

FOUNDER EDITOR

U.K. BHARGAVA

EDITOR

RAKESH BHARGAVA

HONY. COORDINATING EDITORS

**DR. VINOD K. SINGHANIA,
VINAY JAIN AND NARAYAN JAIN**

Taxman weekly comes in Six volumes.

Annual Subscription : ₹ 13,900 for Six volumes for the year 2022. Single copy is ₹ 300 only.

Back years' volume ₹ 2350 per volume for paper back and add ₹ 250 per volume for Hard case binding.

Taxman weekly is published on every Saturday. NON-RECEIPT OF PART MUST BE NOTIFIED WITHIN 60 DAYS OF THE DUE DATE.

Editor does not necessarily agree with the views expressed in magazine section of Taxman weekly.

Material published in this part is the exclusive copyrighted property of Taxman and cannot be reproduced or copied in any form or by any means without written permission of publisher.

This publication is sold with the understanding that authors/editors and publishers are not responsible for the result of any action taken on the basis of this work nor for any error or omission to any person, whether a purchaser of this publication or not. All disputes are subject to jurisdiction of the Delhi High Court.

Address your editorial and subscription correspondence to **Taxmann Allied Services (P.) Ltd., 59/32, New Rohtak Road, New Delhi-110005**

Printed and Published by **Ansh Bhargava** on behalf of **Taxmann Allied Services (P.) Ltd.** and Printed at **Tan Prints (India) Pvt. Ltd., 44 Km. Mile Stone, National Highway, Rohtak Road, Village Rohad, Distt. Jhajjar (Haryana)** and Published at **59/32, New Rohtak Road, New Delhi-110 005**

Editor : Rakesh Bhargava

Phone : 91-11-45562222

Email: sales@taxmann.com

ISSN : 0972-8198

MODE OF CITATION

[2022] 285 Taxman...(..)

TOTAL PAGES [116]

C O N T E N T S

TAX REPORTS : TABLE OF CASES

- ◆ **Ambulu Ammal v. Anbumani (Mad.) 27**
- ◆ **Asian Paints Ltd. v. Asstt. CIT (Bom.) 65**
- ◆ **Celestial Aviation Trading 64 Ltd. v. ITO(IT) (Delhi) 43**
- ◆ **CIT v. Cochin Malabar Estates & Industries Ltd. (Ker.) 69**
- ◆ **CIT v. Mandavi Builders (SC) 4**
- ◆ **CIT(Exemptions) v. Choice Foundation (Ker.) 48**
- ◆ **Coursera Inc. v. ITO, TDS (Delhi) 6**
- ◆ **Ebenezer International Foundation v. Asstt. CIT (Ker.) 52**
- ◆ **EY Global Services Ltd. v. Asstt. CIT (Delhi) 10**
- ◆ **Greenstar Fertilizers Ltd. v. Additional/Joint/Deputy/Asstt. CIT/ITO, NFAC, Delhi (Mad.) 56**
- ◆ **Indo Arya Central Transport Ltd. v. CIT(TDS) (SC) 2**
- ◆ **Pr. CIT v. Ganesh Plantation Ltd. (Guj.) 35**
- ◆ **Pr. CIT v. Solar Turbines India (P.) Ltd. (SC) 1**
- ◆ **Pr. CIT v. West Bengal Housing Board (Cal.) 32**
- ◆ **Upal Developers (P.) Ltd. v. Dy. CIT (Bom.) 23**

SUBJECT INDEX

BENAMI TRANSACTIONS (PROHIBITION) ACT, 1988

■ **Benami transaction**

APPELLANT OBTAINED A DECREE AGAINST DEFENDANT

- Mere fact that defendant's wife had no income and property was purchased by him in her name could not establish that property was purchased benami in wife's name to evade decree and its execution in a money suit under pronote especially when property was purchased well before decree in suit - *Ambulu Ammal v. Anbumani* (Mad.) 27

BENAMI TRANSACTIONS (PROHIBITION) ACT, 1988

- Section 2(a) 27

BUSINESS EXPENDITURE

■ Allowability of

- *Reassessment* - Where on basis of agreement entered into by assessee with its dealer in subsequent year reassessment was initiated to disallow colour idea concept expenses treating same as capital expenditure instead of revenue expenditure, since said agreement could not form basis for Assessing Officer to have come to a reasonable belief that income chargeable to tax had escaped assessment for assessment year 2012-13, reassessment notice was without jurisdiction - *Asian Paints Ltd. v. Asstt. CIT* (Bom.) **65**

BUSINESS INCOME

■ Chargeable as

- *Reassessment* - Where assessee-company, engaged in business of constructing and running shopping mall, had shown its rental income from shops under head 'Income from house property' and 'Income from other services', namely maintenance income, parking income etc., under head 'Income from business or profession' and assessment was completed accordingly but, Assessing Officer initiated reassessment on ground that other services were inseparably connected to letting out of building by assessee, since figures and details were available not only in return of income, profit and loss account and balance sheet filed by assessee but all said material had been considered in original assessment order, reassessment was unjustified - *Upal Developers (P) Ltd. v. Dy. CIT* (Bom.) **23**

CAPITAL GAINS

■ Capital asset

- *Agricultural land* - Where assessee entered into a MoA to sale its agricultural land with a condition to deliver said land after cutting and carrying away rubber trees on it, cutting and carrying away of rubber trees did not change classification of land from agricultural to non-agricultural, thus, profit arose on sale of such agricultural land was not chargeable to tax - *CIT v. Cochin Malabar Estates & Industries Ltd.* (Ker.) **69**

CASH CREDIT

- *Reassessment* - Where Assessing Officer initiated reassessment on basis of information that search in case of Venus Group showed that amount of Rs. 4 crores had been received by assessee from builders of Venus Group through banking channel against corresponding payment of unaccounted cash by assessee to Builders, and considered this as accommodation entry and made addition under section 68, since no live link/proximate nexus of alleged dubious transactions between searched person and assessee had been brought on record, said addition was to be deleted - *Pr. CIT v. Ganesh Plantation Ltd.* (Guj.) **35**

CHARITABLE OR RELIGIOUS TRUST

■ Exemption of income from property held under

- *Corpus donations* - Where Tribunal by impugned order held that receipt of voluntary contributions by assessee-trust towards infrastructure fund was a voluntary contribution towards corpus fund and was exempted under section 11(1)(d) and therefore, initiation of proceedings under section 263 for disallowing claim under section 11(1)(d) of corpus donation on ground that it was neither voluntary nor capital in nature and was not in accordance with law, same being finding of fact could not have been interfered with - *CIT (Exemptions) v. Choice Foundation* (Ker.) **48**

COMMISSIONER (APPEALS)

■ Appealable orders

- *Scope of* - Where assessee challenged impugned assessment order on ground that impugned order proceeded on basis that there was a violation of 'Foreign Exchange Management Act, 1999' without even issuing notice to counterparty, since arguments of assessee that

norms of FEMA had not been set out with specificity or required approval details had not been set out with specificity in impugned order were all clearly arguments in nature of an appeal *qua* impugned order *i.e.*, not arguments compelling interference in writ jurisdiction, assessee was to be relegated to file statutory appeal under section 246A - *Greenstar Fertilizers Ltd. v. Additional/Joint/Deputy/Asstt. CIT/ITO, NFAC, Delhi* (Mad.) **56**

DEDUCTIONS

■ Profits and gains from industrial undertakings other than infrastructure development undertakings

- *Housing Project* - SLP granted against impugned order of High Court that amendment brought on 1-4-2010 *vide* clauses (e) and (f) to section 80-IB(10) is prospective in nature; therefore, such amendment to section 80-IB(10) could not be applied in case of transactions of sale of flats by assessee-company, engaged in building and developing housing project, which took place in 2007-08 - *CIT v. Mandavi Builders* (SC) **4**
- *Housing project* - SLP granted against High Court ruling that where unaccounted money found during search proceedings at premises of assessee-company was treated as business income of assessee by Assessing Officer, assessee could not be denied deduction under section 80-IB(10) in respect of such amount - *CIT v. Mandavi Builders* (SC) **4**
- *Interest income* - Where assessee, Government undertaking which was engaged in development of housing project, claimed that accrued interest on fixed deposits was to be treated as income from business thereby entitling it for exemption under section 80-IB(10), since interest was earned by assessee from fixed deposits which were made out of business income of assessee and apart from that assessee had no other source of income, said exemption was to be allowed to assessee - *Pr. CIT v. West Bengal Housing Board* (Cal.) **32**

DEPRECIATION

■ Additional depreciation

- *School buses* - Assessee-trust running a school would not be eligible for higher rate of depreciation on its school buses, as test of use of vehicle in business of transportation of assessee was not satisfied - *Ebenezer International Foundation v. Asstt. CIT* (Ker.) **52**

INCOME

■ Deemed to accrue or arise in India

- *Royalty/FTS-Education service* - Where petitioner-American university was an e-platform operator which paid equalisation levy at rate of 2 per cent on receipts from its Indian customers and AO directed petitioner to hold 10 per cent TDS on same receipt, since impugned order was passed without discussing impact of amendment made to section 10(50) to exclude receipts of petitioner which were subject to withholding tax at source to extent such receipts were exigible to equalisation levy, same was to be set aside - *Coursera Inc. v. ITO, TDS* (Delhi) **6**
- *Royalties or fees for technical services - Computer software* - Payment received by UK company for providing access to computer software to Indian company did not amount to 'royalty' liable to be taxed in India under section 9 as well as article 13 of India-UK DTAA as agreement between them did not create any right to transfer copyright in software - *EY Global Services Ltd. v. Asstt. CIT* (Delhi) **10**
- *Shipping, inland waterways transport and air transport - General* - Where assessee, a foreign company, entered into an Aircraft Specified Lease Agreement with company named (AIL) for lease of one aircraft, application filed by assessee under section 197 for 'Nil' rate of withholding tax certificate on premise that under article 8 of India-Ireland

DTAA it was liable to pay tax only in Ireland could not be denied on ground that another group company of assessee which had entered into similar transaction was found to be involved in evasion of tax - *Celestial Aviation Trading 64 Ltd. v. ITO(IT)* (Delhi) **43**

INCOME-TAX ACT, 1961

- Section 2(14) **69**
- Section 9 **7, 10, 43**
- Section 11 **48**
- Section 28(i) **23**
- Section 32 **52**
- Section 37(1) **65**
- Section 68 **35**
- Section 80-IB **4, 5, 32**
- Section 92C **1**
- Section 246A **56**
- Section 276B **3**

OFFENCES AND PROSECUTION

- **Failure to pay tax on distributed profits of domestic companies/Deducted at source**
- SLP dismissed against High Court ruling that where sanction order was issued by Commissioner to proceed against assessee for depositing amount deducted as TDS in account of Government belatedly with interest, since on criminal complaint being preferred, Additional Chief Metropolitan Magistrate had already taken cognizance of said issue of non-depositing of TDS by assessee and issued summons to assessee, thus, trial had already begun, writ petition filed before High Court against sanction order could not be entertained - *Indo Arya Central Transport Ltd. v. CIT(TDS)* (SC) **2**

TRANSFER PRICING

- **Computation of arm's length price**
- *Adjustments - Support service fee* - SLP dismissed against High Court ruling that where assessee had not rendered any marketing support services to its AE in supplying gas turbines to Public Works Department (PWD) in carrying out construction for CWG, impugned addition made to assessee's ALP in respect of said services was to be deleted - *Pr. CIT v. Solar Turbines India (P) Ltd.* (SC) **1**

MAGAZINE : FEATURES

- ◆ Can GAAR override DTAA? // *Mayank Mohanka* **1**
- ◆ Power of the Parliament to nullify judgments with retrospective effect of taxing provision - Legal implications // *Sanjay Bansal and Amit Parsad* **10**