

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 : ₹ 14,800 for Six volumes for the year 2024. Single copy is ₹ 300 only.

Back years' volume ₹ 2500 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 or publisher 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

[2024] 296 Taxman...(...)

TOTAL PAGES [120]

C O N T E N T S

STATUTES

□ NOTIFICATIONS

- Section 5, read with section 4 of the Departmental Inquiries (Enforcement of Attendance of Witnesses and Production of Documents) Act, 1972 - Power of authorised inquiring authority to enforce attendance of witnesses and production of documents - Authorisation to inquiring authority for summoning and enforcing attendance of witnesses and examining them on oath - NOTIFICATION S.O. 311(E) [NO.12/2024/F.NO. C-14011/46/2018-V&L], DATED 19-1-2024 25
- Section 5, read with section 4 of the Departmental Inquiries (Enforcement of Attendance of Witnesses and Production of Documents) Act, 1972 - Power of authorised inquiring authority to enforce attendance of witnesses and production of documents - Authorisation to inquiring authority for summoning and enforcing attendance of witnesses and examining them on oath - NOTIFICATION S.O. 312(E)[NO. 13/2024/ F.NO. C-14011/41/2018-V&L], DATED 19-1-2024 26

TAX REPORTS : TABLE OF CASES

- ◆ Anuradha Bakshi v. Pr. CIT, Central (Delhi) 355
- ◆ CIT (TDS) v. Lalitpur Power Generation Co. Ltd. (All.) 372
- ◆ CIT, IT v. Augustus Capital Pte. Ltd. (Delhi) 398
- ◆ Jain Metal Rolling Mills v. Union of India (Mad.) 336
- ◆ Paresh Babubhai Bahalani v. ITO (Guj.) 324
- ◆ Pr. CIT v. Indus Towers Ltd. (Delhi) 387
- ◆ Pr. CIT v. Modi Rubber Ltd. (Delhi) 381
- ◆ Ratnabhumi Developers Ltd. v. Asstt. CIT (Guj.) 364

SUBJECT INDEX

BUSINESS DISALLOWANCE

■ Certain deductions to be allowed only on actual payment

- *Loan processing fee* - Where assessee claimed upfront loan processing fee on loan which was raised by it for purposes of its business, merely because loan processing charges though paid upfront but was amortized over a period of five years solely to be in consonance with mercantile system of accounting, assessee could not be denied deduction of entire charges in lump sum in relevant year in which same were paid - *Pr. CIT v. Indus Towers Ltd.* (Delhi) **387**

BUSINESS EXPENDITURE

■ Allowability of

- *Compensation* - Where all documentary evidences were furnished during course of original assessment proceedings with regard to lump sum compensation, notice issued for reassessment under section 148 based on material already on record and without any new or tangible information was to be quashed - *Ratnabhumi Developers Ltd. v. Asstt. CIT* (Guj.) **364**

CIRCULARS & NOTIFICATIONS

- Order F. No. 299/22/2021-DIR (INV.III), dated 28-9-2021 **337**

DEDUCTION OF TAX AT SOURCE

■ Contractors/sub-contractors, payments to

- *Work contracts* - Where assessee entered into indivisible contracts with BHEL and CIPL for setting up of thermal power plant, since element of testing and commissioning of technical works etc. were part of main contract, in absence of any internal tool arising from contract or in absence of any legal provision allowing AO to break down indivisibility or composite nature of contract, dominant object of contract could not be overlooked, to conclude existence of component of FTS and thus, TDS with respect to payment made by assessee was to be made under section 194C - *CIT (TDS) v. Lalitpur Power Generation Co. Ltd.* (All.) **372**

DEPRECIATION

■ Allowance/Rate of

- *Passive use of asset for business* - Where assessee claimed depreciation on towers, since towers were constructed during year under consideration which was subsequent to commencement of business of assessee and it was not case that profits earned by assessee had no nexus with towers in question, assessee was to be allowed depreciation on towers - *Pr. CIT v. Indus Towers Ltd.* (Delhi) **387**

INCOME

■ Deemed to accrue or arise in India

- *Capital gains - Shares* - *Explanations* 6 and 7 to section 9(1)(i) has to be treated retrospectively as it have to be read along with *Explanation* 5 which operates from 1-4-1962 - *CIT, IT v. Augustus Capital Pte. Ltd.* (Delhi) **398**

INCOME-TAX ACT, 1961

- Section 9 **398**
- Section 32 **387**
- Section 36(1)(iii) **388**

- Section 37(1) **364**
- Section 43B **388**
- Section 69B **324**
- Section 194C **372**
- Section 153B **355**
- Section 245C **337**
- Section 271(1)(c) **381**

INTEREST ON BORROWED CAPITAL

- *Illustrations* - Where assessee, engaged in providing telecom infrastructure, incurred interest expenses on loan taken for construction of telecom towers, since assessee had filed relevant evidence with regard to such interest expenses and there was no adverse finding of revenue to effect that said expenses were not utilized for business, said interest paid was to be allowed as revenue expenses - *Pr. CIT v. Indus Towers Ltd.* (Delhi) **387**

INTERPRETATION OF STATUTES

- Strict rule of interpretation **356**

PENALTY

■ For concealment of income

- *Conditions precedent* - Where Assessing Officer while framing assessment order mentioned that penalty proceedings under section 271(1)(c) were to be initiated as assessee had furnished inaccurate particulars of his income in its return, however, while passing penalty order he reiterated that assessee had furnished 'inaccurate particulars of income or concealed income', thus, there was no clarity in mind of Assessing Officer as to which limb of section 271(1)(c) got attracted for imposition of penalty, impugned penalty was to be deleted - *Pr. CIT v. Modi Rubber Ltd.* (Delhi) **381**

SEARCH AND SEIZURE

■ Time limit for completion of assessment under section 153A

- *Illustrations* - Where ITO inspected three distinct lockers belonging to petitioner, namely, Lockers 299, 2070, and 1320, since restraint and revocation orders pertaining to Locker 299 unequivocally establish that Locker 299 underwent its initial search on 29-4-2021, even though it resulted in no recoveries, this date marked onset of limitation period prescribed under section 153B and, thus, assessment order dated 31-3-2023 notified under section 153A was within limitation period - *Anuradha Bakshi v. Pr. CIT, Central* (Delhi) **355**

SETTLEMENT COMMISSION

■ Application for settlement of cases

- *Retrospective amendment* - Since purpose of retrospective amendment to section 245A was to make ITSC inoperative right from date of introduction of Bill and to send all pending applications to Interim Board and neither there was any intent nor it was within purpose to do away with pending applications in respect of matters in which cases arose from 1-2-2021 to 31-3-2021, therefore, last date mentioned for filing applications in section 245C(5) should be read as 31-3-2021 instead of 1-2-2021 and, consequently, last date mentioned in Circular dated 28-9-2021 should also be read as 31-3-2021 - *Jain Metal Rolling Mills v. Union of India* (Mad.) **336**

UNDISCLOSED INVESTMENTS

- *Recording of reasons* - Where reasons recorded by Assessing Officer did not disclose nature of transactions, date of transactions and other relevant details, notices issued by Assessing Officer under sections 147 and 148 for reopening assessment was to be set aside as Assessing Officer had failed to record independent reason to believe that income chargeable to tax had escaped assessment - *Paresh Babubhai Bahalani v. ITO* (Guj.) **324**

MAGAZINE : FEATURES

- ◆ Deductions in respect of employment of new employees u/s 80JJAA as interpreted by the NFRA//*Srinivasan Anand G.* **31**

TAXMANN[®]
Tax & Corporate Laws of INDIA




SUBSCRIBE NOW

DAILY E-MAIL ALERTS

Know About All-Important News & Updates in Tax, Corporate and Accounts & Audit Laws

SINGLE-LINE SUMMARY

THREE LINE SUMMARY

FULL SOURCE DOCUMENT

DAILY TAX DIGEST

TAXMANN'S DAILY

CORPORATE LAWS DAILY

ACCOUNTS & AUDIT DAILY

GST DAILY

TAXMANN | THIS WEEK

TAXMAN □ FEBRUARY 3 - FEBRUARY 9, 2024 ◆ 6