



IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI

I.T.A. NO. 162 OF 2004

Judgment Reserved on : January 10, 2005

% Date of Decision: February 03, 2005

Commissioner of Income Tax ... Petitioner
Through
Ms. Prem Lata Bansal, Adv.

Versus

M/s Delhi Towers & Estates (Pvt.) Ltd. ... Respondent
Through Nemo.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SWATANTER KUMAR
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MADAN B. LOKUR

1. Whether reporters of local paper may be allowed to see the judgment?
2. To be referred to the reporter or not?
3. Whether the judgment should be referred in the Digest?

SWATANTER KUMAR, J.

For Orders, see ITA No. 777/2004.


(SWATANTER KUMAR)
JUDGE


(MADAN B. LOKUR)
JUDGE

February 03, 2005



(2)

* IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI

+ I.T.A. NOs. 777 & 162 OF 2004

Judgment Reserved on : January 10, 2005

% Date of Decision: February 03, 2005

Commissioner of Income Tax

... Petitioner
Through
Ms. Prem Lata Bansal,
Advocate

Versus

M/s Akash Deep Promoters & Developers
Pvt. Ltd.

...Respondent
Through
Nemo.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SWATANTER KUMAR
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MADAN B. LOKUR

1. Whether reporters of local paper may be allowed to see the judgment?
2. To be referred to the reporter or not? No
3. Whether the judgment should be referred in the Digest?

SWATANTER KUMAR, J.

In this appeal under Section 260-A of the Income Tax Act, 1961 (hereinafter referred to as the "Act ") the assessee challenges the legality and correctness of the order dated 29.4.2004 passed by the Income



Tax Appellate Tribunal for the assessment year 2000-2001. The Tribunal while relying upon its earlier order passed in the case of M/s Delhi Towers and Estates (P) Ltd. one of the associate companies of the same developer company held that the assessee company is entitled to deduction of income-tax paid to the developer company.

2. Necessary facts are that the respondent company was engaged in real estate business and for the relevant year it filed a return declaring the loss of Rs.82,030/-. According to the assessee it had paid additional service charges of Rs.5,37,732/- to one of its associate company M/s APIL. The assessing officer found that it had entered into a collaboration agreement with the developer company on 3.12.1991 including various other companies. Relying upon the terms of the agreement the assessing officer was of the view that out of the sale proceeds the assessee company was deducting the cost of the land, arrear of cost of development and service charges payable. After deduction of these expenses notional expenses were further deducted by the assessee so as to restrict the amount of profit to Rs.20,000/- per acre. The nature and character of these notional additional service charges was not disclosed. After invoking the provisions of Section 40A(2)(b) of the Income Tax Act the assessing officer was of the opinion that the services to be rendered by the developer



company was not explained in the agreement for which additional charges were to be paid as such this was not allowed as an expenditure within the provisions of the Act. Disallowing the charges of Rs.5,37,732/- this was added as part of the income. Against the said order of assessment the assessee filed an appeal wherein the CIT (A) deleted the addition made by the assessing officer against which department preferred an appeal before the ITAT which has already dismissed the appeal while relying upon its earlier orders.

3. On the above facts the department in the present appeal has argued that substantial question of law arises in the present case particularly as to whether the order of the Tribunal is perverse in law and on facts as it did not contest the expenditure on the touch stone of Section 37(1) or Section 40A(2) or Section 60 of the Income Tax Act and as such the deletion of the added amount was totally unjustified. At the very outset we may refer to the relevant part of the order passed by the Tribunal which reads as under:

“ Ld. Counsel filed a paper book and submitted that the issue is squarely covered in the case of the assessee by the order of the Tribunal in the case of Delhi Towers and Estates (P) Ltd., 115, Ansal Bhawan, 16, K.G. Marg, New Delhi for assessment year 1992-93. A copy of the Tribunal's order dated 18.06.2003 in IAA No.3388/Del/97 has been filed at pages 62 to 64 of the paper book. Ld. Counsel submitted that additional service charges have been paid by



the said company, M/s. Delhi Towers & Estates (P) Ltd. to the Respondent Companies and deduction of such expenses has been duly allowed in the said case by the Tribunal. Ld. Counsel further submitted that such additional service charges have been allowed by the CIT(A) for the immediately preceding assessment year 1999-2000 as per copy of the order placed at pages 58 to 61 of the paper book. In the said order, CIT (A) has duly taken note of the fact that additional on similar grounds have been deleted in the cases of associates companies for various assessment years. Ld. DR who is present before me, has not been able to rebut the aforesaid submissions of the Ld. Counsel.

5. Respectively following the aforesaid order of the Tribunal and in view of the identical facts and circumstances of the same, I am inclined to concur with the finding of the Ld. CIT(A) in both the cases. The appeals of the revenue are dismissed.”

4. As is clear from bare reading of the above findings of the Tribunal it is apparent that the expenses incurred as additional service charges paid by the company to other companies were permitted to be deducted for the year 1999-2000 and the said order has attained finality. The order passed by the Tribunal in the case of Assistant Commissioner of Income Tax vs. M/s Delhi Towers and Estates P. Ltd., (ITA 3388/97) for the year 1992-1993, it was held that in the absence of any evidence the revenue authorities had failed to prove that the payment fall within the provisions of Section 40A(2) of the Act. Thus the additional service charges added by the assessing officer was deleted. The judgment of the Appellate Tribunal dated 18.6.2003 passed in that case was subject matter



⑥


of an appeal before the High Court in ITA 162/2004 which was dismissed by a Division Bench of this Court vide its order dated 30.4.2004.

5. We have no reason to differ with the view taken by another Division Bench of this Court. The principle of consistency would require that the Court should take similar view which has been taken by another Division Bench unless the decision of the Court was contrary to law or there were compelling circumstances for taking a different view. The facts of the present case are similar to that of M/s Delhi Towers and Estates P. Ltd. (supra) and following the law of precedence we would also dismiss this appeal in limine.

6. The appeal is dismissed.



(SWATANTER KUMAR)
JUDGE



(MADAN B. LOKUR)
JUDGE

February 03, 2005

jsc