg. Restaurant <i>v.</i> Asst. CIT [2009] 317 ITR 433 (Bom)		41, 111, 299, 377, 462
Signature Hotels (P.) Ltd. <i>v.</i> ITO [2011] 338 ITR 51 (Delhi)		377
Siraigo Pharma (P.) Ltd. <i>v.</i> Dy. CIT (I. T. A. No. 1010/Jaipur/2013 dated January 13, 2016)		377

xx

ITR'S TRIBUNAL TAX REPORTS

[VOL. 81

	PAGE
Sitaram Rathore v. CIT [1994] 77 Taxman 265 (MP)	127
Solar Automobiles India (P.) Ltd. v. Dy. CIT [2011] 245 CTR 475 (Karn)	127
Som Nath Maini v. CIT [2008] 306 ITR 414 (P&H)	493
Sony Ericsson Mobile Communications India (P.) Ltd. v. CIT [2015] 374 ITR 118 (Delhi)	577
Spandana (Rural and Urban Development Organisation) v. Asst. CIT (I. T. A. No. 364/Vizag/2009 dated February 17, 2019)	20
Sree Manjunatha Wines v. CIT [2011] 202 Taxman 620 (Karn)	127
Sreema Mahila Samity v. Dy. CIT (I. T. A No. 2826/Kolkata/2013 dated October 13, 2017)	20
State of Gujarat v. Rajesh Kumar Chimanlal Barot [1996] AIR 1996 SC 2664	127
State of Karnataka v. Union of India [1977] 4 SCC 608	111
Sumati Dayal v. CIT [1995] 214 ITR 801 (SC)	493
Super Cloth v. Asst. CIT [2006] 99 ITD 300 (Chennai-Trib)	237
Tega Industries Ltd. v. Asst. CIT (I. T. A. No. 404/Kol/2017 dated August 23, 2019)	577
Tek Ram v. CIT [2013] 357 ITR 133 (SC)	419
Televista Electronics Ltd. v. Dy. CIT [2018] 400 ITR 36 (Delhi) <i>relied on</i>	99
The Citizen Co-operative Society Ltd. v. Asst. CIT [2017] 397 ITR 1 (SC)	13
Thiagarajar Charities v. Addl. CIT [1997] 225 ITR 1010 (SC)	20
Tolaram Daga v. CIT [1966] 59 ITR 632 (Assam) <i>followed</i>	237
Tushar Developers v. ITO [2009] 315 ITR (A.T.) 268 (Pune) [SB]	299
Varun Developers v. Dy. CIT 7 Taxcorp (AT) 1978 (Pune) <i>followed</i>	299
Vedabai <i>alias</i> Vijayanatabai Baburao Patil v. Shantaram Baburao Patil [2002] 253 ITR 798 (SC)	549
Venkata Ramaiah (K.) v. Seetharama Reddy (A.) [1963] AIR 1963 SC 1526	127
Vipin P. Mehta v. ITO [2011] 46 SOT 71 (Mum)	127
Viswas Promoters P. Ltd. v. Asst. CIT [2013] 214 Taxman 524 (Mad) <i>followed</i>	299
VMT Spinning Co. Ltd. v. CIT [2016] 389 ITR 326 (P&H)	549
Windson Electronics (P.) Ltd. v. Union of India [2004] 269 ITR 481 (Cal)	377

**THE
ITR'S TRIBUNAL TAX REPORTS
SHORT NOTES CASES
VOLUME 81 — 2020**

SUBJECT INDEX OF SHORT NOTES CASES

Accommodation entries —See INCOME FROM UNDISCLOSED SOURCES ...	59
Appeal to Appellate Tribunal —Rectification of mistake—Mistake apparent from record—Tribunal taking firm view following decisions of court including jurisdictional High Court—Decision of jurisdictional High Court binding on Tribunal—Failure to consider judgment in favour of Department of another High Court—Decision not cited by Department at time of hearing of appeal—Not a mistake apparent from record—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 254(2)—ITO <i>v.</i> KAILASH CHAND BANGUR (Jaipur) ...	88
Appeal to Commissioner (Appeals) —Assessee challenging entire additions but Commissioner (Appeals) considering only two out of seven items—Commissioner (Appeals) to decide issue afresh after taking a holistic view of expenses—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 57—REGUNATHAN VENKATA RAJENDRAN <i>v.</i> ASST. CIT (Bangalore) ...	71
—Duty of Commissioner (Appeals)—Duty to dispose of appeal by order in writing stating points for determination, decision thereon and reasons for decision—Ex parte order without complying with requirement—Commissioner (Appeals) to dispose of appeal afresh on merits in accordance with law after giving proper and sufficient opportunity of being heard to assessee—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 250—A. J. MILL STORE AGENCY PVT. LTD. <i>v.</i> ITO (Kolkata) ...	64
—Educational institution—Exemption—Commissioner (Appeals) not mentioning in his order if any notice served upon assessee for hearing of appeal—Appellate order passed without giving sufficient opportunity to assessee—In penalty proceedings receipts shown at figure lower than prescribed limit which requires adjudication on merits—Commissioner (Appeals) to redecide appeal on merits—Income-tax Act, 1961—	

ii	ITR'S TRIBUNAL TAX REPORTS	[VOL. 81
	Appeal to Commissioner (Appeals) (Contd.)—	PAGE
	MAHARISHI DAYANAND EDUCATIONAL SOCIETY <i>v.</i> ITO (EXEMPTIONS) (Delhi) . . .	86
	Arm's length price —See INTERNATIONAL TRANSACTIONS	14, 35, 46, 58, 73, 89, 94
	Assessment in search cases —See SEARCH AND SEIZURE	55, 91
	Benchmarking of transactions —See INTERNATIONAL TRANSACTIONS	73, 89
	Bogus purchases —Business expenditure—Estimation of income— Once books of account rejected Assessing Officer required to estimate income of assessee on reasonable and proper basis—Past history can form basis for estimating current year's gross profit—Gross profit estimated at 10.22 per cent. as against gross profit declared by assessee at 10.04 per cent. for instant year—Addition equivalent to gross profit rate of 0.18 per cent. on declared turnover upheld—KEDIA EXPORTS P. LTD. <i>v.</i> ASST. CIT (Jaipur) . . .	83
	Brand licence fees —Depreciation—Satellite television channels— Payments including amount approved by competent authority that specifically considered value of brand licence—No disallowance on account of depreciation on payment of brand licence fees—Entitled to depreciation— STAR INDIA P. LTD. <i>v.</i> ASST. CIT (Mumbai) . . .	8
	Business expenditure —Bogus purchases—Estimation of income— Once books of account rejected Assessing Officer required to estimate income of assessee on reasonable and proper basis—Past history can form basis for estimating current year's gross profit—Gross profit estimated at 10.22 per cent. as against gross profit declared by assessee at 10.04 per cent. for instant year—Addition equivalent to gross profit rate of 0.18 per cent. on declared turnover upheld—Income-tax Act, 1961, ss. 37, 145(3)— KEDIA EXPORTS P. LTD. <i>v.</i> ASST. CIT (Jaipur) . . .	83
	—Deduction only on actual payment—Delay in depositing provident fund and employees' State insurance contribution—Tribunal in assessee's case for earlier years allowing deduction and deduction confirmed by High Court—Assessee making contribution before due date for filing return—Deductible—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 43B—DEPUTY CIT <i>v.</i> JAIPUR VIDYUT VITARAN NIGAM LTD. (Jaipur) . . .	72
	—Disallowance—Excessive or unreasonable payments—Unregis- tered agreement cannot basis for disallowance—Assessing Officer to form an opinion that expenses more than fair market value or not according to legitimate needs of business or no benefit derived—Assessing Officer only comparing royalty expenses of preceding assessment year—Assessing Officer required to compare royalty expenses paid in case of similar pro- duct by other companies during relevant period—No disallowance could be made—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 40A(2)(b)—DE DIAMOND ELECTRIC INDIA PVT. LTD. <i>v.</i> ASST. CIT (Delhi) . . .	32

2020]	GENERAL INDEX (SHORT NOTES)	iii
	Business expenditure (<i>Contd.</i>)—	PAGE
	—Disallowance—Payments liable to deduction of tax at source— Placement fees under contract between assessee and cable operators— Not commission or royalty—No disallowance could be made—Income- tax Act, 1961, s. 40(a)(ia)—STAR INDIA P. LTD. v. ASST. CIT (Mumbai) . . .	8
	—Disallowance—Payments liable to deduction of tax at source— Reimbursement of salary cost to expatriate employees—Assessee paying to its own employees—No disallowance could be made—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 40(a)(ia)—BOEING INDIA PVT. LTD. v. ASST. CIT (Delhi) . . .	94
	—Disallowance—Tax or rates on profits—Education cess and higher and secondary education cess—Though cess may be collected as part of income-tax not rate or tax which attracts disallowance under section 40(a)(ii)—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 40(a)(ii)—THOMSON PRESS INDIA LTD. v. ASST. CIT (Delhi) . . .	63
	—Foreign exchange forward contracts to safeguard against losses due to fluctuation in foreign currency—Losses on revaluation of unma- tured foreign exchange forward contract not notional losses—Forward contracts in foreign exchange incidental to business of export—Allowa- ble—Not speculative activity but business activity—Allowable—Income- tax Act, 1961, s. 37(1)—S. VINODKUMAR DIAMONDS P. LTD. v. DEPUTY CIT (Mumbai) . . .	46
	—Leave and licence for running premises—Reimbursement of prop- erty tax paid for rental premises—Whether reimbursement of property tax partakes of character of rent only—Whether to aggregate amount of rent plus reimbursements compares well with earlier years payment—Duty of assessee to justify payment—Assessing Officer to decide afresh—Income- tax Act, 1961, s. 37—STAR INDIA P. LTD. v. ASST. CIT (Mumbai) . . .	8
	—Motor car expenses, conveyance expense and miscellaneous expenses—Ad hoc disallowance without rejecting books of account— Though assessee's accounts audited, Assessing Officer making a vague observation that assessee not producing satisfactory supporting evidence for verification—Disallowance not justified—Sales promotion expenses— Disallowance simply because assessee incurred expenditure in cash not justified—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 37—THE RAJLAXMI COTTON MILLS P. LTD. v. DEPUTY CIT (Kolkata) . . .	52
	—Unverifiable purchases—Estimation of gross profit rate—Sales of assessee accepted by Assessing Officer—No comparable case showing reasonable rate or any purchase showing such higher gross profit rate— Payments through banking channels and purchases substantiated by doc- uments—Failure by some parties to respond to notice not basis to make huge addition where purchases accepted in preceding year—Past results can form basis for estimating gross profit rate—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 37—SILBURN PAPERS PVT. LTD. v. ITO (Delhi) . . .	85

<p>Business income—Income from house property—Repairs and maintenance—Rental income from 100 square feet out of 10,000 square feet let out for five months taxed as income from house property—Corresponding deduction at 30 per cent. towards repairs given only for five months—Assessee entitled to proportionate deduction for remaining period of seven months of repairs and maintenance—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 38(2)—<i>WILHELMOSEN SHIP MANAGEMENT INDIA PVT. LTD. v. DEPUTY CIT</i> (Mumbai) . . .</p> <p>Capital gains—Cost of improvement—Inconsistency in sale deed with respect to exact description of property—Nothing on record to corroborate assessee's claim that plot of land with construction thereon had been sold—Assessee not entitled to cost of construction—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 54—<i>ASHOK KUMAR DUSAD v. ITO</i> (Jaipur) . . .</p> <p>—Exemption—Claim that assessee invested in residential house property by way of payment through cheque to her spouse—Alone would not establish that she actually acquired residential house—Not sufficient to allow exemption—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 54—<i>ARUNA KOMMURI v. ASST. CIT</i> (Hyderabad) . . .</p> <p>—Exemption—Sale of property and purchasing new residential house—Conditions precedent—Assessee depositing gains in Capital Gains Accounts Scheme before due date for filing return under section 139(4) and purchasing new house within two years of transfer—Assessee explaining reasons for delay in depositing amount in Capital Gains Accounts Scheme—Substantial compliance—Failure to deposit sum within time specified in section 139(1)—Mere non-compliance with procedural requirement under section 54(2)—Not a reason for denying exemption—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 54—<i>ITO v. SMT. REKHA SHETTY</i> (Chennai) . . .</p> <p>—Full value of consideration—Transfer of litigated property—Assessing Officer to obtain valuation report from District Valuation Officer—Market value of property could not exceed actual sale consideration received by assessee—Not appropriate to adopt value of stamp valuation authority for purpose of computation of capital gains—Assessing Officer directed to compute capital gains in the hands of assessee based on actual sale consideration received by assessee—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 50C—<i>ARUNA KOMMURI v. ASST. CIT</i> (Hyderabad) . . .</p> <p>—Penalty—Concealment of income—Assessee and buyer agreeing cheques will not be presented till October 2012—Bank on which cheques drawn going into liquidation meanwhile and no payment realised in year 2011-12—Assessee under bona fide belief that sale not complete and no profits accrued to him—Failure to declare capital gains—Neither mens rea nor actus reus on part of assessee—Penalty not impossible—<i>RAVINDRA ANANT BHUSKUTE v. ITO</i> (Pune) . . .</p>	<p>14</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>1</p> <p>20</p> <p>40</p>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------

2020]	GENERAL INDEX (SHORT NOTES)	v
		PAGE
	Capital or revenue expenditure —Expenses for upgradation and renewal of existing software—Revenue expenditure—Income-tax Act, 1961—DEPUTY CIT <i>v.</i> CADENCE DESIGN SYSTEMS (INDIA) P. LTD. (Delhi) . . .	35
	Cash credits —Cash deposits—Assessee salaried employee having three bank accounts—Circuitous deposits—Nothing to show that cash withdrawals utilised by assessee somewhere else—Some payments made by assessee by cheques as reflected in his bank accounts towards personal and household expenses—Fair and proper to treat cash withdrawals made by assessee from his bank accounts as utilised for personal and household expenses to that extent—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 68—BAIDYA NATH DEY <i>v.</i> ITO (Kolkata) . . .	28
	—Confirmations and ledger account of creditors prima facie showing that balances came from earlier years—If credits in books of account pertain to earlier year addition could not be made in instant year—Balance-sheet for preceding year and earlier years not on record—Assessing Officer to re-decide issue in light of material brought on record—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 68—VIRENDRA VERMA <i>v.</i> ITO (Delhi) . . .	16
	—Share application money—Cheques neither presented nor encashed in accounting year relevant to assessment year—Assessee passing journal entry and ultimately share application money received in subsequent year—No amount in real sense credited in accounts of assessee for current year—No enquiry could be made—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 68—DEEM ROLL TECH LTD. <i>v.</i> DEPUTY CIT (Ahmedabad) . . .	82
	—Unsecured loans—Receipt of money from two persons—Oral understanding with two persons that amount first received as advance for flats by assessee to be transferred to another partnership for construction—Amounts credited with corresponding debit to bank account—Amounts through banking channels which subsequently adjusted against booking of flat—No doubt about genuineness of transactions appearing in books of assessee—No addition could be made—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 68—DEPUTY CIT <i>v.</i> H. B. ASSOCIATES (Pune) . . .	38
	Cash deposits —See CASH CREDITS . . .	28
	Charitable purpose —Changes in objects clause—Section 12A(1)(ab) providing for reason of amendment of objects clause of trust should be verified clarificatory in nature—Assessee requesting Commissioner to take amended objects on record after proper verification but no communication from Commissioner—Commissioner to take into account amended object examine its genuineness and its compliance with respect to section 2(15)—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 12A(1)(ab)—HCL FOUNDATION <i>v.</i> CIT (EXEMPTIONS) (Delhi) . . .	7
	—Exemption—Disqualification—Failure by assessee to show use of cash withdrawals by trustee for purpose of trust—Not clear from orders of authorities whether assessee submitted all evidence in support of its claim	

Charitable purpose (<i>Contd.</i>)—	PAGE
of exemption and such material properly appreciated—Assessee to place all evidence in support of its claim before Assessing Officer—Assessing Officer after due verification and appropriate enquiry and after affording assessee adequate opportunity to pass a speaking order—Income-tax Act, 1961, ss. 11, 13(1)(c)— DR. D. JOHN PONNUDURAI EDUCATIONAL TRUST v. ADDL. DIT (Chennai) . . .	69
—Exemption—Non-profit organisation—Activities of assessee not existing for purpose of making profits and distribution of such profits to its members—Nothing suggesting assessee's activities involved in nature of trade, commerce or business or activity of rendering any service in relation to any trade, commerce or business and in consideration of which cess or fee received by assessee—Entitled to exemption—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 11— CONFEDERATION OF INDIAN TEXTILE INDUSTRY v. ITO (EXEMPTION) (Mumbai) . . .	12
—Reassessment—Exemption—All information called for relating to important activities, income claimed under section 11 submitted—Books of account supported by bills and vouchers produced before Assessing Officer for verification—Reasons not mentioning adverse facts coming to light in order to reopen original assessment or information or fresh evidence in possession of Assessing Officer—Reopened assessment merely on basis of same set of facts already available on record—Reopening wrong and null and void— DEPUTY CIT (EXEMPTIONS) v. GANDHINAGAR URBAN DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY (Ahmedabad) . . .	51
Comparable companies —See INTERNATIONAL TRANSACTIONS . . .	89
Computer accessories and peripherals —Depreciation—Higher rate of depreciation—Computer accessories and peripherals integral part of computer system—Entitled to depreciation at sixty per cent.— DEPUTY CIT v. CADENCE DESIGN SYSTEMS (INDIA) P. LTD. (Delhi) . . .	35
Concealment of income —See PENALTY	40, 65
Conveyance expense and miscellaneous expenses —See BUSINESS EXPENDITURE . . .	52
Cost of improvement —See CAPITAL GAINS . . .	19
Deduction of tax at source —Payments liable to deduction of tax at source—Business expenditure—Disallowance—Placement fees under contract between assessee and cable operators—Not commission or royalty—No disallowance could be made— STAR INDIA P. LTD. v. ASST. CIT (Mumbai) . . .	8
—Payments liable to deduction of tax at source—Business expenditure—Disallowance—Reimbursement of salary cost to expatriate employees—Assessee paying to its own employees—No disallowance could be made— BOEING INDIA PVT. LTD. v. ASST. CIT (Delhi) . . .	94
Deduction only on actual payment —Business expenditure—Delay in depositing provident fund and employees' State insurance contribution—	

2020]	GENERAL INDEX (SHORT NOTES)	vii
		PAGE
	Deduction only on actual payment (<i>Contd.</i>)—	
	Tribunal in assessee's case for earlier years allowing deduction and deduction confirmed by High Court—Assessee making contribution before due date for filing return—Deductible—DEPUTY CIT <i>v.</i> JAIPUR VIDYUT VITARAN NIGAM LTD. (Jaipur) . . .	72
	Depreciation —Higher rate of depreciation—Computer accessories and peripherals integral part of computer system—Entitled to depreciation at sixty per cent.—Income-tax Act, 1961—DEPUTY CIT <i>v.</i> CADENCE DESIGN SYSTEMS (INDIA) P. LTD. (Delhi) . . .	35
	—Satellite television channels—Brand licence fees—Payments including amount approved by competent authority that specifically considered value of brand licence—No disallowance on account of depreciation on payment of brand licence fees—Entitled to depreciation—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 32—STAR INDIA P. LTD. <i>v.</i> ASST. CIT (Mumbai) . . .	8
	—Software expenditure—Expenditure incurred towards software treated as capital in nature—Assessing Officer directed to grant depreciation on software expenditure incurred during year in addition to depreciation on opening written down value of computer and computer software—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 32—STAR INDIA P. LTD. <i>v.</i> ASST. CIT (Mumbai) . . .	8
	Donations and capitation fees —Search and seizure—Unaccounted income—Medical college—Onus upon Assessing Officer to prove through cogent and reliable evidence that assessee in fact paid cash by way of donation of capitation fees to medical college and chairman—Entire addition based on statement made by chairman of trust—No cross-examination allowed on behalf of assessee at assessment stage—No other material available on record so as to make any addition against assessee—Addition unsustainable—SULEKH CHAND SINGHAL <i>v.</i> ASST. CIT (Delhi) . . .	26
	Draft assessment order —Validity—Assessing Officer quantifying taxable income and determining tax payable and issuing and serving demand notice—Effect—Proceedings concluded—Subsequent proceedings and orders non est—Subsequent participation of assessee would not debar assessee to raise validity before appellate authority—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 144C—PERFETTI VAN MELLE (INDIA) PVT. LTD. <i>v.</i> ASST. CIT (Delhi) . . .	79
	—See INTERNATIONAL TRANSACTIONS . . .	94
	Education cess and higher and secondary education cess —Business expenditure—Disallowance—Tax or rates on profits—Though cess may be collected as part of income-tax not rate or tax which attracts disallowance under section 40(a)(ii)—THOMSON PRESS INDIA LTD. <i>v.</i> ASST. CIT (Delhi) . . .	63
	Educational institution —Appeal to Commissioner (Appeals)—Exemption—Commissioner (Appeals) not mentioning in his order if any	

	PAGE
Educational institution (<i>Contd.</i>)—	
notice served upon assessee for hearing of appeal—Appellate order passed without giving sufficient opportunity to assessee—In penalty proceedings receipts shown at figure lower than prescribed limit which requires adjudication on merits—Commissioner (Appeals) to redecide appeal on merits— MAHARISHI DAYANAND EDUCATIONAL SOCIETY v. ITO (EXEMPTIONS) (Delhi) . . .	86
Excessive or unreasonable payments —See BUSINESS EXPENDITURE . . .	32
Exempt income —See INCOME . . .	34, 46, 57, 61
Exemption —Appeal to Commissioner (Appeals)—Educational institution—Commissioner (Appeals) not mentioning in his order if any notice served upon assessee for hearing of appeal—Appellate order passed without giving sufficient opportunity to assessee—In penalty proceedings receipts shown at figure lower than prescribed limit which requires adjudication on merits—Commissioner (Appeals) to redecide appeal on merits— MAHARISHI DAYANAND EDUCATIONAL SOCIETY v. ITO (EXEMPTIONS) (Delhi) . . .	86
—Capital gains—Claim that assessee invested in residential house property by way of payment through cheque to her spouse—Alone would not establish that she actually acquired residential house—Not sufficient to allow exemption— ARUNA KOMMURI v. ASST. CIT (Hyderabad) . . .	20
—Capital gains—Sale of property and purchasing new residential house—Conditions precedent—Assessee depositing gains in Capital Gains Accounts Scheme before due date for filing return under section 139(4) and purchasing new house within two years of transfer—Assessee explaining reasons for delay in depositing amount in Capital Gains Accounts Scheme—Substantial compliance—Failure to deposit sum within time specified in section 139(1)—Mere non-compliance with procedural requirement under section 54(2)—Not a reason for denying exemption— ITO v. SMT. REKHA SHETTY (Chennai) . . .	1
—Charitable purpose—Disqualification—Failure by assessee to show use of cash withdrawals by trustee for purpose of trust—Not clear from orders of authorities whether assessee submitted all evidence in support of its claim of exemption and such material properly appreciated—Assessee to place all evidence in support of its claim before Assessing Officer—Assessing Officer after due verification and appropriate enquiry and after affording assessee adequate opportunity to pass a speaking order— DR. D. JOHN PONNUDURAI EDUCATIONAL TRUST v. ADDL. DIT (Chennai) . . .	69
—Charitable purpose—Non-profit organisation—Activities of assessee not existing for purpose of making profits and distribution of such profits to its members—Nothing suggesting assessee's activities involved in nature of trade, commerce or business or activity of rendering any service in relation to any trade, commerce or business and in consideration of	

2020]	GENERAL INDEX (SHORT NOTES)	ix
		PAGE
	Exemption (<i>Contd.</i>)—	
	which cess or fee received by assessee—Entitled to exemption—CONFED- ERATION OF INDIAN TEXTILE INDUSTRY <i>v.</i> ITO (EXEMPTION)	
	(Mumbai) . . .	12
	—Export—Exemption allowed in earlier years—Denial of exemption in current year not justified—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 10A—AMERICAN EXPRESS (I) P. LTD. <i>v.</i> DEPUTY CIT (Delhi) . . .	89
	—Reassessment—Charitable purpose—All information called for relating to important activities, income claimed under section 11 submit- ted—Books of account supported by bills and vouchers produced before Assessing Officer for verification—Reasons not mentioning adverse facts coming to light in order to reopen original assessment or information or fresh evidence in possession of Assessing Officer—Reopened assessment merely on basis of same set of facts already available on record—Reo- pening wrong and null and void—DEPUTY CIT (EXEMPTIONS) <i>v.</i> GAN- DHINAGAR URBAN DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY (Ahmedabad) . . .	51
	Expenses for upgradation and renewal of existing software —Cap- ital or revenue expenditure—Revenue expenditure—DEPUTY CIT <i>v.</i> CADENCE DESIGN SYSTEMS (INDIA) P. LTD. (Delhi) . . .	35
	Export —Exemption—Exemption allowed in earlier years—Denial of exemption in current year not justified—AMERICAN EXPRESS (I) P. LTD. <i>v.</i> DEPUTY CIT (Delhi) . . .	89
	Foreign exchange forward contracts —Business expenditure—For- eign exchange forward contracts to safeguard against losses due to fluc- tuation in foreign currency—Losses on revaluation of unmatured foreign exchange forward contract not notional losses—Forward contracts in for- eign exchange incidental to business of export—Allowable—Not specu- lative activity but business activity—Allowable—S. VINODKUMAR DIA- MONDS P. LTD. <i>v.</i> DEPUTY CIT (Mumbai) . . .	46
	Full value of consideration —See CAPITAL GAINS . . .	20
	Furnishing inaccurate particulars of income —See PENALTY . . .	65
	Generation of electricity —Infrastructure development—Special deduction—Computation of profits of eligible business—Initial assess- ment year—Embargo placed under section 80-IA(5) for quantification of deduction of profits and gains of eligible business applicable from assess- ment years immediately succeeding initial assessment years only—Asses- see not required to notionally reduce losses arising from eligible business in earlier years already set off against other business of assessee in terms of sections 70, 71 and 72 prior to exercise of option of initial assessment year—Losses arising in eligible business subsequent to earmarking of ini- tial assessment year to be governed by embargo placed in section 80- IA(5)—DEPUTY CIT <i>v.</i> CHHOTABHAI JETHABHAI PATEL AND Co. (Ahmedabad) . . .	5

x

ITR'S TRIBUNAL TAX REPORTS

[VOL. 81

PAGE

Gold jewellery and silver items —Source of gold jewellery and silver items—Search and seizure—Unexplained money—Statement of assessee that silver and jewellery found belonged to all family members accepted—Remaining items should be accepted as belonging to respective family members and not just to assessee only—Silver jewellery items declared by assessee and her mother in their respective wealth-tax returns to be considered—PANKAJ LADHA <i>v.</i> DEPUTY CIT (Jaipur) . . .	42
Gross profits —Estimation—Fall in gross profit—No finding against books of account and stock register—Audited books of account not rejected—Estimate of gross profit by comparison to earlier years—Ad hoc addition not justified—Income-tax Act, 1961—R. K. AGRO PRODUCTS <i>v.</i> ASST. CIT (Pune) . . .	50
Heads of income —Revision—Income from holiday homes some owned by assessee and some managed by assessee declared under head “Other sources”—Assessing Officer assessing income under business income—Head of income under which income taxable purely a debatable issue—Assessing Officer taking possible view—Revision to tax income from holiday homes owned by assessee under “House property” and that from homes managed by it under “Other sources”—Not valid—ELECTRO URBAN CO-OPERATIVE CREDIT SOCIETY LTD. <i>v.</i> PRINCIPAL CIT (Kolkata) . . .	17
Higher rate of depreciation —Computer accessories and peripherals integral part of computer system—Entitled to depreciation at sixty per cent.—DEPUTY CIT <i>v.</i> CADENCE DESIGN SYSTEMS (INDIA) P. LTD. (Delhi) . . .	35
Housing project —Revision—Erroneous and prejudicial to Revenue—Method of accounting—Assessing Officer making proper, sufficient and adequate enquiry on issues including issue of revenue recognition of assessee adopting percentage completion method and project-wise revenue recognition—Not a case of no enquiry, inadequate enquiry or insufficient enquiry—Assessee recognising revenue towards its project at much higher figure in comparison to estimate made by Principal Commissioner—Order not erroneous and prejudicial to interests of Revenue—Revision not valid—SUREKHA BUILDERS AND DEVELOPERS PVT. LTD. <i>v.</i> PRINCIPAL CIT (Cuttack) . . .	24
Income —Assessee managing director in a company and sum invested in that company—Company engaging a person for arranging loan from foreign sources—Company paying certain amount to that person as well paying sum to assessee’s relative—Loan transaction failing and settlement out of court—Reimbursement of expenses incurred on behalf of company—Assessee not producing criminal complaint to prove that sum given by way of loan by his relative nor that sum given to that person arranging loan—Assessee failing to furnish documents relating to criminal proceedings neither before income-tax authorities nor before Tribunal—	

2020]	GENERAL INDEX (SHORT NOTES)	xi
	Income (<i>Contd.</i>)—	PAGE
	Additions sustained—Income-tax Act, 1961—N. S. JOHN <i>v.</i> ITO (Cochin) . . .	76
	—Disallowance of expenditure in relation to earning exempt income—Investments far below reserves and surpluses—Presumption that assessee invested out of reserves and surpluses—No disallowance by assessee in earning exempt income—Disallowance confirmed—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 14A—Income-tax Rules, 1962, r. 8D(2)(ii), (iii)—MAHAVIR STEEL INDUSTRIES LTD. <i>v.</i> ASST. CIT (Pune) . . .	34
	—Disallowance of expenditure incurred in relation to earning exempt income—Only investments which yielded exempt income during relevant period to be considered for computing average value of investment—Assessing Officer to recompute disallowance—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 14A—Income-tax Rules, 1962, r. 8D—GUJARAT MINERAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. <i>v.</i> ASST. CIT (Ahmedabad) . . .	57
	—Disallowance of expenditure incurred in relation to exempt income—Most of investments in past years—Reserves and surpluses of assessee far in excess of investments made by assessee—Assessee having surpluses and reserves available with it at end of financial year when investments made in exempt income—No disallowance could be made—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 14A—Income-tax Rules, 1962, r. 8D(2)(ii)—S. VINODKUMAR DIAMONDS P. LTD. <i>v.</i> DEPUTY CIT (Mumbai) . . .	46
	—Expenditure incurred in relation to exempt income—Assessee making investment in debt mutual fund out of its own tax-free surplus funds during relevant year and making suo motu disallowance towards 25 per cent. of salary of one accounting person and 5 per cent. remuneration of finance director—Assessing Officer required to record his categorical dissatisfaction with working of disallowance given by assessee—In the absence of mandatory satisfaction—No question of disallowance—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 14A—Income-tax Rules, 1962, r. 8D—GUJARAT GUARDIAN LTD. <i>v.</i> DEPUTY CIT (Delhi) . . .	61
	Income from holiday homes —Revision—Heads of income—Income from holiday homes some owned by assessee and some managed by assessee declared under head “Other sources”—Assessing Officer assessing income under business income—Head of income under which income taxable purely a debatable issue—Assessing Officer taking possible view—Revision to tax income from holiday homes owned by assessee under “House property” and that from homes managed by it under “Other sources”—Not valid—ELECTRO URBAN CO-OPERATIVE CREDIT SOCIETY LTD. <i>v.</i> PRINCIPAL CIT (Kolkata) . . .	17
	Income from house property —Business income—Repairs and maintenance—Rental income from 100 square feet out of 10,000 square feet let out for five months taxed as income from house property—Corresponding deduction at 30 per cent. towards repairs given only for five months—Assessee entitled to proportionate deduction for remaining period of	

	PAGE
Income from house property (<i>Contd.</i>)—	
seven months of repairs and maintenance—WILHELMSSEN SHIP MANAGEMENT INDIA PVT. LTD. <i>v.</i> DEPUTY CIT (Mumbai) . . .	14
—Income from other sources—Lease—Demised premises mentioned as workstation in building in lease agreement—Prime objective exploitation of asset and not building or any part thereof—Use of easement and common areas by lessee incidental to lease of exploitation of workstation—Workstation in the form of plant and machinery inseparable from building and for exploitation or use of workstation, use of building incidental—Assessable as income from other sources—Income-tax Act, 1961, ss. 24(a), 56(2)(iii)—TELEKON MEDIA INDIA P. LTD. <i>v.</i> ITO (Delhi) . . .	3
Income from other sources —Income from house property—Lease—Demised premises mentioned as workstation in building in lease agreement—Prime objective exploitation of asset and not building or any part thereof—Use of easement and common areas by lessee incidental to lease of exploitation of workstation—Workstation in the form of plant and machinery inseparable from building and for exploitation or use of workstation, use of building incidental—Assessable as income from other sources—TELEKON MEDIA INDIA P. LTD. <i>v.</i> ITO (Delhi) . . .	3
—Receipt of shares at value above face value—Determination of fair market value—Discounted cash flow method—Choice of assessee to choose a prescribed method for ascertaining market value of shares transferred—No power of Assessing Officer to change method adopted by assessee from one method to another method provided under rule 11UA—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 56(2)(viib)—Income-tax Rules, 1962, r. 11UA—KARMIC LABS P. LTD. <i>v.</i> ITO (Mumbai) . . .	78
Income from undisclosed sources —Accommodation entries—Incriminating materials found in search showing sale of gold and gold jewellery to assessee—Onus on assessee to establish genuineness of suppliers—Assessee not submitting any material other than bills and vouchers and bank statements to establish genuineness of transaction—Estimate of additional income at 10 per cent. on bogus purchases made from grey market justified—Entire bogus purchases not to be treated as income of assessee because assessee made purchases apparently from accounted money as payments made through banking channels—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 132—BHAGATRAM <i>v.</i> ASST. CIT (Hyderabad) . . .	59
—Information of misuse of client code modification facility—No contention that client code modification facility often misused to pass on losses to investors, who may have sizable profit arising out of commodity trading against which such losses could be set off—Income escaping assessment alone can be taxed—Assessing Officer adding entire amount of doubtful transactions by way of assessee's additional income—Impermissible—Income-tax Act, 1961, ss. 147, 148—MUKESH CHAND GARG <i>v.</i> ITO (Delhi) . . .	22

2020]	GENERAL INDEX (SHORT NOTES)	xiii
		PAGE
	Industrial undertaking —Special deduction—Claim of assessee rejected at threshold without verifying amount of profits derived by industrial undertaking—Assessing Officer to verify claim by examination of audited accounts of industrial undertaking and then grant deduction in accordance with law—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 80-IA—GUJARAT GUARDIAN LTD. <i>v.</i> DEPUTY CIT (Delhi) . . .	61
	Infrastructure development —Generation of electricity—Special deduction—Computation of profits of eligible business—Initial assessment year—Embargo placed under section 80-IA(5) for quantification of deduction of profits and gains of eligible business applicable from assessment years immediately succeeding initial assessment years only—Assessee not required to notionally reduce losses arising from eligible business in earlier years already set off against other business of assessee in terms of sections 70, 71 and 72 prior to exercise of option of initial assessment year—Losses arising in eligible business subsequent to earmarking of initial assessment year to be governed by embargo placed in section 80-IA(5)—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 80-IA(4)—Circular No. 1 of 2016 dated 15-2-2016—DEPUTY CIT <i>v.</i> CHHOTABHAI JETHABHAI PATEL AND CO. (Ahmedabad) . . .	5
	International transaction —Transfer pricing—Arm's length price—Assessee a debt-free company—No interest paid to creditor or supplier nor interest earned from unrelated party—Assessee's revenue entirely from its associated enterprises—No question of receiving any interest on receivables—Transfer pricing adjustment not warranted—Income-tax Act, 1961—BOEING INDIA PVT. LTD. <i>v.</i> ASST. CIT (Delhi) . . .	94
	—Transfer pricing—Arm's length price—Assessee paying discount to its overseas associated enterprises—Discounts and rebates provided at a global level and not directly by company rendering services—Transactions not demonstrated to be sham—Assessing Officer should have examined transactions in the light of agreements, memorandum of understandings and related documentary evidences before coming to any conclusion—Assessee to demonstrate that discounts and rebates ultimately passed on to customers—Income-tax Act, 1961—BUREAU VERITAS CONSUMER PRODUCTS SERVICES (INDIA) P. LTD. <i>v.</i> ASST. CIT (Delhi). . .	73
	—Transfer pricing—Arm's length price—Benchmarking of transactions—Comparable companies—Information enabled technology services—Extraordinary events taking place in relevant period—Company excludible from final list of comparables—Interest receivables—If working capital adjustment granted, no separate adjustment for interest receivables required—Payments in respect of technology service, fee charge out, receipt of services, professional charges and relocation expenses—Most of relocation expenses in respect of salary paid to employees of assessee who travelled abroad for business of assessee—Assessing Officer to verify details and examine whether payments by assessee were to its own	

International transactions (Contd.)—

PAGE

employees who travelled abroad and decide afresh—Assessing Officer to give credit of tax deduction at source—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 92CA— AMERICAN EXPRESS (I) P. LTD. v. DEPUTY CIT (Delhi) . . .	89
—Transfer pricing—Arm's length price—Delay in realisation of trade debts—Assessee adopting uniform policy of not charging interest for delay in realisation of export receivables from associated enterprises and non-enterprises—Sale of cut and polished diamonds with associated enterprises accepted at arm's length price—No notional interest warranted—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 92B— S. VINODKUMAR DIAMONDS P. LTD. v. DEPUTY CIT (Mumbai) . . .	46
—Transfer pricing—Arm's length price—Exchange rate fluctuations—Foreign exchange loss on account of exchange rate fluctuations arising in normal course of business transaction—To be taken part of operating margin—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 92CA— VITECH SYSTEMS ASIA PVT. LTD. v. ITO (Hyderabad) . . .	58
—Transfer pricing—Arm's length price—Huge related party transactions—Unreliable financials—Not comparables—Income-tax Act, 1961— DEPUTY CIT v. CADENCE DESIGN SYSTEMS (INDIA) P. LTD. (Delhi) . . .	35
—Transfer pricing—Arm's length price—Manning service fee—Tribunal in assessee's case finding manning service fee at arm's length in earlier years—No change in facts—Manning service fee at arm's length—Income-tax Act, 1961— WILHELMSSEN SHIP MANAGEMENT INDIA PVT. LTD. v. DEPUTY CIT (Mumbai) . . .	14
—Transfer pricing—Arm's length price—Transactional net margining method—Benchmarking of transactions—Transfer Pricing Officer should have examined calculation provided by assessee thereafter should have rejected contention of assessee—Transfer Pricing Officer to examine arithmetical accuracy of computation of related party transaction and if found correct comparables should be excluded from final set of comparables—No reason given to demonstrate dissimilarity in functions—Transfer Pricing Officer should not have rejected comparable merely by stating that comparable in health care segment and functionally dissimilar—Income-tax Act, 1961— BUREAU VERITAS CONSUMER PRODUCTS SERVICES (INDIA) P. LTD. v. ASST. CIT (Delhi) . . .	73
—Transfer pricing—Arm's length price—Working capital adjustment—Transfer Pricing Officer disallowing claim without verification of working submitted by assessee at the time of hearing—Assessing Officer to verify working capital adjustment, details given by assessee and allow appropriate working capital adjustment to assessee after due verification—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 92C— DEPUTY CIT v. CADENCE DESIGN SYSTEMS (INDIA) P. LTD. (Delhi) . . .	35
—Transfer pricing—Draft assessment order—Jurisdictional requirement—Assessing Officer passing order in name of non-existing person—	

2020]	GENERAL INDEX (SHORT NOTES)	xv
		PAGE
	International transactions (<i>Contd.</i>)—	
	Not valid and entire proceeding inherently without jurisdiction—Mistake neither procedural irregularity nor rectifiable —Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 144C—BOEING INDIA PVT. LTD. <i>v.</i> ASST. CIT (Delhi) . . .	94
	Lease —Income from house property—Income from other sources—Demised premises mentioned as workstation in building in lease agreement—Prime objective exploitation of asset and not building or any part thereof—Use of easement and common areas by lessee incidental to lease of exploitation of workstation—Workstation in the form of plant and machinery inseparable from building and for exploitation or use of workstation, use of building incidental—Assessable as income from other sources—TELEKON MEDIA INDIA P. LTD. <i>v.</i> ITO (Delhi) . . .	3
	Leave and licence for running premises —Business expenditure—Reimbursement of property tax paid for rental premises— Whether reimbursement of property tax partakes of character of rent only—Whether to aggregate amount of rent plus reimbursements compares well with earlier years payment—Duty of assessee to justify payment—Assessing Officer to decide afresh—STAR INDIA P. LTD. <i>v.</i> ASST. CIT (Mumbai) . . .	8
	Limitation —Revision—Service of order not mentioned in provision—Order passed within two years from relevant date—Within limitation—JAIDURGA MINERALS <i>v.</i> PRINCIPAL CIT (Cuttack) . . .	67
	Loss —Short-term capital loss—Search and seizure—Assessment in search cases—Short-term capital gains offered in statement recorded during search—Brought forward short-term capital loss allowed by Department in earlier years—Assessee filing computation of income correctly—Computation filed in terms of scheme of computation provided in Act—Eligible to be set off against short-term capital gains of current year declared by assessee—Set off of loss not to be denied on ground not claimed in statement recorded during search—ROOP KISHORE MADAN <i>v.</i> DEPUTY CIT (Delhi) . . .	55
	Manning service fee —International transactions—Transfer pricing—Arm's length price—Tribunal in assessee's case finding manning service fee at arm's length in earlier years—No change in facts—Manning service fee at arm's length—WILHELMSSEN SHIP MANAGEMENT INDIA PVT. LTD. <i>v.</i> DEPUTY CIT (Mumbai) . . .	14
	Medical college —Search and seizure—Unaccounted income—Donations and capitation fees—Onus upon Assessing Officer to prove through cogent and reliable evidence that assessee in fact paid cash by way of donation of capitation fees to medical college and chairman—Entire addition based on statement made by chairman of trust—No cross-examination allowed on behalf of assessee at assessment stage—No other material available on record so as to make any addition against assessee—Addition unsustainable—SULEKH CHAND SINGHAL <i>v.</i> ASST. CIT (Delhi) . . .	26
	Method of accounting —Revision—Erroneous and prejudicial to Revenue—Housing project—Assessing Officer making proper, sufficient	

	PAGE
Method of accounting (<i>Contd.</i>)—	
and adequate enquiry on issues including issue of revenue recognition of assessee adopting percentage completion method and project-wise revenue recognition—Not a case of no enquiry, inadequate enquiry or insufficient enquiry—Assessee recognising revenue towards its project at much higher figure in comparison to estimate made by Principal Commissioner—Order not erroneous and prejudicial to interests of Revenue—Revision not valid— SUREKHA BUILDERS AND DEVELOPERS PVT. LTD. v. PRINCIPAL CIT (Cuttack) . . .	24
Motor car expenses —See BUSINESS EXPENDITURE . . .	52
Natural justice —Revision—Assessee not afforded sufficient opportunity to give reply to show-cause notice—Liable to be quashed— JAIDURGA MINERALS v. PRINCIPAL CIT (Cuttack) . . .	67
Non-profit organisation —See CHARITABLE PURPOSES . . .	12
Penalty —Concealment of income—Capital gains—Assessee and buyer agreeing cheques will not be presented till October 2012—Bank on which cheques drawn going into liquidation meanwhile and no payment realised in year 2011-12—Assessee under bona fide belief that sale not complete and no profits accrued to him—Failure to declare capital gains—Neither mens rea nor actus reus on part of assessee—Penalty not imposable—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 271(1)(c)— RAVINDRA ANANT BHUSKUTE v. ITO (Pune) . . .	40
—Concealment of income—Furnishing inaccurate particulars of income—Initiation of penalty proceedings on both charges but penalty levied on a specific charge of concealing particulars of income—Not a case where penalty initiated for a particular charge and thereafter penalty finally levied on a different charge—Not a case of lack of opportunity to assessee or lack of application of mind on part of Assessing Officer—No case that charge of concealment of particulars of income not attracted in the facts—Levy of penalty justified—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 271(1)(c)— SMT. SARLA MUNDRA v. DEPUTY CIT (Jaipur) . . .	65
—Failure to file return within prescribed time—Assessee an agriculturist and illiterate and facing financial and family problems—Under impression that gain arising from sale of any agricultural land not chargeable to tax—Reasonable cause—Penalty not imposable—Income-tax Act, 1961, ss. 139(1), 271F— ARJUN DADA KHARATE v. DEPUTY CIT (Pune) . . .	68
Provident fund and employees' State insurance —Delay in depositing provident fund and employees' State insurance contribution—Business expenditure—Deduction only on actual payment—Tribunal in assessee's case for earlier years allowing deduction and deduction confirmed by High Court—Assessee making contribution before due date for filing return—Deductible— DEPUTY CIT v. JAIPUR VIDYUT VITARAN NIGAM LTD. (Jaipur) . . .	72

2020]	GENERAL INDEX (SHORT NOTES)	xvii
		PAGE
	Reassessment —Charitable purpose—Exemption—All information called for relating to important activities, income claimed under section 11 submitted—Books of account supported by bills and vouchers produced before Assessing Officer for verification—Reasons not mentioning adverse facts coming to light in order to reopen original assessment or information or fresh evidence in possession of Assessing Officer—Reopened assessment merely on basis of same set of facts already available on record—Reopening wrong and null and void—Income-tax Act, 1961, ss. 147, 148—DEPUTY CIT (EXEMPTIONS) <i>v.</i> GANDHINAGAR URBAN DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY (Ahmedabad) . . .	51
	—No return filed prior to issue of notice—Annual information return showing deposits in assessee's bank accounts—No compliance on part of assessee pursuant to notice—Assessing Officer forming prima facie belief that income escaped assessment and issue notice—Justified—Income-tax Act, 1961, ss. 147, 148—BHUP SINGH <i>v.</i> ITO (Jaipur) . . .	44
	—Scope of proceedings—Power of Assessing Officer to tax incomes other than those in respect of which proceedings initiated—Not available when reasons for initiation of those proceedings cease to survive—Assessing Officer exceeded jurisdiction in reassessing issues other than issues in respect of which proceedings initiated since reasons for initiation of those proceedings ceased to survive—Income-tax Act, 1961, ss. 147, 148—RAJ BALA <i>v.</i> ITO (Delhi) . . .	31
	Rectification of mistake —See APPEAL TO APPELLATE TRIBUNAL . . .	88
	Reimbursement of property tax paid for rental premises —See BUSINESS EXPENDITURE . . .	8
	Repairs and maintenance —See BUSINESS EXPENDITURE . . .	14
	Residential house —Sale of property and purchasing new residential house—Capital gains—Exemption—Conditions precedent—Assessee depositing gains in Capital Gains Accounts Scheme before due date for filing return under section 139(4) and purchasing new house within two years of transfer—Assessee explaining reasons for delay in depositing amount in Capital Gains Accounts Scheme—Substantial compliance—Failure to deposit sum within time specified in section 139(1)—Mere non-compliance with procedural requirement under section 54(2)—Not a reason for denying exemption—ITO <i>v.</i> SMT. REKHA SHETTY (Chennai) . . .	1
	Revision —Addition made pursuant to revisional order—Tribunal quashing revisional order—Resultant proceedings would not survive—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 263—ASST. CIT <i>v.</i> OSCAR INVESTMENT LTD. (Delhi) . . .	81
	—Erroneous and prejudicial to Revenue—Method of accounting—Housing project—Assessing Officer making proper, sufficient and adequate enquiry on issues including issue of revenue recognition of assessee adopting percentage completion method and project-wise revenue rec-	

xviii

ITR'S TRIBUNAL TAX REPORTS

[VOL. 81

Revision (Contd.)—

PAGE

- ognition—Not a case of no enquiry, inadequate enquiry or insufficient enquiry—Assessee recognising revenue towards its project at much higher figure in comparison to estimate made by Principal Commissioner—Order not erroneous and prejudicial to interests of Revenue—Revision not valid—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 263—**SUREKHA BUILDERS AND DEVELOPERS PVT. LTD. v. PRINCIPAL CIT** (Cuttack) . . . 24
- Erroneous and prejudicial to Revenue—No discussion in assessment order regarding difference in figures in original return and revised computation filed by assessee—Assessing Officer while accepting documents submitted by assessee not conducting any specific enquiry as to facts of case—Mere extraction of submissions would not show Assessing Officer applied his mind—Revision valid—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 263—**HINDUMAL BALMUKUND INVESTMENT CO. PVT. LTD. v. PRINCIPAL CIT** (Pune) . . . 48
- Heads of income—Income from holiday homes some owned by assessee and some managed by assessee declared under head “Other sources”—Assessing Officer assessing income under business income—Head of income under which income taxable purely a debatable issue—Assessing Officer taking possible view—Revision to tax income from holiday homes owned by assessee under “House property” and that from homes managed by it under “Other sources”—Not valid—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 263—**ELECTRO URBAN CO-OPERATIVE CREDIT SOCIETY LTD. v. PRINCIPAL CIT** (Kolkata) . . . 17
- Limitation—Service of order not mentioned in provision—Order passed within two years from relevant date—Within limitation—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 263—**JAIDURGA MINERALS v. PRINCIPAL CIT** (Cuttack) . . . 67
- Natural justice—Assessee not afforded sufficient opportunity to give reply to show-cause notice—Liable to be quashed—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 263—**JAIDURGA MINERALS v. PRINCIPAL CIT** (Cuttack) . . . 67
- Satellite television channels**—Depreciation—Brand licence fees—Payments including amount approved by competent authority that specifically considered value of brand licence—No disallowance on account of depreciation on payment of brand licence fees—Entitled to depreciation—**STAR INDIA P. LTD. v. ASST. CIT** (Mumbai) . . . 8
- Search and seizure**—Assessment in search cases—Short-term capital gains offered in statement recorded during search—Loss—Short-term capital loss—Brought forward short-term capital loss allowed by Department in earlier years—Assessee filing computation of income correctly—Computation filed in terms of scheme of computation provided in Act—Eligible to be set off against short-term capital gains of current year declared by assessee—Set off of loss not to be denied on ground not claimed in statement recorded during search—Income-tax Act, 1961, ss. 74, 132(4)—**ROOP KISHORE MADAN v. DEPUTY CIT** (Delhi) . . . 55

2020]	GENERAL INDEX (SHORT NOTES)	xix
	Search and seizure (<i>Contd.</i>)—	PAGE
	—Assessment in search cases—Unexplained income—Purchase of shares and sale transactions through online mode, whereby identity of buyer of shares would not be known to assessee—Additions on basis of third party statement—Nothing on record to establish vital link between assessee group and third party or any of his group entities—Nothing to controvert denial by assessee of knowledge of third party and his associates and establish link between third party and assessee—Failure to provide assessee opportunity to cross-examine third party—Additions unsustainable—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 153A— DIPESH RAMESH VARDHAN v. DEPUTY CIT (Mumbai) . . .	91
	—Unaccounted income—Medical college—Donations and capitation fees—Onus upon Assessing Officer to prove through cogent and reliable evidence that assessee in fact paid cash by way of donation of capitation fees to medical college and chairman—Entire addition based on statement made by chairman of trust—No cross-examination allowed on behalf of assessee at assessment stage—No other material available on record so as to make any addition against assessee—Addition unsustainable—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 132— SULEKH CHAND SINGHAL v. ASST. CIT (Delhi) . . .	26
	—Unexplained money—Source of gold jewellery and silver items—Statement of assessee that silver and jewellery found belonged to all family members accepted—Remaining items should be accepted as belonging to respective family members and not just to assessee only—Silver jewellery items declared by assessee and her mother in their respective wealth-tax returns to be considered—Income-tax Act, 1961, ss. 69A, 132— PANKAJ LADHA v. DEPUTY CIT (Jaipur) . . .	42
	Share application money —Cash credits—Cheques neither presented nor encashed in accounting year relevant to assessment year—Assessee passing journal entry and ultimately share application money received in subsequent year—No amount in real sense credited in accounts of assessee for current year—No enquiry could be made— DEEM ROLL TECH LTD. v. DEPUTY CIT (Ahmedabad) . . .	82
	Short-term capital loss —Search and seizure—Assessment in search cases—Short-term capital gains offered in statement recorded during search—Loss—Brought forward short-term capital loss allowed by Department in earlier years—Assessee filing computation of income correctly—Computation filed in terms of scheme of computation provided in Act—Eligible to be set off against short-term capital gains of current year declared by assessee—Set off of loss not to be denied on ground not claimed in statement recorded during search— ROOP KISHORE MADAN v. DEPUTY CIT (Delhi) . . .	55
	Software expenditure —Depreciation—Expenditure incurred towards software treated as capital in nature—Assessing Officer directed to grant depreciation on software expenditure incurred during year in addition to	

xx	ITR'S TRIBUNAL TAX REPORTS	[VOL. 81
		PAGE
	Software expenditure (<i>Contd.</i>)—	
	depreciation on opening written down value of computer and computer software—STAR INDIA P. LTD. <i>v.</i> ASST. CIT (Mumbai) . . .	8
	Special deduction —Industrial undertaking—Claim of assessee rejected at threshold without verifying amount of profits derived by industrial undertaking—Assessing Officer to verify claim by examination of audited accounts of industrial undertaking and then grant deduction in accordance with law—GUJARAT GUARDIAN LTD. <i>v.</i> DEPUTY CIT (Delhi) . . .	61
	—Infrastructure development—Generation of electricity—Computation of profits of eligible business—Initial assessment year—Embargo placed under section 80-IA(5) for quantification of deduction of profits and gains of eligible business applicable from assessment years immediately succeeding initial assessment years only—Assessee not required to notionally reduce losses arising from eligible business in earlier years already set off against other business of assessee in terms of sections 70, 71 and 72 prior to exercise of option of initial assessment year—Losses arising in eligible business subsequent to earmarking of initial assessment year to be governed by embargo placed in section 80-IA(5)—DEPUTY CIT <i>v.</i> CHHOTABHAI JETHABHAI PATEL AND CO. (Ahmedabad) . . .	5
	Tax or rates on profits —Business expenditure—Disallowance—Education cess and higher and secondary education cess—Though cess may be collected as part of income-tax not rate or tax which attracts disallowance under section 40(a)(ii)—THOMSON PRESS INDIA LTD. <i>v.</i> ASST. CIT (Delhi) . . .	63
	Transactional net marging method —See INTERNATIONAL TRANSACTIONS . . .	73
	Transfer of litigated property —See CAPITAL GAINS . . .	20
	Transfer pricing —See INTERNATIONAL TRANSACTIONS 14, 35, 46, 58, 73, 89, 94	
	Unaccounted income —Search and seizure—Assessment in search cases—Purchase of shares and sale transactions through online mode, whereby identity of buyer of shares would not be known to assessee—Additions on basis of third party statement—Nothing on record to establish vital link between assessee group and third party or any of his group entities—Nothing to controvert denial by assessee of knowledge of thirty party and his associates and establish link between third party and assessee—Failure to provide assessee opportunity to cross-examine third party—Additions unsustainable—DIPESH RAMESH VARDHAN <i>v.</i> DEPUTY CIT (Mumbai) . . .	91
	—Search and seizure—Medical college—Donations and capitation fees—Onus upon Assessing Officer to prove through cogent and reliable evidence that assessee in fact paid cash by way of donation of capitation fees to medical college and chairman—Entire addition based on statement	

2020]	GENERAL INDEX (SHORT NOTES)	xxi
		PAGE
	Unexplained income (<i>Contd.</i>)—	
	made by chairman of trust—No cross-examination allowed on behalf of assessee at assessment stage—No other material available on record so as to make any addition against assessee—Addition unsustainable—SULEKH CHAND SINGHAL <i>v.</i> ASST. CIT (Delhi) . . .	26
	Unexplained investment —Submission of assessee that cash deposit was out of his agricultural income, gift received from his son and from previous cash withdrawals and documentary evidence in support of assessee's explanation not available—Commissioner (Appeals) to examine issue afresh and pass a speaking order—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 69A—BHUP SINGH <i>v.</i> ITO (Jaipur) . . .	44
	Unexplained money —Search and seizure—Source of gold jewellery and silver items—Statement of assessee that silver and jewellery found belonged to all family members accepted—Remaining items should be accepted as belonging to respective family members and not just to assessee only—Silver jewellery items declared by assessee and her mother in their respective wealth-tax returns to be considered—PANKAJ LADHA <i>v.</i> DEPUTY CIT (Jaipur) . . .	42
	Unsecured loans —Cash credits—Receipt of money from two persons—Oral understanding with two persons that amount first received as advance for flats by assessee to be transferred to another partnership for construction—Amounts credited with corresponding debit to bank account—Amounts through banking channels which subsequently adjusted against booking of flat—No doubt about genuineness of transactions appearing in books of assessee—No addition could be made—DEPUTY CIT <i>v.</i> H. B. ASSOCIATES (Pune) . . .	38

End of Volume 81

SECTIONWISE INDEX OF SHORT NOTES CASES

ACTS :

Income-tax Act, 1961 :

- S. 10A**—Exemption—Export—Exemption allowed in earlier years—Denial of exemption in current year not justified—**AMERICAN EXPRESS (I) P. LTD. v. DEPUTY CIT** (Delhi) . . . 89
- S. 11**—Charitable purpose—Exemption—Disqualification—Failure by assessee to show use of cash withdrawals by trustee for purpose of trust—Not clear from orders of authorities whether assessee submitted all evidence in support of its claim of exemption and such material properly appreciated—Assessee to place all evidence in support of its claim before Assessing Officer—Assessing Officer after due verification and appropriate enquiry and after affording assessee adequate opportunity to pass a speaking order—**DR. D. JOHN PONNUDURAI EDUCATIONAL TRUST v. ADDL. DIT** (Chennai) . . . 69
- Charitable purpose—Exemption—Non-profit organisation—Activities of assessee not existing for purpose of making profits and distribution of such profits to its members—Nothing suggesting assessee's activities involved in nature of trade, commerce or business or activity of rendering any service in relation to any trade, commerce or business and in consideration of which cess or fee received by assessee—Entitled to exemption—**CONFEDERATION OF INDIAN TEXTILE INDUSTRY v. ITO (EXEMPTION)** (Mumbai) . . . 12
- S. 12A(1)(ab)**—Charitable purpose—Changes in objects clause—Section 12A(1)(ab) providing for reason of amendment of objects clause of trust should be verified clarificatory in nature—Assessee requesting Commissioner to take amended objects on record after proper verification but no communication from Commissioner—Commissioner to take into account amended object examine its genuineness and its compliance with respect to section 2(15)—**HCL FOUNDATION v. CIT (EXEMPTIONS)** (Delhi) . . . 7
- S. 13(1)(c)**—Charitable purpose—Exemption—Disqualification—Failure by assessee to show use of cash withdrawals by trustee for purpose of trust—Not clear from orders of authorities whether assessee submitted all evidence in support of its claim of exemption and such material properly appreciated—Assessee to place all evidence in support of its claim before Assessing Officer—Assessing Officer after due verification and appropriate enquiry and after affording assessee adequate opportunity to pass a speaking order—**DR. D. JOHN PONNUDURAI EDUCATIONAL TRUST v. ADDL. DIT** (Chennai) . . . 69
- S. 14A**—Income—Disallowance of expenditure in relation to earning exempt income—Investments far below reserves and surpluses—Presumption that assessee invested out of reserves and surpluses—No

2020]	GENERAL INDEX (SHORT NOTES)	xxiii
		PAGE
	disallowance by assessee in earning exempt income—Disallowance confirmed— MAHAVIR STEEL INDUSTRIES LTD. v. ASST. CIT (Pune) . . .	34
	—Income—Disallowance of expenditure incurred in relation to exempt income—Most of investments in past years—Reserves and surpluses of assessee far in excess of investments made by assessee—Assessee having surpluses and reserves available with it at end of financial year when investments made in exempt income—No disallowance could be made— S. VINODKUMAR DIAMONDS P. LTD. v. DEPUTY CIT (Mumbai) . . .	46
	—Income—Disallowance of expenditure incurred in relation to earning exempt income—Only investments which yielded exempt income during relevant period to be considered for computing average value of investment—Assessing Officer to recompute disallowance— GUJARAT MINERAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. v. ASST. CIT (Ahmedabad) . . .	57
	—Income—Expenditure incurred in relation to exempt income—Assessee making investment in debt mutual fund out of its own tax-free surplus funds during relevant year and making suo motu disallowance towards 25 per cent. of salary of one accounting person and 5 per cent. remuneration of finance director—Assessing Officer required to record his categorical dissatisfaction with working of disallowance given by assessee—In the absence of mandatory satisfaction—No question of disallowance— GUJARAT GUARDIAN LTD. v. DEPUTY CIT (Delhi) . . .	61
	S. 24(a) —Income from house property—Income from other sources—Lease—Demised premises mentioned as workstation in building in lease agreement—Prime objective exploitation of asset and not building or any part thereof—Use of easement and common areas by lessee incidental to lease of exploitation of workstation—Workstation in the form of plant and machinery inseparable from building and for exploitation or use of workstation, use of building incidental—Assessable as income from other sources— TELEKON MEDIA INDIA P. LTD. v. ITO (Delhi) . . .	3
	S. 32 —Depreciation—Satellite television channels—Brand licence fees—Payments including amount approved by competent authority that specifically considered value of brand licence—No disallowance on account of depreciation on payment of brand licence fees—Entitled to depreciation— STAR INDIA P. LTD. v. ASST. CIT (Mumbai) . . .	8
	—Depreciation—Software expenditure—Expenditure incurred towards software treated as capital in nature—Assessing Officer directed to grant depreciation on software expenditure incurred during year in addition to depreciation on opening written down value of computer and computer software— STAR INDIA P. LTD. v. ASST. CIT (Mumbai) . . .	8
	S. 37 —Business expenditure—Bogus purchases—Estimation of income—Once books of account rejected Assessing Officer required to estimate income of assessee on reasonable and proper basis—Past history	

xxiv

ITR'S TRIBUNAL TAX REPORTS

[VOL. 81

	PAGE
can form basis for estimating current year's gross profit—Gross profit estimated at 10.22 per cent. as against gross profit declared by assessee at 10.04 per cent. for instant year—Addition equivalent to gross profit rate of 0.18 per cent. on declared turnover upheld— <i>KEDIA EXPORTS P. LTD. v. ASST. CIT</i> (Jaipur) . . .	83
—Business expenditure—Leave and licence for running premises—Reimbursement of property tax paid for rental premises—Whether reimbursement of property tax partakes of character of rent only—Whether to aggregate amount of rent plus reimbursements compares well with earlier years payment—Duty of assessee to justify payment—Assessing Officer to decide afresh— <i>STAR INDIA P. LTD. v. ASST. CIT</i> (Mumbai) . . .	8
—Business expenditure—Motor car expenses, conveyance expense and miscellaneous expenses—Ad hoc disallowance without rejecting books of account—Though assessee's accounts audited, Assessing Officer making a vague observation that assessee not producing satisfactory supporting evidence for verification—Disallowance not justified—Sales promotion expenses—Disallowance simply because assessee incurred expenditure in cash not justified— <i>THE RAJLAXMI COTTON MILLS P. LTD. v. DEPUTY CIT</i> (Kolkata) . . .	52
—Business expenditure—Unverifiable purchases—Estimation of gross profit rate—Sales of assessee accepted by Assessing Officer—No comparable case showing reasonable rate or any purchase showing such higher gross profit rate—Payments through banking channels and purchases substantiated by documents—Failure by some parties to respond to notice not basis to make huge addition where purchases accepted in preceding year—Past results can form basis for estimating gross profit rate— <i>SILBURN PAPERS PVT. LTD. v. ITO</i> (Delhi) . . .	85
S. 37(1) —Business expenditure—Foreign exchange forward contracts to safeguard against losses due to fluctuation in foreign currency—Losses on revaluation of unmatured foreign exchange forward contract not notional losses—Forward contracts in foreign exchange incidental to business of export—Allowable—Not speculative activity but business activity—Allowable— <i>S. VINODKUMAR DIAMONDS P. LTD. v. DEPUTY CIT</i> (Mumbai) . . .	46
S. 38(2) —Business income—Income from house property—Repairs and maintenance—Rental income from 100 square feet out of 10,000 square feet let out for five months taxed as income from house property—Corresponding deduction at 30 per cent. towards repairs given only for five months—Assessee entitled to proportionate deduction for remaining period of seven months of repairs and maintenance— <i>WILHELMSSEN SHIP MANAGEMENT INDIA PVT. LTD. v. DEPUTY CIT</i> (Mumbai) . . .	14
S. 40(a)(ia) —Business expenditure—Disallowance—Payments liable to deduction of tax at source—Placement fees under contract between assessee and cable operators—Not commission or royalty—No disallow-	

2020]	GENERAL INDEX (SHORT NOTES)	xxv
		PAGE
	ance could be made—STAR INDIA P. LTD. v. ASST. CIT	
	(Mumbai) . . .	8
	—Business expenditure—Disallowance—Payments liable to deduction of tax at source—Reimbursement of salary cost to expatriate employees—Assessee paying to its own employees—No disallowance could be made—BOEING INDIA PVT. LTD. v. ASST. CIT (Delhi) . . .	94
	S. 40(a)(ii) —Business expenditure—Disallowance—Tax or rates on profits—Education cess and higher and secondary education cess—Though cess may be collected as part of income-tax not rate or tax which attracts disallowance under section 40(a)(ii)—THOMSON PRESS INDIA LTD. v. ASST. CIT (Delhi) . . .	63
	S. 40A(2)(b) —Business expenditure—Disallowance—Excessive or unreasonable payments—Unregistered agreement cannot basis for disallowance—Assessing Officer to form an opinion that expenses more than fair market value or not according to legitimate needs of business or no benefit derived—Assessing Officer only comparing royalty expenses of preceding assessment year—Assessing Officer required to compare royalty expenses paid in case of similar product by other companies during relevant period—No disallowance could be made—DE DIAMOND ELECTRIC INDIA PVT. LTD. v. ASST. CIT (Delhi) . . .	32
	S. 43B —Business expenditure—Deduction only on actual payment—Delay in depositing provident fund and employees' State insurance contribution—Tribunal in assessee's case for earlier years allowing deduction and deduction confirmed by High Court—Assessee making contribution before due date for filing return—Deductible—DEPUTY CIT v. JAIPUR VIDYUT VITARAN NIGAM LTD. (Jaipur) . . .	72
	S. 50C —Capital gains—Full value of consideration—Transfer of litigated property—Assessing Officer to obtain valuation report from District Valuation Officer—Market value of property could not exceed actual sale consideration received by assessee—Not appropriate to adopt value of stamp valuation authority for purpose of computation of capital gains—Assessing Officer directed to compute capital gains in the hands of assessee based on actual sale consideration received by assessee—ARUNA KOMMURI v. ASST. CIT (Hyderabad) . . .	20
	S. 54 —Capital gains—Cost of improvement—Inconsistency in sale deed with respect to exact description of property—Nothing on record to corroborate assessee's claim that plot of land with construction thereon had been sold—Assessee not entitled to cost of construction—ASHOK KUMAR DUSAD v. ITO (Jaipur) . . .	19
	—Capital gains—Exemption—Claim that assessee invested in residential house property by way of payment through cheque to her spouse—Alone would not establish that she actually acquired residential house—Not sufficient to allow exemption—ARUNA KOMMURI v. ASST. CIT (Hyderabad) . . .	20

—Capital gains—Exemption—Sale of property and purchasing new residential house—Conditions precedent—Assessee depositing gains in Capital Gains Accounts Scheme before due date for filing return under section 139(4) and purchasing new house within two years of transfer—Assessee explaining reasons for delay in depositing amount in Capital Gains Accounts Scheme—Substantial compliance—Failure to deposit sum within time specified in section 139(1)—Mere non-compliance with procedural requirement under section 54(2)—Not a reason for denying exemption— <i>ITO v. SMT. REKHA SHETTY</i> (Chennai) . . .	1
S. 56(2)(iii) —Income from house property—Income from other sources—Lease—Demised premises mentioned as workstation in building in lease agreement—Prime objective exploitation of asset and not building or any part thereof—Use of easement and common areas by lessee incidental to lease of exploitation of workstation—Workstation in the form of plant and machinery inseparable from building and for exploitation or use of workstation, use of building incidental—Assessable as income from other sources— <i>TELEKON MEDIA INDIA P. LTD. v. ITO</i> (Delhi) . . .	3
S. 56(2)(viib) —Income from other sources—Receipt of shares at value above face value—Determination of fair market value—Discounted cash flow method—Choice of assessee to choose a prescribed method for ascertaining market value of shares transferred—No power of Assessing Officer to change method adopted by assessee from one method to another method provided under rule 11UA— <i>KARMIC LABS P. LTD. v. ITO</i> (Mumbai) . . .	78
S. 57 —Appeal to Commissioner (Appeals)—Assessee challenging entire additions but Commissioner (Appeals) considering only two out of seven items—Commissioner (Appeals) to decide issue afresh after taking a holistic view of expenses— <i>REGUNATHAN VENKATA RAJENDRAN v. ASST. CIT</i> (Bangalore) . . .	71
S. 68 —Cash credits—Cash deposits—Assessee salaried employee having three bank accounts—Circuitous deposits—Nothing to show that cash withdrawals utilised by assessee somewhere else—Some payments made by assessee by cheques as reflected in his bank accounts towards personal and household expenses—Fair and proper to treat cash withdrawals made by assessee from his bank accounts as utilised for personal and household expenses to that extent— <i>BAIDYA NATH DEY v. ITO</i> (Kolkata) . . .	28
—Cash credits—Confirmations and ledger account of creditors prima facie showing that balances came from earlier years—If credits in books of account pertain to earlier year addition could not be made in instant year—Balance-sheet for preceding year and earlier years not on record—Assessing Officer to re-decide issue in light of material brought on record— <i>VIRENDRA VERMA v. ITO</i> (Delhi) . . .	16

2020]	GENERAL INDEX (SHORT NOTES)	xxvii
		PAGE
	—Cash credits—Share application money—Cheques neither presented nor encashed in accounting year relevant to assessment year—Assessee passing journal entry and ultimately share application money received in subsequent year—No amount in real sense credited in accounts of assessee for current year—No enquiry could be made— DEEM ROLL TECH LTD. v. DEPUTY CIT (Ahmedabad) . . .	82
	—Cash credits—Unsecured loans—Receipt of money from two persons—Oral understanding with two persons that amount first received as advance for flats by assessee to be transferred to another partnership for construction—Amounts credited with corresponding debit to bank account—Amounts through banking channels which subsequently adjusted against booking of flat—No doubt about genuineness of transactions appearing in books of assessee—No addition could be made— DEPUTY CIT v. H. B. ASSOCIATES (Pune) . . .	38
	S. 69A —Search and seizure—Unexplained money—Source of gold jewellery and silver items—Statement of assessee that silver and jewellery found belonged to all family members accepted—Remaining items should be accepted as belonging to respective family members and not just to assessee only—Silver jewellery items declared by assessee and her mother in their respective wealth-tax returns to be considered— PANKAJ LADHA v. DEPUTY CIT (Jaipur) . . .	42
	—Unexplained investment—Submission of assessee that cash deposit was out of his agricultural income, gift received from his son and from previous cash withdrawals and documentary evidence in support of assessee's explanation not available—Commissioner (Appeals) to examine issue afresh and pass a speaking order— BHUP SINGH v. ITO (Jaipur) . . .	44
	S. 74 —Search and seizure—Assessment in search cases—Short-term capital gains offered in statement recorded during search—Loss—Short-term capital loss—Brought forward short-term capital loss allowed by Department in earlier years—Assessee filing computation of income correctly—Computation filed in terms of scheme of computation provided in Act—Eligible to be set off against short-term capital gains of current year declared by assessee—Set off of loss not to be denied on ground not claimed in statement recorded during search— ROOP KISHORE MADAN v. DEPUTY CIT (Delhi) . . .	55
	S. 80-IA —Industrial undertaking—Special deduction—Claim of assessee rejected at threshold without verifying amount of profits derived by industrial undertaking—Assessing Officer to verify claim by examination of audited accounts of industrial undertaking and then grant deduction in accordance with law— GUJARAT GUARDIAN LTD. v. DEPUTY CIT (Delhi) . . .	61
	S. 80-IA(4) —Infrastructure development—Generation of electricity—Special deduction—Computation of profits of eligible business—Initial	

assessment year—Embargo placed under section 80-IA(5) for quantification of deduction of profits and gains of eligible business applicable from assessment years immediately succeeding initial assessment years only—Assessee not required to notionally reduce losses arising from eligible business in earlier years already set off against other business of assessee in terms of sections 70, 71 and 72 prior to exercise of option of initial assessment year—Losses arising in eligible business subsequent to earmarking of initial assessment year to be governed by embargo placed in section 80-IA(5)—DEPUTY CIT <i>v.</i> CHHOTABHAI JETHABHAI PATEL AND Co. (Ahmedabad) . . .	5
S. 92B —International transactions—Transfer pricing—Arm's length price—Delay in realisation of trade debts—Assessee adopting uniform policy of not charging interest for delay in realisation of export receivables from associated enterprises and non-enterprises—Sale of cut and polished diamonds with associated enterprises accepted at arm's length price—No notional interest warranted—S. VINODKUMAR DIAMONDS P. LTD. <i>v.</i> DEPUTY CIT (Mumbai) . . .	46
S. 92C —International transactions—Transfer pricing—Arm's length price—Working capital adjustment—Transfer Pricing Officer disallowing claim without verification of working submitted by assessee at the time of hearing—Assessing Officer to verify working capital adjustment, details given by assessee and allow appropriate working capital adjustment to assessee after due verification—DEPUTY CIT <i>v.</i> CADENCE DESIGN SYSTEMS (INDIA) P. LTD. (Delhi) . . .	35
S. 92CA —International transactions—Transfer pricing—Arm's length price—Benchmarking of transactions—Comparable companies—Information enabled technology services—Extraordinary events taking place in relevant period—Company excludible from final list of comparables—Interest receivables—If working capital adjustment granted, no separate adjustment for interest receivables required—Payments in respect of technology service, fee charge out, receipt of services, professional charges and relocation expenses—Most of relocation expenses in respect of salary paid to employees of assessee who travelled abroad for business of assessee—Assessing Officer to verify details and examine whether payments by assessee were to its own employees who travelled abroad and decide afresh—Assessing Officer to give credit of tax deduction at source—AMERICAN EXPRESS (I) P. LTD. <i>v.</i> DEPUTY CIT (Delhi) . . .	89
—International transactions—Transfer pricing—Arm's length price—Exchange rate fluctuations—Foreign exchange loss on account of exchange rate fluctuations arising in normal course of business transaction—To be taken part of operating margin—VITECH SYSTEMS ASIA PVT. LTD. <i>v.</i> ITO (Hyderabad) . . .	58
S. 132 —Income from undisclosed sources—Accommodation entries—Incriminating materials found in search showing sale of gold and gold	

2020]	GENERAL INDEX (SHORT NOTES)	xxix
		PAGE
	jewellery to assessee—Onus on assessee to establish genuineness of suppliers—Assessee not submitting any material other than bills and vouchers and bank statements to establish genuineness of transaction—Estimate of additional income at 10 per cent. on bogus purchases made from grey market justified—Entire bogus purchases not to be treated as income of assessee because assessee made purchases apparently from accounted money as payments made through banking channels— BHAGATRAM v. ASST. CIT (Hyderabad) . . .	59
	—Search and seizure—Unaccounted income—Medical college—Donations and capitation fees—Onus upon Assessing Officer to prove through cogent and reliable evidence that assessee in fact paid cash by way of donation of capitation fees to medical college and chairman—Entire addition based on statement made by chairman of trust—No cross-examination allowed on behalf of assessee at assessment stage—No other material available on record so as to make any addition against assessee—Addition unsustainable— SULEKH CHAND SINGHAL v. ASST. CIT (Delhi) . . .	26
	—Search and seizure—Unexplained money—Source of gold jewellery and silver items—Statement of assessee that silver and jewellery found belonged to all family members accepted—Remaining items should be accepted as belonging to respective family members and not just to assessee only—Silver jewellery items declared by assessee and her mother in their respective wealth-tax returns to be considered— PANKAJ LADHA v. DEPUTY CIT (Jaipur) . . .	42
	S. 132(4) —Search and seizure—Assessment in search cases—Short-term capital gains offered in statement recorded during search—Loss—Short-term capital loss—Brought forward short-term capital loss allowed by Department in earlier years—Assessee filing computation of income correctly—Computation filed in terms of scheme of computation provided in Act—Eligible to be set off against short-term capital gains of current year declared by assessee—Set off of loss not to be denied on ground not claimed in statement recorded during search— ROOP KISHORE MADAN v. DEPUTY CIT (Delhi) . . .	55
	S. 139(1) —Penalty—Failure to file return within prescribed time—Assessee an agriculturist and illiterate and facing financial and family problems—Under impression that gain arising from sale of any agricultural land not chargeable to tax—Reasonable cause—Penalty not imposable— ARJUN DADA KHARATE v. DEPUTY CIT (Pune) . . .	68
	S. 144C —Draft assessment order—Validity—Assessing Officer quantifying taxable income and determining tax payable and issuing and serving demand notice—Effect—Proceedings concluded—Subsequent proceedings and orders non est—Subsequent participation of assessee would not debar assessee to raise validity before appellate authority— PERFETTI VAN MELLE (INDIA) PVT. LTD. v. ASST. CIT (Delhi) . . .	79

xxx

ITR'S TRIBUNAL TAX REPORTS

[VOL. 81

PAGE

—International transactions—Transfer pricing—Draft assessment order—Jurisdictional requirement—Assessing Officer passing order in name of non-existing person—Not valid and entire proceeding inherently without jurisdiction—Mistake neither procedural irregularity nor rectifiable— BOEING INDIA PVT. LTD. v. ASST. CIT (Delhi) . . .	94
S. 145(3) —Business expenditure—Bogus purchases—Estimation of income—Once books of account rejected Assessing Officer required to estimate income of assessee on reasonable and proper basis—Past history can form basis for estimating current year's gross profit—Gross profit estimated at 10.22 per cent. as against gross profit declared by assessee at 10.04 per cent. for instant year—Addition equivalent to gross profit rate of 0.18 per cent. on declared turnover upheld— KEDIA EXPORTS P. LTD. v. ASST. CIT (Jaipur) . . .	83
S. 147 —Income from undisclosed sources—Information of misuse of client code modification facility—No contention that client code modification facility often misused to pass on losses to investors, who may have sizable profit arising out of commodity trading against which such losses could be set off—Income escaping assessment alone can be taxed—Assessing Officer adding entire amount of doubtful transactions by way of assessee's additional income—Impermissible— MUKESH CHAND GARG v. ITO (Delhi) . . .	22
—Reassessment—Charitable purpose—Exemption—All information called for relating to important activities, income claimed under section 11 submitted—Books of account supported by bills and vouchers produced before Assessing Officer for verification—Reasons not mentioning adverse facts coming to light in order to reopen original assessment or information or fresh evidence in possession of Assessing Officer—Reopened assessment merely on basis of same set of facts already available on record—Reopening wrong and null and void— DEPUTY CIT (EXEMPTIONS) v. GANDHINAGAR URBAN DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY (Ahmedabad) . . .	51
—Reassessment—No return filed prior to issue of notice—Annual information return showing deposits in assessee's bank accounts—No compliance on part of assessee pursuant to notice—Assessing Officer forming prima facie belief that income escaped assessment and issue notice—Justified— BHUP SINGH v. ITO (Jaipur) . . .	44
—Reassessment—Scope of proceedings—Power of Assessing Officer to tax incomes other than those in respect of which proceedings initiated—Not available when reasons for initiation of those proceedings cease to survive—Assessing Officer exceeded jurisdiction in reassessing issues other than issues in respect of which proceedings initiated since reasons for initiation of those proceedings ceased to survive— RAJ BALA v. ITO (Delhi) . . .	31

2020]	GENERAL INDEX (SHORT NOTES)	xxxi
		PAGE
	S. 148 —Income from undisclosed sources—Information of misuse of client code modification facility—No contention that client code modification facility often misused to pass on losses to investors, who may have sizable profit arising out of commodity trading against which such losses could be set off—Income escaping assessment alone can be taxed—Assessing Officer adding entire amount of doubtful transactions by way of assessee's additional income—Impermissible— MUKESH CHAND GARG v. ITO (Delhi) . . .	22
	—Reassessment—Charitable purpose—Exemption—All information called for relating to important activities, income claimed under section 11 submitted—Books of account supported by bills and vouchers produced before Assessing Officer for verification—Reasons not mentioning adverse facts coming to light in order to reopen original assessment or information or fresh evidence in possession of Assessing Officer—Reopened assessment merely on basis of same set of facts already available on record—Reopening wrong and null and void— DEPUTY CIT (EXEMPTIONS) v. GANDHINAGAR URBAN DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY (Ahmedabad) . . .	51
	—Reassessment—No return filed prior to issue of notice—Annual information return showing deposits in assessee's bank accounts—No compliance on part of assessee pursuant to notice—Assessing Officer forming prima facie belief that income escaped assessment and issue notice—Justified— BHUP SINGH v. ITO (Jaipur) . . .	44
	—Reassessment—Scope of proceedings—Power of Assessing Officer to tax incomes other than those in respect of which proceedings initiated—Not available when reasons for initiation of those proceedings cease to survive—Assessing Officer exceeded jurisdiction in reassessing issues other than issues in respect of which proceedings initiated since reasons for initiation of those proceedings ceased to survive— RAJ BALA v. ITO (Delhi) . . .	31
	S. 153A —Search and seizure—Assessment in search cases—Unexplained income—Purchase of shares and sale transactions through online mode, whereby identity of buyer of shares would not be known to assessee—Additions on basis of third party statement—Nothing on record to establish vital link between assessee group and third party or any of his group entities—Nothing to controvert denial by assessee of knowledge of third party and his associates and establish link between third party and assessee—Failure to provide assessee opportunity to cross-examine third party—Additions unsustainable— DIPESH RAMESH VARDHAN v. DEPUTY CIT (Mumbai) . . .	91
	S. 250 —Appeal to Commissioner (Appeals)—Duty of Commissioner (Appeals)—Duty to dispose of appeal by order in writing stating points for determination, decision thereon and reasons for decision—Ex parte order without complying with requirement—Commissioner (Appeals) to	

	PAGE
dispose of appeal afresh on merits in accordance with law after giving proper and sufficient opportunity of being heard to assessee— <i>A. J. MILL STORE AGENCY PVT. LTD. v. ITO</i> (Kolkata) . . .	64
S. 254(2) —Appeal to Appellate Tribunal—Rectification of mistake—Mistake apparent from record—Tribunal taking firm view following decisions of court including jurisdictional High Court—Decision of jurisdictional High Court binding on Tribunal—Failure to consider judgment in favour of Department of another High Court—Decision not cited by Department at time of hearing of appeal—Not a mistake apparent from record— <i>ITO v. KAILASH CHAND BANGUR</i> (Jaipur) . . .	88
S. 263 —Revision—Addition made pursuant to revisional order—Tribunal quashing revisional order—Resultant proceedings would not survive— <i>ASST. CIT v. OSCAR INVESTMENT LTD.</i> (Delhi) . . .	81
—Revision—Erroneous and prejudicial to Revenue—No discussion in assessment order regarding difference in figures in original return and revised computation filed by assessee—Assessing Officer while accepting documents submitted by assessee not conducting any specific enquiry as to facts of case—Mere extraction of submissions would not show Assessing Officer applied his mind—Revision valid— <i>HINDUMAL BALMUKUND INVESTMENT CO. PVT. LTD. v. PRINCIPAL CIT</i> (Pune) . . .	48
—Revision—Heads of income—Income from holiday homes some owned by assessee and some managed by assessee declared under head “Other sources”—Assessing Officer assessing income under business income—Head of income under which income taxable purely a debatable issue—Assessing Officer taking possible view—Revision to tax income from holiday homes owned by assessee under “House property” and that from homes managed by it under “Other sources”—Not valid— <i>ELECTRO URBAN CO-OPERATIVE CREDIT SOCIETY LTD. v. PRINCIPAL CIT</i> (Kolkata) . . .	17
—Revision—Limitation—Service of order not mentioned in provision—Order passed within two years from relevant date—Within limitation— <i>JAIDURGA MINERALS v. PRINCIPAL CIT</i> (Cuttack) . . .	67
—Revision—Erroneous and prejudicial to Revenue—Method of accounting—Housing project—Assessing Officer making proper, sufficient and adequate enquiry on issues including issue of revenue recognition of assessee adopting percentage completion method and project-wise revenue recognition—Not a case of no enquiry, inadequate enquiry or insufficient enquiry—Assessee recognising revenue towards its project at much higher figure in comparison to estimate made by Principal Commissioner—Order not erroneous and prejudicial to interests of Revenue—Revision not valid— <i>SUREKHA BUILDERS AND DEVELOPERS PVT. LTD. v. PRINCIPAL CIT</i> (Cuttack) . . .	24

2020]	GENERAL INDEX (SHORT NOTES)	xxxiii
		PAGE
	—Revision—Natural justice—Assessee not afforded sufficient opportunity to give reply to show-cause notice—Liable to be quashed— JAI DURGA MINERALS v. PRINCIPAL CIT (Cuttack) . . .	67
	S. 271(1)(c) —Penalty—Concealment of income—Capital gains—Assessee and buyer agreeing cheques will not be presented till October 2012—Bank on which cheques drawn going into liquidation meanwhile and no payment realised in year 2011-12—Assessee under bona fide belief that sale not complete and no profits accrued to him—Failure to declare capital gains—Neither mens rea nor actus reus on part of assessee—Penalty not imposable— RAVINDRA ANANT BHUSKUTE v. ITO (Pune) . . .	40
	—Penalty—Concealment of income—Furnishing inaccurate particulars of income—Initiation of penalty proceedings on both charges but penalty levied on a specific charge of concealing particulars of income—Not a case where penalty initiated for a particular charge and thereafter penalty finally levied on a different charge—Not a case of lack of opportunity to assessee or lack of application of mind on part of Assessing Officer—No case that charge of concealment of particulars of income not attracted in the facts—Levy of penalty justified— SMT. SARLA MUNDRA v. DEPUTY CIT (Jaipur) . . .	65
	S. 271F —Penalty—Failure to file return within prescribed time—Assessee an agriculturist and illiterate and facing financial and family problems—Under impression that gain arising from sale of any agricultural land not chargeable to tax—Reasonable cause—Penalty not imposable— ARJUN DADA KHARATE v. DEPUTY CIT (Pune) . . .	68
	RULES :	
	Income-tax Rules, 1962 :	
	R. 8D —Income—Disallowance of expenditure incurred in relation to earning exempt income—Only investments which yielded exempt income during relevant period to be considered for computing average value of investment—Assessing Officer to recompute disallowance— GUJARAT MINERAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD. v. ASST. CIT (Ahmedabad) . . .	57
	—Income—Expenditure incurred in relation to exempt income—Assessee making investment in debt mutual fund out of its own tax-free surplus funds during relevant year and making suo motu disallowance towards 25 per cent. of salary of one accounting person and 5 per cent. remuneration of finance director—Assessing Officer required to record his categorical dissatisfaction with working of disallowance given by assessee—In the absence of mandatory satisfaction—No question of disallowance— GUJARAT GUARDIAN LTD. v. DEPUTY CIT (Delhi) . . .	61

xxxiv

ITR'S TRIBUNAL TAX REPORTS

[VOL. 81

PAGE

R. 8D(2)(ii) —Income—Disallowance of expenditure incurred in relation to exempt income—Most of investments in past years—Reserves and surpluses of assessee far in excess of investments made by assessee—Assessee having surpluses and reserves available with it at end of financial year when investments made in exempt income—No disallowance could be made— <i>S. VINODKUMAR DIAMONDS P. LTD. v. DEPUTY CIT</i> (Mumbai) . . .	46
—Income—Disallowance of expenditure in relation to earning exempt income—Investments far below reserves and surpluses—Presumption that assessee invested out of reserves and surpluses—No disallowance by assessee in earning exempt income—Disallowance confirmed— <i>MAHAVIR STEEL INDUSTRIES LTD. v. ASST. CIT</i> (Pune) . . .	34
R. 8D(2)(iii) —Income—Disallowance of expenditure in relation to earning exempt income—Investments far below reserves and surpluses—Presumption that assessee invested out of reserves and surpluses—No disallowance by assessee in earning exempt income—Disallowance confirmed— <i>MAHAVIR STEEL INDUSTRIES LTD. v. ASST. CIT</i> (Pune) . . .	34
R. 11UA —Income from other sources—Receipt of shares at value above face value—Determination of fair market value—Discounted cash flow method—Choice of assessee to choose a prescribed method for ascertaining market value of shares transferred—No power of Assessing Officer to change method adopted by assessee from one method to another method provided under rule 11UA— <i>KARMIC LABS P. LTD. v. ITO</i> (Mumbai) . . .	78

**THE
ITR'S TRIBUNAL TAX REPORTS
VOLUME 81 — 2020**

SUBJECT INDEX

- Accounting**—Rejection of books of account—Income from undisclosed sources—Commission income—Assessee in actual business—Merely because assessee showing small marging no presumption can be raised that assessee was merely entry provider—In the absence of convincing evidence assessing at higher rate not justified—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 145(3)—DEPUTY CIT *v.* VASU KALIA (Chandigarh) . . . 507
- Advertising, marketing and promotion of sales expenses**—See INTERNATIONAL TRANSACTIONS . . . 577
- Agricultural income**—Penalty—Concealment of income—Sale of casuarina plants—Assessee explaining his transactions and bringing to notice of Assessing Officer that transactions undertaken through banking channels—Assessee prima facie placing relevant materials and explaining transaction—Assessing Officer not recording satisfaction that explanation offered by assessee false—Penalty unsustainable—GURUSAMY RAMA-MURTHY *v.* ITO (Chennai) . . . 9
- Agricultural land**—Capital gains—Capital asset—Permission for change of user granted by village panchayat or Land Revenue authorities—Not sufficient to classify land as residential land until and unless nature and user of land actually changed by an overt activity—Assessee not showing positive income—Not enough to hold that assessee did not carry out any agricultural activity—BLUE COAST INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT P. LTD. *v.* DEPUTY CIT (Chandigarh) . . . 419
- Appeal to Appellate Tribunal**—Pronouncement of orders—Extraordinary situation in light of Covid-19 pandemic and lockdown—Period of lockdown days to be excluded—Income-tax Act, 1961—ARVIND METALS AND MINERALS P. LTD. *v.* ASST. CIT (Kolkata) . . . 648
- Appeal to Commissioner (Appeals)**—Maintainability of appeal—Order of Assessing Officer giving effect to order of High Court not containing decision on any issue or computation of income—Not appeala-

xxxvi

ITR'S TRIBUNAL TAX REPORTS

[VOL. 81

	PAGE
Appeal to Commissioner (Appeals) (<i>Contd.</i>)—	
ble—Whether interest to be levied for period reckoning from original demand till recomputation of tax as per outcome of finality of dispute—Assessing Officer to take decision—Once Assessing Officer decides period from which interest has to be calculated on outstanding demand—Appealable order—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 246—Circular No. 334, dated 3-4-1982—ABC EXPORTS <i>v.</i> ASST. CIT (Jaipur) . . .	99
Arm's length price —See INTERNATIONAL TRANSACTIONS . . .	577
Assessment in search cases —See SEARCH AND SEIZURE . . .	194, 549
Assessment —Central Board of Direct Taxes—Instructions—Income-tax Department—Board instructions on conversion of limited scrutiny assessment to full scrutiny—Assessing authorities must follow consistently and not selectively—DEV MILK FOODS PVT. LTD. <i>v.</i> ADDL. CIT (Delhi) . . .	178
—Conversion of limited scrutiny into complete scrutiny—No cogent material mentioned by Assessing Officer for conversion—Assessee requesting Assessing Officer for opportunity to cross-examine persons on whose statements he proposed to rely on but cross-examination not allowed—Proposal of converting limited scrutiny to complete scrutiny merely aimed at making fishing enquiries—Principal Commissioner according approval in a mechanised manner—Conversion violation of Instruction—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 143(3)—Instruction No. 5 of 2016 dated 14-7-2016—DEV MILK FOODS PVT. LTD. <i>v.</i> ADDL. CIT (Delhi) . . .	178
Associated enterprises —See INTERNATIONAL TRANSACTIONS . . .	577
Book profits —Company—Exclusions—Sick industrial company—Assessee discharged by Board for Industrial and Financial Reconstruction and its net worth turning positive by virtue of implementation of revival scheme—No relief under section 115JB—Authorities not specifically dealing with issues of adjustment in computing book profits under section 115JB—Commissioner (Appeals) to readjudicate issue by speaking order—WINDSOR MACHINES LTD. <i>v.</i> DEPUTY CIT (Mumbai) . . .	41
Buildings —Valuation of buildings—Undisclosed investment—Difference between value estimated by Valuation Officer and that stated by assessee being less than 15 per cent.—No addition could be made—SHRI RAM MURTI SMARAK TRUST <i>v.</i> ASST. CIT (Lucknow) . . .	194
Business expenditure —Deduction only on actual payment—Prior period expenses—Assessee depositing employees State insurance payment for earlier year and for relevant assessment year—Effect of section 43B—Amount allowable in year in which actually paid—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 43B—ARVIND METALS AND MINERALS P. LTD. <i>v.</i> ASST. CIT (Kolkata) . . .	648

2020]	GENERAL INDEX	xxxvii
		PAGE
	Business expenditure (<i>Contd.</i>)—	
	—Disallowance—Tax on profits—Section 40(a)(ii) applies only to taxes and not to education cess—Education cess allowable—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 40(a)(ii)—RECKITT BENCKISER (I.) PVT. LTD. <i>v.</i> DEPUTY CIT (Kolkata) . . .	577
	—Rent expenses—Copies of rental agreement and evidence of payment—Fact not controverted—Allowable—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 37—ASST. CIT <i>v.</i> PADMA LOGISTICS AND KHANIJ PVT. LTD. (Kolkata) . . .	61
	—Travelling and conveyance expenses—Failure by assessee to submit few bills and vouchers before Assessing Officer for verification—Disallowance restricted to Rs. 50,000—Adjudication not to be treated as precedent—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 37—ARVIND METALS AND MINERALS P. LTD. <i>v.</i> ASST. CIT (Kolkata) . . .	648
	Business income —Other sources—Interest earned from treasuries and banks—Part of banking activity of co-operative society—Assessable as income from business—Income-tax Act, 1961—THE CHOMBAL SERVICE CO-OPERATIVE BANK LTD. <i>v.</i> ITO (Cochin) . . .	13
	Business loss —Speculation business—Definition—Loss on forward booking of foreign exchange—Transaction not speculative in nature—To be allowed as business loss—Income-tax Act, 1961, ss. 28, 43(5)(a)—ARVIND METALS AND MINERALS P. LTD. <i>v.</i> ASST. CIT (Kolkata) . . .	648
	Capital asset —Capital gains—Agricultural land—Permission for change of user granted by village panchayat or Land Revenue authorities—Not sufficient to classify land as residential land until and unless nature and user of land actually changed by an overt activity—Assessee not showing positive income—Not enough to hold that assessee did not carry out any agricultural activity—BLUE COAST INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT P. LTD. <i>v.</i> DEPUTY CIT (Chandigarh) . . .	419
	Capital gains —Capital asset—Agricultural land—Permission for change of user granted by village panchayat or Land Revenue authorities—Not sufficient to classify land as residential land until and unless nature and user of land actually changed by an overt activity—Assessee not showing positive income—Not enough to hold that assessee did not carry out any agricultural activity—Income-tax Act, 1961—BLUE COAST INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT P. LTD. <i>v.</i> DEPUTY CIT (Chandigarh) . . .	419
	—Reassessment—Assessing Officer aware that necessary enquiries made into capital gains arising to assessee not only by his office but also by Investigation Wing—No reason to believe to form income had escaped assessment—Consequent reassessment illegal—BLUE COAST INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT P. LTD. <i>v.</i> DEPUTY CIT (Chandigarh) . . .	419
	Cash credits —Unexplained credit—Unsecured loans given in form of hundi—Maturity proceeds of hundis subsequently deposited in bank	

xxxviii

ITR'S TRIBUNAL TAX REPORTS

[VOL. 81

	PAGE
Cash credits (<i>Contd.</i>)—	
account—Unaccounted income surrendered and offered to tax—No evidence to prove cash deposited in bank earned in form of bribe for admission in medical colleges—No connection with scam—Complete details of hundis with respect to name, amount, interest and due date of receiving interest mentioned formed part of assessment order—Books of account not rejected by Assessing Officer—Addition made under section 68 not justified and to be deleted—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 68—VINOD BHANDARI <i>v.</i> PRINCIPAL CIT (Indore) . . .	237
Casuarina plants —Sale of casuarina plants—Penalty—Concealment of income—Agricultural income—Assessee explaining his transactions and bringing to notice of Assessing Officer that transactions undertaken through banking channels—Assessee prima facie placing relevant materials and explaining transaction—Assessing Officer not recording satisfaction that explanation offered by assessee false—Penalty unsustainable—GURUSAMY RAMAMURTHY <i>v.</i> ITO (Chennai) . . .	9
Central Board of Direct Taxes —Instructions—Income-tax Department—Assessment—Board instructions on conversion of limited scrutiny assessment to full scrutiny—Assessing authorities must follow consistently and not selectively—Instruction No. 5 of 2016 dated 14-7-2016—DEV MILK FOODS PVT. LTD. <i>v.</i> ADDL. CIT (Delhi) . . .	178
Charitable purpose —Exemption—Micro finance activity—Not charitable in nature—Not entitled to exemption—SHALOM CHARITABLE INDUSTRIES OF INDIA <i>v.</i> ASST. CIT (Cochin) . . .	20
Collection of tax at source —Buyers manufacturing beedis from tendu leaves sold by assessee—Failure to collect tax—Interest—Proviso to section 206C(7) with effect from 1-7-2012—Assessee liable to pay interest from date on which tax collectible to date of furnishing of return by respective buyers excluding period prior to 1-7-2012—Assessee not required to deposit interest and give details of interest deposit in prescribed certificates—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 206C(7)—EID MOHAMMAD NIZAMUDDIN <i>v.</i> ITO (TDS) (Jaipur) . . .	127
—Buyers manufacturing beedis from tendu leaves sold by assessee—Liability of assessee only to extent of tax collection at source on such sales and not on whole sale amount—Assessing Officer to verify and determine quantum—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 206C—EID MOHAMMAD NIZAMUDDIN <i>v.</i> ITO (TDS) (Jaipur) . . .	127
Commission income —Accounting—Rejection of books of account—Income from undisclosed sources—Assessee in actual business—Merely because assessee showing small marging no presumption can be raised that assessee was merely entry provider—In the absence of convincing evidence assessing at higher rate not justified—DEPUTY CIT <i>v.</i> VASU KALIA (Chandigarh) . . .	507

2020]	GENERAL INDEX	xxxix
		PAGE
Company —Book profits—Exclusions—Sick industrial company—Assessee discharged by Board for Industrial and Financial Reconstruction and its net worth turning positive by virtue of implementation of revival scheme—No relief under section 115JB—Authorities not specifically dealing with issues of adjustment in computing book profits under section 115JB—Commissioner (Appeals) to readjudicate issue by speaking order—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 115JB—Sick Industrial Companies (Special Provisions) Act, 1985, s. 17(1)— <i>WINDSOR MACHINES LTD. v. DEPUTY CIT</i> (Mumbai) . . .		41
Concealment of income —See PENALTY		9, 218
Co-operative society —Special deduction—Interest income—Assessing Officer to conduct inquiry into factual situation as to activities of assessee to determine eligibility for deduction—Assessing Officer shall examine activities of assessee and determine whether activities in compliance with activities of co-operative society functioning under Kerala Co-operative Societies Act, 1969—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 80P(2)— <i>THE CHOMBAL SERVICE CO-OPERATIVE BANK LTD. v. ITO</i> (Cochin) . . .		13
Deduction only on actual payment —Business expenditure—Prior period expenses—Assessee depositing employees' State insurance payment for earlier year and for relevant assessment year—Effect of section 43B—Amount allowable in year in which actually paid— <i>ARVIND METALS AND MINERALS P. LTD. v. ASST. CIT</i> (Kolkata) . . .		648
Demerger —Loss—Set off and carry forward—Accumulated loss and unabsorbed depreciation—Demerger—Pendency of application before High Court reported to Assessing Officer—Assessee filing nil revised return after order of High Court approving demerger—Right to file revised return not lapsing with issuance of intimation—All conditions stated in section 72A(4) read with section 2(19AA) fulfilled—Assessing Officer bound to accept revised return pursuant to scheme of demerger—Assessee entitled to set off and carry forward of accumulated losses and unabsorbed depreciation— <i>ASST. CIT v. PADMA LOGISTICS AND KHANIJ PVT. LTD.</i> (Kolkata) . . .		61
Diversion of income by overriding title —See INCOME . . .		30
Exempt income —See INCOME . . .		61
Exemption —Charitable purpose—Micro finance activity—Not charitable in nature—Not entitled to exemption—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 11— <i>SHALOM CHARITABLE MINISTRIES OF INDIA v. ASST. CIT</i> (Cochin) . . .		20
Fees for technical services —Non-resident—Taxability in India—Royalty—Assessee entering into technology licence agreement for licence of technology and system with Indian entity—Indian entity appointing various franchisees for operating restaurants in India—Deputation of employee of non-resident to Indian company—Reimbursement of salary		

xl

ITR'S TRIBUNAL TAX REPORTS

[VOL. 81

	PAGE
Fees for technical services (<i>Contd.</i>)—	
by Indian company—No services “make available” and payment not fees for technical services—Lien on employment with Indian concern which paid his salary and taxed in India—Assessee had no permanent establishment in India and no business undertaking in India—Reimbursement of salary not income and not taxable—DEPUTY DIT <i>v.</i> YUM! RESTAURANTS (ASIA) PTE. LTD. (Delhi) . . .	440
Hotel business —Undisclosed income—Assessee’s objection against certain expenditure before Commissioner (Appeals) not properly dealt with—Assessing Officer to verify addition made on hotel building—Assessing Officer to give telescoping if assessee paid taxes on entire surrendered amount—If not Assessing Officer to consider amount on which assessee paid taxes—Assessing Officer to grant depreciation if assessee eligible on hotel building and if depreciation not claimed while calculating taxable income of assessee—TARLOK KUMAR <i>v.</i> ASST. CIT (Amritsar) . . .	462
Housing project —Special deduction—Built-up area—Meaning of—Assessee failing to complete construction of housing project within prescribed time limit—Not entitled to deduction—If flat purchaser de facto in exclusive possession of dry balcony attached with flat—Area of dry balcony whether includible while computing built-up area of flat—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 80-IB(10)—HARSHVARDHAN CONSTRUCTIONS <i>v.</i> ITO (Mumbai) . . .	299
Income —Disallowance of expenditure in relation to earning exempt income—Shares held as stock-in-trade—Entire interest expenditure corresponding to stock-in-trade could not allowable as business expenditure—Assessing Officer to apportion part of expenses related to exempt dividend income and consider that part alone for disallowance—Exempt income not only from equity shares kept as stock-in-trade but also from interest received on bonds—Assessee to demonstrate that investment in bonds also made out interest-free own funds—Whether provision for diminution in value of stock-in-trade made out of trading account or within trading account—Assessing Officer to verify facts from books of account and other records of assessee and decide afresh—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 14A—Income-tax Rules, 1962, r. 8D(2)(ii)—ADDL. CIT <i>v.</i> PNB GILTS LTD. (Delhi) . . .	224
—Diversion of income by overriding title—“Revenue sharing agreement” between assessee and its holding company in construction projects—Obligation arising before an income accrues and assessee under compulsion to discharge its obligation—Diversion of income by overriding title—Expenditure incurred by assessee towards services obtained from its holding company allowable—Income-tax Act, 1961—ASST. CIT <i>v.</i> EMAAR MGF CONSTRUCTION P. LTD. (Delhi) . . .	30
—Expenditure incurred in relation to earning exempt income—Strategic investment—Not disallowable—Own funds of assessee more than investments—No disallowance—Disallowance to be in relation to income	

2020]	GENERAL INDEX	xli
		PAGE
Income (<i>Contd.</i>)—		
which does not form part of total income—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 14A—Income-tax Rules, 1962, r. 8D—ASST. CIT <i>v.</i> PADMA LOGISTICS AND KHANIJ PVT. LTD. (Kolkata) . . .		61
Income escaping assessment —See REASSESSMENT . . .		1
Income from undisclosed sources —Accounting—Rejection of books of account—Commission income—Assessee in actual business—Merely because assessee showing small margin no presumption can be raised that assessee was merely entry provider—In the absence of convincing evidence assessing at higher rate not justified—DEPUTY CIT <i>v.</i> VASU KALIA (Chandigarh) . . .		507
—Ex parte assessment—Loan—Creditworthiness and genuineness of creditor—Assessing Officer after verification of documents including audited balance-sheet, etc., not finding any fault in documents—Assessing Officer neither doubting nor calling for any further evidence from assessee to prove source of deposits in account of creditor—Assessee proving creditor possessed of sufficient funds to make advances to it—Creditor showing very low income not a determinative factor for determining creditworthiness of creditor—No doubt raised either by Assessing Officer or by Commissioner (Appeals) regarding receipt by assessee from savings account of individual—Additions unsustainable—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 144—ROHIT KUMAR JINDAL (HUF) <i>v.</i> ITO (Chandigarh). . .		469
Industrial undertaking —Special deduction—Apportionment of expenses between eligible and non-eligible units—Allocation on basis of number of employees linked to factory operation divided by total number of employees in corporate office into sales of eligible units divided by total sales —Proper—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 80-IB—RECKITT BENCKISER (I.) PVT. LTD. <i>v.</i> DEPUTY CIT (Kolkata) . . .		577
—Special deduction under section 80-IC—Condition precedent—Manufacture or production of article eligible for special deduction—Sale of scrap—Scrap produced during manufacture—Profits and gains from sale of scrap materials eligible to deduction—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 80-IC—RECKITT BENCKISER (I.) PVT. LTD. <i>v.</i> DEPUTY CIT (Kolkata) . . .		577
—Special deduction under section 80-IC—Interest—Disallowance of interest allocated to eligible units—Assessee raising additional ground regarding quantification of disallowance—Matter remanded—Income-tax Act, 1961, ss. 80-IB, 80-IC—RECKITT BENCKISER (I.) PVT. LTD. <i>v.</i> DEPUTY CIT (Kolkata) . . .		577
Instructions —Income-tax Department—See CENTRAL BOARD OF DIRECT TAXES . . .		178
Interest —Collection of tax at source—Buyers manufacturing beedis from tendu leaves sold by assessee—Failure to collect tax—Proviso to section 206C(7) with effect from 1-7-2012—Assessee liable to pay interest from date on which tax collectible to date of furnishing of return by respective		

xlii	ITR'S TRIBUNAL TAX REPORTS	[VOL. 81
Interest (<i>Contd.</i>)—		PAGE
buyers excluding period prior to 1-7-2012—Assessee not required to deposit interest and give details of interest deposit in prescribed certificates—EID MOHAMMAD NIZAMUDDIN <i>v.</i> ITO (TDS) (Jaipur) . . .		127
—Industrial undertaking—Special deduction under section 80-IC—Disallowance of interest allocated to eligible units—Assessee raising additional ground regarding quantification of disallowance—Matter remanded—RECKITT BENCKISER (I.) PVT. LTD. <i>v.</i> DEPUTY CIT (Kolkata) . . .		577
Interest earned from treasuries and banks —Business income—Other sources—Part of banking activity of co-operative society—Assessable as income from business—THE CHOMBAL SERVICE CO-OPERATIVE BANK LTD. <i>v.</i> ITO (Cochin) . . .		13
Interest income —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 shall examine activities of assessee and determine whether activities in compliance with activities of co-operative society functioning under Kerala Co-operative Societies Act, 1969—THE CHOMBAL SERVICE CO-OPERATIVE BANK LTD. <i>v.</i> ITO (Cochin) . . .		13
International transactions —Arm's length price—Associated enterprise—Royalty—Trade-marks for two products registered and owned by associated enterprise—Royalties paid not only in respect of patent but for basket of services—Transfer Pricing Officer not justified in determining arm's length price of royalty paid in case of two items as nil—Direction to delete arm's length price adjustment for payment of royalty—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 92CA(2)—RECKITT BENCKISER (I.) PVT. LTD. <i>v.</i> DEPUTY CIT (Kolkata) . . .		577
—Transfer pricing—Arm's length price—Advertising, marketing and promotion of sales expenses—No undertaking between assessee and its associated enterprises to incur expenses for brand promotion according to any global or nation specific strategy—No proof of existence of international transaction—Arm's length price adjustment made in respect of advertising, marketing and promotion of sales expenses to be deleted—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 92—RECKITT BENCKISER (I.) PVT. LTD. <i>v.</i> DEPUTY CIT (Kolkata) . . .		577
—Transfer pricing—Associated enterprises—Assessee providing service to associated enterprises and expenses reimbursed by associated enterprises—Upward transfer pricing adjustment without considering nature of expenses—Failure by Transfer Pricing Officer to adjudicate issue taking into account documents already submitted by assessee—Matter remanded—Income-tax Act, 1961—RECKITT BENCKISER (I.) PVT. LTD. <i>v.</i> DEPUTY CIT (Kolkata) . . .		577
Loan —Income from undisclosed sources—Ex parte assessment—Creditworthiness and genuineness of creditor—Assessing Officer after		

2020]	GENERAL INDEX	xliii
		PAGE
Loan (<i>Contd.</i>)—		
verification of documents including audited balance-sheet, etc., not finding any fault in documents—Assessing Officer neither doubting nor calling for any further evidence from assessee to prove source of deposits in account of creditor—Assessee proving creditor possessed of sufficient funds to make advances to it—Creditor showing very low income not a determinative factor for determining creditworthiness of creditor—No doubt raised either by Assessing Officer or by Commissioner (Appeals) regarding receipt by assessee from savings account of individual—Additions unsustainable— ROHIT KUMAR JINDAL (HUF) v. ITO (Chandigarh) . . .		469
Loss —Set off and carry forward—Demerger—Accumulated loss and unabsorbed depreciation—Demerger—Pendency of application before High Court reported to Assessing Officer—Assessee filing nil revised return after order of High Court approving demerger—Right to file revised return not lapsing with issuance of intimation—All conditions stated in section 72A(4) read with section 2(19AA) fulfilled—Assessing Officer bound to accept revised return pursuant to scheme of demerger—Assessee entitled to set off and carry forward of accumulated losses and unabsorbed depreciation—Income-tax Act, 1961— ASST. CIT v. PADMA LOGISTICS AND KHANIJ PVT. LTD. (Kolkata) . . .		61
Medical college and hospitals —Search and seizure—Assessment in search cases—Capitation fee—Without working out of basic parameters regarding ownership of transactions—Presumptive clauses in provision had no application—No examination of students from whom amounts purportedly received to prove receipt of donation—No primary evidence available with Department extrapolating amount to work out donation purportedly received—No addition could be made— SHRI RAM MURTI SMARAK TRUST v. ASST. CIT (Lucknow) . . .		194
—Search and seizure—Unexplained cash—Facts or explanation given by assessee not examined by Department in right perspective to determine accountability of amounts in regular books or not—Assessing Officer to verify cash balances with regular books of account filed by assessee as well as with balance-sheets and income and expenditure accounts available with Department with returns and books of account available in seized material— SHRI RAM MURTI SMARAK TRUST v. ASST. CIT (Lucknow) . . .		194
Micro finance activity —Exemption—Charitable purpose—Not charitable in nature—Not entitled to exemption— SHALOM CHARITABLE MINISTRIES OF INDIA v. ASST. CIT (Cochin) . . .		20
Non-resident —Reassessment—Assessing Officer had no jurisdiction to reopen assessment—Notice not valid—Income-tax Officer transferring case thereafter to Assessing Officer of competent jurisdiction fully convinced that he had no jurisdiction to make assessment in case of assessee—Transfer of such void proceedings to Assessing Officer of competent jurisdiction did not validate his action and proceedings—No notice issued by Assessing Officer		

xliv

ITR'S TRIBUNAL TAX REPORTS

[VOL. 81

	PAGE
Non-resident (<i>Contd.</i>)—	
of competent jurisdiction—Reassessment not valid— MANJIT SINGH v. DEPUTY CIT (INTERNATIONAL TAXATION) (Chandigarh) . . .	454
—Taxability in India—Royalty—Fees for technical services—Assessee entering into technology licence agreement for licence of technology and system with Indian entity—Indian entity appointing various franchisees for operating restaurants in India—Deputation of employee of non-resident to Indian company—Reimbursement of salary by Indian company—No services “make available” and payment not fees for technical services—Lien on employment with Indian concern which paid his salary and taxed in India—Assessee had no permanent establishment in India and no business undertaking in India—Reimbursement of salary not income and not taxable—Income-tax Act, 1961—Double Taxation Avoidance Agreement between India and Singapore, arts. 5(2), 12— DEPUTY DIT v. YUM! RESTAURANTS (ASIA) PTE. LTD. (Delhi) . . .	440
Notice —See REASSESSMENT	1, 299, 493
Other sources —Business income—Interest earned from treasuries and banks—Part of banking activity of co-operative society—Assessable as income from business— THE CHOMBAL SERVICE CO-OPERATIVE BANK LTD. v. ITO (Cochin) . . .	13
Penalty —Concealment of income—Agricultural income—Sale of casuarina plants—Assessee explaining his transactions and bringing to notice of Assessing Officer that transactions undertaken through banking channels—Assessee prima facie placing relevant materials and explaining transaction—Assessing Officer not recording satisfaction that explanation offered by assessee false—Penalty unsustainable—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 271(1)(c)— GURUSAMY RAMAMURTHY v. ITO (Chennai) . . .	9
—Concealment of income—Assessee residing out of India and employed in different jobs—Returns prepared by consultant without knowledge of “employee stock ownership plan” and some differences of salary in reconciliation of salary slips—All tax has been deducted already and form 26AS showing deduction of tax at source at higher slab rate of 30 per cent.—No intention to conceal income or deliberate default on part of assessee—Penalty to be deleted—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 271(1)(c)— SUSHIL KUMAR BHATI v. ITO (Delhi) . . .	218
Reassessment —Capital gains—Assessing Officer aware that necessary enquiries made into capital gains arising to assessee not only by his office but also by Investigation Wing—No reason to believe to form income had escaped assessment—Consequent reassessment illegal—Income-tax Act, 1961, ss. 147, 148— BLUE COAST INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT P. LTD. v. DEPUTY CIT (Chandigarh) . . .	419
—Income escaping assessment—Sale of property by mischief and forgery—Assessee neither disclosing sale transaction nor offering capital gains on transaction—Documents to which assessee a party constituting	

2020]	GENERAL INDEX	xliv
		PAGE
	Reassessment (Contd.)—	
	tangible material to form belief that income assessable to tax escaped assessment—Inordinate appreciation of value from date from date of purchase and till date of sale—Addition justified—Income-tax Act, 1961, ss. 147, 148—SURESH KUMAR SHARMA <i>v.</i> ITO (Jaipur) . . .	1
	—Non-resident—Assessing Officer had no jurisdiction to reopen assessment—Notice not valid—Income-tax Officer transferring case thereafter to Assessing Officer of competent jurisdiction fully convinced that he had no jurisdiction to make assessment in case of assessee—Transfer of such void proceedings to Assessing Officer of competent jurisdiction did not validate his action and proceedings—No notice issued by Assessing Officer of competent jurisdiction—Reassessment not valid—Income-tax Act, 1961, ss. 147, 148—MANJIT SINGH <i>v.</i> DEPUTY CIT (INTERNATIONAL TAXATION) (Chandigarh) . . .	454
	—Notice—Assessee carrying on mining business—Opinion of commission appointed by Central Government that there had been underinvoicing of exports—Assessing Officer must apply his own mind and make his own assessment of facts before he issues any notice—Reopening merely on basis of report—Not justified—Income-tax Act, 1961, ss. 147, 148—ASHAPURA MINECHEM LTD. <i>v.</i> DEPUTY CIT (Mumbai) . . .	111
	—Notice—Assessing Officer need not conclusively prove income chargeable to tax escaped assessment at stage of notice—Information that assessee not satisfied conditions for deduction coming to knowledge while framing assessment for subsequent year—Information tangible material to form reason to believe—Reassessment valid—Income-tax Act, 1961, ss. 147, 148—HARSHVARDHAN CONSTRUCTIONS <i>v.</i> ITO (Mumbai) . . .	299
	—Notice—Information that assessee received high premium with share application money—Not tangible material or incriminating material to form belief that share application money received unaccounted money—No information of receipt of any bogus transactions undertaken by assessee—Names of companies from whom share premium received not mentioned nor any allegation that share applicants not traceable or were bogus companies—Reopening unsustainable—Income-tax Act, 1961, ss. 147, 148—INDO GLOBAL TECHNO TRADE LTD. <i>v.</i> ITO (Chandigarh) . . .	493
	—Notice after four years—Condition precedent—Freezer security deposits—Taxability considered and addition to income by Assessing Officer—Assessing Officer not establishing failure on part of assessee to disclose truly and fully all material facts—Lapsed liability taxed in original assessment on proportionate basis over four years from date of receipt—Reassessment to tax it on basis that liability to repay ceased—Change of opinion—Tribunal finding in earlier year that amount taxable only in year of termination—Reassessment not valid—Income-tax Act, 1961, ss. 147, 148—ASST. CIT <i>v.</i> JOJO FROZEN FOODS P. LTD. (Cochin) . . .	90

xlvi

ITR'S TRIBUNAL TAX REPORTS

[VOL. 81

Reassessment (<i>Contd.</i>)—	PAGE
—Search and seizure—Assessment pursuant to search in case of another party taken up but after return and details filed by assessee proceedings dropped—Notice for reassessment issued thereafter on basis of information received from Investigation Wing—Information not independently verified from record—Suspicion of income having escaped assessment not sufficient for reassessment—Correct course of action would have been to proceed against assessee under section 153C and not under section 147—Income-tax Act, 1961, ss. 147, 148— SANJAY SINGHAL (HUF) v. DEPUTY CIT (Chandigarh) . . .	377
Rectification of mistakes —Mistake apparent from record—Commissioner (Appeals) granting deduction on basis of decision of High Court—Decision subsequently reversed by Full Bench—Commissioner rectifying earlier order and disallowing deduction—Justified—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 154— THE CHOMBAL SERVICE CO-OPERATIVE BANK LTD. v. ITO (Cochin) . . .	13
Rejection of books of account —Accounting—Income from undisclosed sources—Commission income—Assessee in actual business—Merely because assessee showing small marging no presumption can be raised that assessee was merely entry provider—In the absence of convincing evidence assessing at higher rate not justified— DEPUTY CIT v. VASU KALIA (Chandigarh) . . .	507
Rent expenses —Business expenditure—Copies of rental agreement and evidence of payment—Fact not controverted—Allowable— ASST. CIT v. PADMA LOGISTICS AND KHANIJ PVT. LTD. (Kolkata) . . .	61
Revision —Erroneous and prejudicial to interests of Revenue—Unexplained cash credit—Assessee, a medical practitioner, providing unsecured short-term loans in form of hundi—Assessing Officer with motive of linking source of unaccounted income to medical admissions scam making adequate enquiry and then making addition—Order passed with complete application of mind—Cannot be treated as erroneous and prejudicial to interests of Revenue—Commissioner erred in assuming jurisdiction under section 263—Assessment order to be restored—Revision order quashed—Income-tax Act, 1961, ss. 68, 263— VINOD BHANDARI v. PRINCIPAL CIT (Indore) . . .	237
Royalty —International transactions—Arm's length price—Associated enterprise—Trade marks for two products registered and owned by associated enterprise—Royalties paid not only in respect of patent but for basket of services—Transfer Pricing Officer not justified in determining arm's length price of royalty paid in case of two items as nil—Direction to delete arm's length price adjustment for payment of royalty— RECKITT BENCKISER (I.) PVT. LTD. v. DEPUTY CIT (Kolkata) . . .	577
—Non-resident—Taxability in India—Fees for technical services—Assessee entering into technology licence agreement for licence of tech-	

2020]	GENERAL INDEX	xlvii
		PAGE
Royalty (<i>Contd.</i>)—		
nology and system with Indian entity—Indian entity appointing various franchisees for operating restaurants in India—Deputation of employee of non-resident to Indian company—Reimbursement of salary by Indian company—No services “make available” and payment not fees for technical services—Lien on employment with Indian concern which paid his salary and taxed in India—Assessee had no permanent establishment in India and no business undertaking in India—Reimbursement of salary not income and not taxable—DEPUTY DIT <i>v.</i> YUM! RESTAURANTS (ASIA) PTE. LTD. (Delhi) . . .		440
Sale of property by mischief and forgery —See REASSESSMENT . . .		1
Scrap —Sale of scrap—See INDUSTRIAL UNDERTAKING . . .		577
Search and seizure —Assessment in search cases—Additions by Assessing Officer of items already disclosed in original return on which assessment completed on date of search—No material found during course of search—No addition could be made—Income-tax Act, 1961, ss. 68, 153A—ALANKAR SAPHIRE DEVELOPERS <i>v.</i> DEPUTY CIT (Delhi) . . .		549
—Assessment in search cases—Medical college and hospitals—Capitation fee—Without working out of basic parameters regarding ownership of transactions—Presumptive clauses in provision had no application—No examination of students from whom amounts purportedly received to prove receipt of donation—No primary evidence available with Department extrapolating amount to work out donation purportedly received—No addition could be made—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 153A—SHRI RAM MURTI SMARAK TRUST <i>v.</i> ASST. CIT (Lucknow) . . .		194
—Reassessment—Assessment pursuant to search in case of another party taken up but after return and details filed by assessee proceedings dropped—Notice for reassessment issued thereafter on basis of information received from Investigation Wing—Information not independently verified from record—Suspicion of income having escaped assessment not sufficient for reassessment—Correct course of action would have been to proceed against assessee under section 153C and not under section 147—SANJAY SINGHAL (HUF) <i>v.</i> DEPUTY CIT (Chandigarh) . . .		377
—Unexplained cash—Medical college and hospitals—Facts or explanation given by assessee not examined by Department in right perspective to determine accountability of amounts in regular books or not—Assessing Officer to verify cash balances with regular books of account filed by assessee as well as with balance-sheets and income and expenditure accounts available with Department with returns and books of account available in seized material—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 69A—SHRI RAM MURTI SMARAK TRUST <i>v.</i> ASST. CIT (Lucknow) . . .		194
Set off and carry forward —Loss—Demerger—Accumulated loss and unabsorbed depreciation—Demerger—Pendency of application before		

xlvi

ITR'S TRIBUNAL TAX REPORTS

[VOL. 81

	PAGE
Set off and carry forward (<i>Contd.</i>)—	
High Court reported to Assessing Officer—Assessee filing nil revised return after order of High Court approving demerger—Right to file revised return not lapsing with issuance of intimation—All conditions stated in section 72A(4) read with section 2(19AA) fulfilled—Assessing Officer bound to accept revised return pursuant to scheme of demerger—Assessee entitled to set off and carry forward of accumulated losses and unabsorbed depreciation— <i>ASST. CIT v. PADMA LOGISTICS AND KHANIJ PVT. LTD.</i> (Kolkata) . . .	61
Shares held as stock-in-trade —See INCOME . . .	224
Sick industrial company —Book profits—Exclusions—Assessee discharged by Board for Industrial and Financial Reconstruction and its net worth turning positive by virtue of implementation of revival scheme—No relief under section 115JB—Authorities not specifically dealing with issues of adjustment in computing book profits under section 115JB—Commissioner (Appeals) to readjudicate issue by speaking order— <i>WINDSOR MACHINES LTD. v. DEPUTY CIT</i> (Mumbai) . . .	41
Special deduction —Co-operative society—Interest income—Assessing Officer to conduct inquiry into factual situation as to activities of assessee to determine eligibility for deduction—Assessing Officer shall examine activities of assessee and determine whether activities in compliance with activities of co-operative society functioning under Kerala Co-operative Societies Act, 1969— <i>THE CHOMBAL SERVICE CO-OPERATIVE BANK LTD. v. ITO</i> (Cochin) . . .	13
—Housing project—Built-up area—Meaning of—Assessee failing to complete construction of housing project within prescribed time limit—Not entitled to deduction—If flat purchaser de facto in exclusive possession of dry balcony attached with flat—Area of dry balcony whether includible while computing built-up area of flat— <i>HARSHVARDHAN CONSTRUCTIONS v. ITO</i> (Mumbai) . . .	299
—Industrial undertaking—Apportionment of expenses between eligible and non-eligible units—Allocation on basis of number of employees linked to factory operation divided by total number of employees in corporate office into sales of eligible units divided by total sales— <i>PROPER—RECKITT BENCKISER (I.) PVT. LTD. v. DEPUTY CIT</i> (Kolkata) . . .	577
—Special deduction under section 80-IC—Industrial undertaking—Condition precedent—Manufacture or production of article eligible for special deduction—Sale of scrap—Scrap produced during manufacture—Profits and gains from sale of scrap materials eligible to deduction— <i>RECKITT BENCKISER (I.) PVT. LTD. v. DEPUTY CIT</i> (Kolkata) . . .	577
—Special deduction under section 80-IC—Industrial undertaking—Interest—Disallowance of interest allocated to eligible units—Assessee raising additional ground regarding quantification of disallowance—Matter remanded— <i>RECKITT BENCKISER (I.) PVT. LTD. v. DEPUTY CIT</i> (Kolkata) . . .	577

2020]	GENERAL INDEX	xlix
		PAGE
	Speculation business —Business loss—Definition—Loss on forward booking of foreign exchange—Transaction not speculative in nature—To be allowed as business loss— <i>ARVIND METALS AND MINERALS P. LTD. v. ASST. CIT</i> (Kolkata) . . .	648
	Tax on profits —Business expenditure—Disallowance—Section 40(a)(ii) applies only to taxes and not to education cess—Education cess allowable— <i>RECKITT BENCKISER (I.) PVT. LTD. v. DEPUTY CIT</i> (Kolkata) . . .	577
	Taxability in India —See NON-RESIDENT . . .	440
	Tendu leaves —Collection of tax at source—Buyers manufacturing beedis from tendu leaves sold by assessee—Failure to collect tax—Interest—Proviso to section 206C(7) with effect from 1-7-2012—Assessee liable to pay interest from date on which tax collectible to date of furnishing of return by respective buyers excluding period prior to 1-7-2012—Assessee not required to deposit interest and give details of interest deposit in prescribed certificates— <i>EID MOHAMMAD NIZAMUDDIN v. ITO (TDS)</i> (Jaipur) . . .	127
	—Collection of tax at source—Buyers manufacturing beedis from tendu leaves sold by assessee—Liability of assessee only to extent of tax collection at source on such sales and not on whole sale amount—Assessing Officer to verify and determine quantum— <i>EID MOHAMMAD NIZAMUDDIN v. ITO (TDS)</i> (Jaipur) . . .	127
	Transfer pricing —See INTERNATIONAL TRANSACTIONS . . .	577
	Travelling and conveyance expenses —Business expenditure—Failure by assessee to submit few bills and vouchers before Assessing Officer for verification—Disallowance restricted to Rs. 50,000—Adjudication not to be treated as precedent— <i>ARVIND METALS AND MINERALS P. LTD. v. ASST. CIT</i> (Kolkata) . . .	648
	Undisclosed income —Hotel business—Assessee's objection against certain expenditure before Commissioner (Appeals) not properly dealt with—Assessing Officer to verify addition made on hotel building—Assessing Officer to give telescoping if assessee paid taxes on entire surrendered amount—If not Assessing Officer to consider amount on which assessee paid taxes—Assessing Officer to grant depreciation if assessee eligible on hotel building and if depreciation not claimed while calculating taxable income of assessee—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 133A— <i>TARLOK KUMAR v. ASST. CIT</i> (Amritsar) . . .	462
	—Mismatch in figures between balance-sheet of assessee and balance-sheet of other parties—Difference cannot be assumed unexplained income of assessee—Assessing Officer neither doubting nor making any inquiries regarding source of funds of payments received by assessee nor of other parties from whom assessee received payment—No unexplained	

1	ITR'S TRIBUNAL TAX REPORTS	[VOL. 81
		PAGE
	Undisclosed income (<i>Contd.</i>)—	
	income of assessee—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 68—DEPUTY CIT <i>v.</i> VASU KALIA (Chandigarh) . . .	507
	Undisclosed investment —Valuation of buildings—Difference between value estimated by Valuation Officer and that stated by assessee being less than 15 per cent.—No addition could be made—Income-tax Act, 1961, s. 69B—SHRI RAM MURTI SMARAK TRUST <i>v.</i> ASST. CIT (Lucknow) . . .	194
	Unexplained cash —Search and seizure—Medical college and hospi- tals—Facts or explanation given by assessee not examined by Department in right perspective to determine accountability of amounts in regular books or not—Assessing Officer to verify cash balances with regular books of account filed by assessee as well as with balance-sheets and income and expenditure accounts available with Department with returns and books of account available in seized material—SHRI RAM MURTI SMARAK TRUST <i>v.</i> ASST. CIT (Lucknow) . . .	194
	Unexplained credit —Cash credits—Unsecured loans given in form of hundi—Maturity proceeds of hundis subsequently deposited in bank account—Unaccounted income surrendered and offered to tax—No evi- dence to prove cash deposited in bank earned in form of bribe for admis- sion in medical colleges—No connection with scam—Complete details of hundis with respect to name, amount, interest and due date of receiving interest mentioned formed part of assessment order—Books of account not rejected by Assessing Officer—Addition made under section 68 not justified and to be deleted—VINOD BHANDARI <i>v.</i> PRINCIPAL CIT (Indore) . . .	237
	—Revision—Erroneous and prejudicial to interests of Revenue— Assessee, a medical practitioner, providing unsecured short-term loans in form of hundi—Assessing Officer with motive of linking source of unac- counted income to medical admissions scam making adequate enquiry and then making addition—Order passed with complete application of mind—Cannot be treated as erroneous and prejudicial to interests of Rev- enue—Commissioner erred in assuming jurisdiction under section 263— Assessment order to be restored—Revision order quashed—VINOD BHANDARI <i>v.</i> PRINCIPAL CIT (Indore) . . .	237
	Words and phrases	
	built-up area . . .	299

End of Volume 81

SECTIONWISE INDEX

SECTIONWISE INDEX TO CASES REPORTED IN THIS PART

Double Taxation Avoidance Agreement between India and Singapore :

Arts. 5(2), 12—Non-resident—Taxability in India—Royalty—Fees for technical services—Assessee entering into technology licence agreement for licence of technology and system with Indian entity—Indian entity appointing various franchisees for operating restaurants in India—Deputation of employee of non-resident to Indian company—Reimbursement of salary by Indian company—No services “make available” and payment not fees for technical services—Lien on employment with Indian concern which paid his salary and taxed in India—Assessee had no permanent establishment in India and no business undertaking in India—Reimbursement of salary not income and not taxable—**DEPUTY DIT v. YUM! RESTAURANTS (ASIA) PTE. LTD.** (Delhi) . . . 440

ACTS :

Income-tax Act, 1961 :

S. 11—Exemption—Charitable purpose—Micro finance activity—Not charitable in nature—Not entitled to exemption—**SHALOM CHARITABLE MINISTRIES OF INDIA v. ASST. CIT** (Cochin) . . . 20

S. 14A—Income—Expenditure incurred in relation to earning exempt income—Strategic investment—Not disallowable—Own funds of assessee more than investments—No disallowance—Disallowance to be in relation to income which does not form part of total income—**ASST. CIT v. PADMA LOGISTICS AND KHANIJ PVT. LTD.** (Kolkata) . . . 61

—Income—Disallowance of expenditure in relation to earning exempt income—Shares held as stock-in-trade—Entire interest expenditure corresponding to stock-in-trade could not allowable as business expenditure—Assessing Officer to apportion part of expenses related to exempt dividend income and consider that part alone for disallowance—Exempt income not only from equity shares kept as stock-in-trade but also from interest received on bonds—Assessee to demonstrate that investment in bonds also made out interest-free own funds—Whether provision for diminution in value of stock-in-trade made out of trading account or within trading account—Assessing Officer to verify facts from books of account and other records of assessee and decide afresh—**ADDL. CIT v. PNB GILTS LTD.** (Delhi) . . . 224

	PAGE
S. 28 —Business loss—Speculation business—Definition—Loss on forward booking of foreign exchange—Transaction not speculative in nature—To be allowed as business loss— ARVIND METALS AND MINERALS P. LTD. v. ASST. CIT (Kolkata) . . .	648
S. 37 —Business expenditure—Rent expenses—Copies of rental agreement and evidence of payment—Fact not controverted—Allowable— ASST. CIT v. PADMA LOGISTICS AND KHANIJ PVT. LTD. (Kolkata) . . .	61
—Business expenditure—Travelling and conveyance expenses—Failure by assessee to submit few bills and vouchers before Assessing Officer for verification—Disallowance restricted to Rs. 50,000—Adjudication not to be treated as precedent— ARVIND METALS AND MINERALS P. LTD. v. ASST. CIT (Kolkata) . . .	648
S. 40(a)(ii) —Business expenditure—Disallowance—Tax on profits—Section 40(a)(ii) applies only to taxes and not to education cess—Education cess allowable— RECKITT BENCKISER (I.) PVT. LTD. v. DEPUTY CIT (Kolkata) . . .	577
S. 43(5)(a) —Business loss—Speculation business—Definition—Loss on forward booking of foreign exchange—Transaction not speculative in nature—To be allowed as business loss— ARVIND METALS AND MINERALS P. LTD. v. ASST. CIT (Kolkata) . . .	648
S. 43B —Business expenditure—Deduction only on actual payment—Prior period expenses—Assessee depositing employees' State insurance payment for earlier year and for relevant assessment year—Effect of section 43B—Amount allowable in year in which actually paid— ARVIND METALS AND MINERALS P. LTD. v. ASST. CIT (Kolkata) . . .	648
S. 68 —Cash credits—Unexplained credit—Unsecured loans given in form of hundi—Maturity proceeds of hundies subsequently deposited in bank account—Unaccounted income surrendered and offered to tax—No evidence to prove cash deposited in bank earned in form of bribe for admission in medical colleges—No connection with scam—Complete details of hundis with respect to name, amount, interest and due date of receiving interest mentioned formed part of assessment order—Books of account not rejected by Assessing Officer—Addition made under section 68 not justified and to be deleted— VINOD BHANDARI v. PRINCIPAL CIT (Indore) . . .	237
—Revision—Erroneous and prejudicial to interests of Revenue—Unexplained cash credit—Assessee, a medical practitioner, providing unsecured short term loans in form of hundi—Assessing Officer with motive of linking source of unaccounted income to medical admissions scam making adequate enquiry and then addition—Order passed with complete application of mind—Cannot be treated as erroneous and prejudicial to interests of Revenue—Commissioner erred in assuming	

2020]	GENERAL INDEX	liii
		PAGE
	jurisdiction under section 263—Assessment order to be restored—Revision order quashed—VINOD BHANDARI <i>v.</i> PRINCIPAL CIT (Indore) . . .	237
	—Search and seizure—Assessment in search cases—Additions by Assessing Officer of items already disclosed in original return on which assessment completed on date of search—No material found during course of search—No addition could be made—ALANKAR SAPHIRE DEVELOPERS <i>v.</i> DEPUTY CIT (Delhi) . . .	549
	—Unexplained income—Mismatch in figures between balance-sheet of assessee and balance-sheet of other parties—Difference cannot be assumed unexplained income of assessee—Assessing Officer neither doubting nor making any inquiries regarding source of funds of payments received by assessee nor of other parties from whom assessee received payment—No unexplained income of assessee—DEPUTY CIT <i>v.</i> VASU KALIA (Chandigarh) . . .	507
	S. 69A —Search and seizure—Unexplained cash—Medical college and hospitals—Facts or explanation given by assessee not examined by Department in right perspective to determine accountability of amounts in regular books or not—Assessing Officer to verify cash balances with regular books of account filed by assessee as well as with balance-sheets and income and expenditure accounts available with Department with returns and books of account available in seized material—SHRI RAM MURTI SMARAK TRUST <i>v.</i> ASST. CIT (Lucknow) . . .	194
	S. 69B —Undisclosed investment—Valuation of buildings—Difference between value estimated by Valuation Officer and that stated by assessee being less than 15 per cent.—No addition could be made—SHRI RAM MURTI SMARAK TRUST <i>v.</i> ASST. CIT (Lucknow) . . .	194
	S. 80-IB —Industrial undertaking—Special deduction—Apportionment of expenses between eligible and non-eligible units—Allocation on basis of number of employees linked to factory operation divided by total number of employees in corporate office into sales of eligible units divided by total sales—Proper—RECKITT BENCKISER (I.) PVT. LTD. <i>v.</i> DEPUTY CIT (Kolkata) . . .	577
	—Industrial undertaking—Special deduction under section 80-IC—Interest—Disallowance of interest allocated to eligible units—Assessee raising additional ground regarding quantification of disallowance—Matter remanded—RECKITT BENCKISER (I.) PVT. LTD. <i>v.</i> DEPUTY CIT (Kolkata) . . .	577
	S. 80-IB(10) —Housing project—Special deduction—Built-up area—Meaning of—Assessee failing to complete construction of housing project within prescribed time limit—Not entitled to deduction—If flat purchaser de facto in exclusive possession of dry balcony attached with flat—Area of	

liv	ITR'S TRIBUNAL TAX REPORTS	[VOL. 81
		PAGE
dry balcony whether includible while computing built-up area of flat— HARSHVARDHAN CONSTRUCTIONS v. ITO (Mumbai) . . .		299
S. 80-IC —Industrial undertaking—Special deduction under section 80-IC—Condition precedent—Manufacture or production of article eligible for special deduction—Sale of scrap—Scrap produced during manufacture—Profits and gains from sale of scrap materials eligible to deduction—RECKITT BENCKISER (I.) PVT. LTD. v. DEPUTY CIT (Kolkata) . . .		577
—Industrial undertaking—Special deduction under section 80-IC—Interest—Disallowance of interest allocated to eligible units—Assessee raising additional ground regarding quantification of disallowance—Matter remanded—RECKITT BENCKISER (I.) PVT. LTD. v. DEPUTY CIT (Kolkata) . . .		577
S. 80P(2) —Co-operative society—Special deduction—Interest income—Assessing Officer to conduct inquiry into factual situation as to activities of assessee to determine eligibility for deduction—Assessing Officer shall examine activities of assessee and determine whether activities in compliance with activities of co-operative society functioning under Kerala Co-operative Societies Act, 1969—THE CHOMBAL SERVICE CO-OPERATIVE BANK LTD. v. ITO (Cochin) . . .		13
S. 92 —International transactions—Transfer pricing—Arm's length price—Advertising, marketing and promotion of sales expenses—No undertaking between assessee and its associated enterprises to incur expenses for brand promotion according to any global or nation specific strategy—No proof of existence of international transaction—Arm's length price adjustment made in respect of advertising, marketing and promotion of sales expenses to be deleted—RECKITT BENCKISER (I.) PVT. LTD. v. DEPUTY CIT (Kolkata) . . .		577
S. 92CA(2) —International transactions—Arm's length price—Associated enterprise—Royalty—Trade marks for two products registered and owned by associated enterprise—Royalties paid not only in respect of patent but for basket of services—Transfer Pricing Officer not justified in determining arm's length price of royalty paid in case of two items as nil—Direction to delete arm's length price adjustment for payment of royalty—RECKITT BENCKISER (I.) PVT. LTD. v. DEPUTY CIT (Kolkata) . . .		577
S. 115JB —Company—Book profits—Exclusions—Sick industrial company—Assessee discharged by Board for Industrial and Financial Reconstruction and its net worth turning positive by virtue of implementation of revival scheme—No relief under section 115JB—Authorities not specifically dealing with issues of adjustment in computing book profits under section 115JB—Commissioner (Appeals) to readjudicate issue by speaking order—WINDSOR MACHINES LTD. v. DEPUTY CIT (Mumbai) . . .		41

2020]	GENERAL INDEX	lv
		PAGE
	S. 133A —Undisclosed income—Hotel business—Assessee's objection against certain expenditure before Commissioner (Appeals) not properly dealt with—Assessing Officer to verify addition made on hotel building—Assessing Officer to give telescoping if assessee paid taxes on entire surrendered amount—If not Assessing Officer to consider amount on which assessee paid taxes—Assessing Officer to grant depreciation if assessee eligible on hotel building and if depreciation not claimed while calculating taxable income of assessee— TARLOK KUMAR v. ASST. CIT (Amritsar) . . .	462
	S. 143(3) —Assessment—Conversion of limited scrutiny into complete scrutiny—No cogent material mentioned by Assessing Officer for conversion—Assessee requesting Assessing Officer for opportunity to cross-examine persons on whose statements he proposed to rely on but cross-examination not allowed—Proposal of converting limited scrutiny to complete scrutiny merely aimed at making fishing enquiries—Principal Commissioner according approval in a mechanised manner—Conversion violation of Instruction— DEV MILK FOODS PVT. LTD. v. ADDL. CIT (Delhi) . . .	178
	S. 144 —Income from undisclosed sources—Ex parte assessment—Loan—Creditworthiness and genuineness of creditor—Assessing Officer after verification of documents including audited balance-sheet, etc., not finding any fault in documents—Assessing Officer neither doubting nor calling for any further evidence from assessee to prove source of deposits in account of creditor—Assessee proving creditor possessed of sufficient funds to make advances to it—Creditor showing very low income not a determinative factor for determining creditworthiness of creditor—No doubt raised either by Assessing Officer or by Commissioner (Appeals) regarding receipt by assessee from savings account of individual—Additions unsustainable— ROHIT KUMAR JINDAL (HUF) v. ITO (Chandigarh) . . .	469
	S. 145(3) —Accounting—Rejection of books of account—Income from undisclosed sources—Commission income—Assessee in actual business—Merely because assessee showing small margin no presumption can be raised that assessee was merely entry provider—In the absence of convincing evidence assessing at higher rate not justified— DEPUTY CIT v. VASU KALIA (Chandigarh) . . .	507
	S. 147 —Reassessment—Capital gains—Assessing Officer aware that necessary enquiries made into capital gains arising to assessee not only by his office but also by Investigation Wing—No reason to believe to form income had escaped assessment—Consequent reassessment illegal— BLUE COAST INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT P. LTD. v. DEPUTY CIT (Chandigarh) . . .	419

—Reassessment—Income escaping assessment—Sale of property by mischief and forgery—Assessee neither disclosing sale transaction nor offering capital gains on transaction—Documents to which assessee a party constituting tangible material to form belief that income assessable to tax escaped assessment—Inordinate appreciation of value from date from date of purchase and till date of sale—Addition justified—SURESH KUMAR SHARMA <i>v.</i> ITO (Jaipur) . . .	1
—Reassessment—Non-resident—Assessing Officer had no jurisdiction to reopen assessment—Notice not valid—Income-tax Officer transferring case thereafter to Assessing Officer of competent jurisdiction fully convinced that he had no jurisdiction to make assessment in case of assessee—Transfer of such void proceedings to Assessing Officer of competent jurisdiction did not validate his action and proceedings—No notice issued by Assessing Officer of competent jurisdiction—Reassessment not valid—MANJIT SINGH <i>v.</i> DEPUTY CIT (INTERNATIONAL TAXATION) (Chandigarh) . . .	454
—Reassessment—Notice—Assessee carrying on mining business — Opinion of commission appointed by Central Government that there had been underinvoicing of exports—Assessing Officer must apply his own mind and make his own assessment of facts before he issues any notice—Reopening merely on basis of report—Not justified—ASHAPURA MINE-CHEM LTD. <i>v.</i> DEPUTY CIT (Mumbai) . . .	111
—Reassessment—Notice—Assessing Officer need not conclusively prove income chargeable to tax escaped assessment at stage of notice—Information that assessee not satisfied conditions for deduction coming to knowledge while framing assessment for subsequent year—Information tangible material to form reason to believe—Reassessment valid—HARSH-VARDHAN CONSTRUCTIONS <i>v.</i> ITO (Mumbai) . . .	299
—Reassessment—Notice—Information that assessee received high premium with share application money—Not tangible material or incriminating material to form belief that share application money received unaccounted money—No information of receipt of any bogus transactions undertaken by assessee—Names of companies from whom share premium received not mentioned nor any allegation that share applicants not traceable or were bogus companies—Reopening unsustainable—INDO GLOBAL TECHNO TRADE LTD. <i>v.</i> ITO (Chandigarh) . . .	493
—Reassessment—Notice after four years—Condition precedent—Freezer security deposits—Taxability considered and addition to income by Assessing Officer—Assessing Officer not establishing failure on part of assessee to disclose truly and fully all material facts—Lapsed liability taxed in original assessment on proportionate basis over four years from date of receipt—Reassessment to tax it on basis that liability to repay ceased—Change of opinion—Tribunal finding in earlier year that amount taxable	

2020]	GENERAL INDEX	lvii
		PAGE
	only in year of termination—Reassessment not valid—Asst. CIT <i>v.</i> JOJO FROZEN FOODS P. LTD. (Cochin) . . .	90
	—Reassessment—Search and seizure—Assessment pursuant to search in case of another party taken up but after return and details filed by assessee proceedings dropped—Notice for reassessment issued thereafter on basis of information received from Investigation Wing—Information not independently verified from record—Suspicion of income having escaped assessment not sufficient for reassessment—Correct course of action would have been to proceed against assessee under section 153C and not under section 147—SANJAY SINGHAL (HUF) <i>v.</i> DEPUTY CIT (Chandigarh) . . .	377
	S. 148 —Reassessment—Capital gains—Assessing Officer aware that necessary enquiries made into capital gains arising to assessee not only by his office but also by Investigation Wing—No reason to believe to form income had escaped assessment—Consequent reassessment illegal—BLUE COAST INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT P. LTD. <i>v.</i> DEPUTY CIT (Chandigarh) . . .	419
	—Reassessment—Income escaping assessment—Sale of property by mischief and forgery—Assessee neither disclosing sale transaction nor offering capital gains on transaction—Documents to which assessee a party constituting tangible material to form belief that income assessable to tax escaped assessment—Inordinate appreciation of value from date from date of purchase and till date of sale—Addition justified—SURESH KUMAR SHARMA <i>v.</i> ITO (Jaipur) . . .	1
	—Reassessment—Non-resident—Assessing Officer had no jurisdiction to reopen assessment—Notice not valid—Income-tax Officer transferring case thereafter to Assessing Officer of competent jurisdiction fully convinced that he had no jurisdiction to make assessment in case of assessee—Transfer of such void proceedings to Assessing Officer of competent jurisdiction did not validate his action and proceedings—No notice issued by Assessing Officer of competent jurisdiction—Reassessment not valid—MANJIT SINGH <i>v.</i> DEPUTY CIT (INTERNATIONAL TAXATION) (Chandigarh) . . .	454
	—Reassessment—Notice—Assessee carrying on mining business — Opinion of commission appointed by Central Government that there had been underinvoicing of exports—Assessing Officer must apply his own mind and make his own assessment of facts before he issues any notice—Reopening merely on basis of report—Not justified—ASHAPURA MINE-CHEM LTD. <i>v.</i> DEPUTY CIT (Mumbai) . . .	111
	—Reassessment—Notice—Assessing Officer need not conclusively prove income chargeable to tax escaped assessment at stage of notice—Information that assessee not satisfied conditions for deduction coming to	

lviii

ITR'S TRIBUNAL TAX REPORTS

[VOL. 81

	PAGE
knowledge while framing assessment for subsequent year—Information tangible material to form reason to believe—Reassessment valid— HARSH-VARDHAN CONSTRUCTIONS v. ITO (Mumbai) . . .	299
—Reassessment—Notice—Information that assessee received high premium with share application money—Not tangible material or incriminating material to form belief that share application money received unaccounted money—No information of receipt of any bogus transactions undertaken by assessee—Names of companies from whom share premium received not mentioned nor any allegation that share applicants not traceable or were bogus companies—Reopening unsustainable— INDO GLOBAL TECHNO TRADE LTD. v. ITO (Chandigarh) . . .	493
—Reassessment—Notice after four years—Condition precedent—Freezer security deposits—Taxability considered and addition to income by Assessing Officer—Assessing Officer not establishing failure on part of assessee to disclose truly and fully all material facts—Lapsed liability taxed in original assessment on proportionate basis over four years from date of receipt—Reassessment to tax it on basis that liability to repay ceased—Change of opinion—Tribunal finding in earlier year that amount taxable only in year of termination—Reassessment not valid— ASST. CIT v. JOJO FROZEN FOODS P. LTD. (Cochin) . . .	90
—Reassessment—Search and seizure—Assessment pursuant to search in case of another party taken up but after return and details filed by assessee proceedings dropped—Notice for reassessment issued thereafter on basis of information received from Investigation Wing—Information not independently verified from record—Suspicion of income having escaped assessment not sufficient for reassessment—Correct course of action would have been to proceed against assessee under section 153C and not under section 147— SANJAY SINGHAL (HUF) v. DEPUTY CIT (Chandigarh) . . .	377
S. 153A —Search and seizure—Assessment in search cases—Additions by Assessing Officer of items already disclosed in original return on which assessment completed on date of search—No material found during course of search—No addition could be made— ALANKAR SAPHIRE DEVELOPERS v. DEPUTY CIT (Delhi) . . .	549
—Search and seizure—Assessment in search cases—Medical college and hospitals—Capitation fee—Without working out of basic parameters regarding ownership of transactions—Presumptive clauses in provision had no application—No examination of students from whom amounts purportedly received to prove receipt of donation—No primary evidence available with Department extrapolating amount to work out donation purportedly received—No addition could be made— SHRI RAM MURTI SMARAK TRUST v. ASST. CIT (Lucknow) . . .	194

2020]	GENERAL INDEX	lix
		PAGE
	S. 154 —Rectification of mistakes—Mistake apparent from record—Commissioner (Appeals) granting deduction on basis of decision of High Court—Decision subsequently reversed by Full Bench—Commissioner rectifying earlier order and disallowing deduction—Justified— THE CHOMBAL SERVICE CO-OPERATIVE BANK LTD. v. ITO (Cochin) . . .	13
	S. 206C —Collection of tax at source—Buyers manufacturing beedis from tendu leaves sold by assessee—Liability of assessee only to extent of tax collection at source on such sales and not on whole sale amount—Assessing Officer to verify and determine quantum— EID MOHAMMAD NIZAMUDDIN v. ITO (TDS) (Jaipur) . . .	127
	S. 206C(7) —Collection of tax at source—Buyers manufacturing beedis from tendu leaves sold by assessee—Failure to collect tax—Interest—Proviso to section 206C(7) with effect from 1-7-2012—Assessee liable to pay interest from date on which tax collectible to date of furnishing of return by respective buyers excluding period prior to 1-7-2012—Assessee not required to deposit interest and give details of interest deposit in prescribed certificates— EID MOHAMMAD NIZAMUDDIN v. ITO (TDS) (Jaipur) . . .	127
	S. 246 —Appeal to Commissioner (Appeals)—Maintainability of appeal—Order of Assessing Officer giving effect to order of High Court not containing decision on any issue or computation of income—Not appealable—Whether interest to be levied for period reckoning from original demand till recomputation of tax as per outcome of finality of dispute—Assessing Officer to take decision—Once Assessing Officer decides period from which interest has to be calculated on outstanding demand—Appealable order— ABC EXPORTS v. ASST. CIT (Jaipur) . . .	99
	S. 263 —Revision—Erroneous and prejudicial to interests of Revenue—Unexplained cash credit—Assessee, a medical practitioner, providing unsecured short term loans in form of hundi—Assessing Officer with motive of linking source of unaccounted income to medical admissions scam making adequate enquiry and then addition—Order passed with complete application of mind—Cannot be treated as erroneous and prejudicial to interests of Revenue—Commissioner erred in assuming jurisdiction under section 263—Assessment order to be restored—Revision order quashed— VINOD BHANDARI v. PRINCIPAL CIT (Indore) . . .	237
	S. 271(1)(c) —Penalty—Concealment of income—Agricultural income—Sale of casuarina plants—Assessee explaining his transactions and bringing to notice of Assessing Officer that transactions undertaken through banking channels—Assessee prima facie placing relevant materials and explaining transaction—Assessing Officer not recording satisfaction that explanation offered by assessee false—Penalty unsustainable— GURUSAMY RAMAMURTHY v. ITO (Chennai) . . .	9

lx

ITR'S TRIBUNAL TAX REPORTS

[VOL. 81

PAGE

—Penalty—Concealment of income—Assessee residing out of India and employed in different jobs—Returns prepared by consultant without knowledge of “employee stock ownership plan” and some differences of salary in reconciliation of salary slips—All tax has been deducted already and form 26AS showing deduction of tax at source at higher slab rate of 30 per cent.—No intention to conceal income or deliberate default on part of assessee—Penalty to be deleted—**SUSHIL KUMAR BHATI v. ITO** (Delhi) . . . 218

Sick Industrial Companies (Special Provisions) Act, 1985 :

S. 17(1)—Company—Book profits—Exclusions—Sick industrial company—Assessee discharged by Board for Industrial and Financial Reconstruction and its net worth turning positive by virtue of implementation of revival scheme—No relief under section 115JB—Authorities not specifically dealing with issues of adjustment in computing book profits under section 115JB—Commissioner (Appeals) to readjudicate issue by speaking order—**WINDSOR MACHINES LTD. v. DEPUTY CIT** (Mumbai) . . . 41

RULES :

Income-tax Rules, 1962 :

R. 8D—Income—Expenditure incurred in relation to earning exempt income—Strategic investment—Not disallowable—Own funds of assessee more than investments—No disallowance—Disallowance to be in relation to income which does not form part of total income—**ASST. CIT v. PADMA LOGISTICS AND KHANIJ PVT. LTD.** (Kolkata) . . . 61

R. 8D(2)(ii)—Income—Disallowance of expenditure in relation to earning exempt income—Shares held as stock-in-trade—Entire interest expenditure corresponding to stock-in-trade could not allowable as business expenditure—Assessing Officer to apportion part of expenses related to exempt dividend income and consider that part alone for disallowance—Exempt income not only from equity shares kept as stock-in-trade but also from interest received on bonds—Assessee to demonstrate that investment in bonds also made out interest-free own funds—Whether provision for diminution in value of stock-in-trade made out of trading account or within trading account—Assessing Officer to verify facts from books of account and other records of assessee and decide afresh—**ADDL. CIT v. PNB GILTS LTD.** (Delhi) . . . 224

End of Volume 81