

FOUNDER EDITOR

**U.K. BHARGAVA**

EDITOR

**RAKESH BHARGAVA**

HON'Y. COORDINATING EDITORS

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

Taxman weekly comes in Eight volumes.

**Annual Subscription : Rs. 9500 for Eight volumes for the year 2018. Single copy is Rs. 200 only.**

**Back years' volume Rs. 1000 per volume for paper back and add Rs. 100 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

[2018] 255 Taxman...(...)

TOTAL PAGES [104]

# C O N T E N T S

## TAX REPORTS : TABLE OF CASES

- ◆ Arjun Malhotra v. CIT (Delhi) **399**
- ◆ CIT(E) v. Santokba Durlabhji Trust Fund (SC) **368**
- ◆ Kaushalya Devi v. CIT (Delhi) **417**
- ◆ Osho Forge Ltd. v. CIT (Punj. & Har.) **375**
- ◆ Prannoy Roy (Dr.) v. Dy. CIT (Delhi) **369**
- ◆ Pr. CIT v. BNY Mellon International Operations (India) (P.) Ltd. (Bom.) **397**
- ◆ Pr. CIT v. Holcim Services (South Asia) Ltd. (Bom.) **392**
- ◆ Pr. CIT v. TIL Ltd. (Cal.) **373**
- ◆ Sandeep Chandak v. Pr. CIT (SC) **367**
- ◆ Standard Batteries Ltd. v. CIT (Bom.) **380**

## SUBJECT INDEX

### APPELLATE TRIBUNAL

#### ■ Powers of

- *Power to admit additional evidence* - Where assessee filed instant petition challenging validity of Tribunal's order under section 254(2), in view of fact that Tribunal had accepted additional evidence without complying with provisions of rule 29 of ITAT Procedure Rules, impugned order passed by Tribunal became defective and, thus, same was to be set aside - *Dr. Prannoy Roy v. Dy. CIT (Delhi)* **369**

### BLOCK ASSESSMENT

#### ■ Prior approval necessary for assessment in cases of search or requisition

- *Scope of* - Section 153D is only applicable for passing an assessment order or re-assessment order, however, there is no requirement under section 153D for prior approval for complying with remand directions - *Osho Forge Ltd. v. CIT (Punj. & Har.)* **375**

**BUSINESS EXPENDITURE**

---

**■ Allowability of**

- *Commission* - Where revenue challenged order passed by Tribunal allowing assessee's claim of sales commission paid to 'M', an agent in Iraq, on ground that his name figured in Volker Commission Report and payment of commission was not authorised by U.N., since question as to whether particular person was or was not an agent and as to whether he was paid commission was a pure question of fact, impugned order passed by Tribunal did not require any interference - *Pr. CIT v. TIL Ltd. (Cal.)* **373**
- *Software* - Even though computer software is treated as a capital asset and is amendable to depreciation, yet consultancy charges on account of drawings and designs prepared by a particular agency in respect of computer software cannot be treated as capital expense - *Pr. CIT v. TIL Ltd. (Cal.)* **373**
- *Software expenses* - Software expenses incurred by assessee to upgrade computer software which brought greater efficiency in functioning of assessee's business is revenue in nature - *Pr. CIT v. Holcim Services (South Asia) Ltd. (Bom.)* **392**
- *Welfare of employees* - Expenditure incurred by assessee in respect of health and safety measures for benefit of its employees to foster a safe working environment is revenue expenditure - *Pr. CIT v. Holcim Services (South Asia) Ltd. (Bom.)* **392**

**CAPITAL GAINS**

---

**■ Computation of**

- *Substitution by fair market value* - Actual sale consideration could not have been substituted by fair market value of capital asset for taxing capital gains arising out of sale of shares by assessee, an individual to its related entity - *Arjun Malhotra v. CIT (Delhi)* **399**
- *Deductions* - Where assessee earned long term capital gain from sale of property, in view of fact that assessee had to pay certain liquidated damages in term of earlier assessment to sell which did not materialise, it could be concluded that there was a close nexus and connect between payment of liquidated damages and transfer of property resulting in income by way of capital gains, and, thus, amount so paid was eligible for deduction under section 48(i) - *Kaushalya Devi v. CIT (Delhi)* **417**

**CHARITABLE OR RELIGIOUS TRUST**

---

**■ Denial of exemption**

- *Sub-section (1)(d)* - Delay in filing appeal against partial disallowance of assessee's claim for exemption of income under section 11, was to be condoned - *CIT(E) v. Santokba Durlabhji Trust Fund (SC)* **368**

**INCOME-TAX ACT, 1961**

---

- Section 13 **368**
- Section 35AB **380**
- Section 37(1) **373, 392**
- Section 48 **399, 417**
- Section 92C **397**
- Section 153D **375**
- Section 254 **369**
- Section 271AAB **367**

**PENALTY WHERE SEARCH HAS BEEN INITIATED**

- 
- *Applicability of* - Where assessee in course of search admits undisclosed income and manner in which such income has been derived, than provisions of section 271AAB would automatically attract - *Sandeep Chandak v. Pr. CIT (SC)* **367**

**TECHNICAL KNOW-HOW EXPENDITURE**

- 
- *Scope of* - Where assessee made payments in instalments for acquiring technical know-how, it would not cease to be a lump sum payment and, thus, applicability of provisions of section 35AB to assessee's case could not be ruled out - *Standard Batteries Ltd. v. CIT (Bom.)* **380**

**TRANSFER PRICING****■ Computation of arm's length price**

- 
- *Comparables and adjustments/Comparables - Illustrations* - Where assessee was rendering BPO services to AE, a company engaged in distinct activities such as payroll activity, KPO service, development of products and routine IT services, could not be accepted as comparable - *Pr. CIT v. BNY Mellon International Operations (India) (P.) Ltd. (Bom.)* **397**

**MAGAZINE : FEATURES**

- 
- ◆ **Mark to market loss - DT perspective**// *D.C. Agrawal* 63
  - ◆ **Is there any benefit in conversion of inventory into capital asset in view of new Amendments?**// *Mukesh Soni and Deepak Pareek* 67
  - ◆ **Power to Review Vs. Power to Re-assess**// *Jyoti Gupta* 70