

**IN THE INCOME TAX APPELLATE TRIBUNAL,
MUMBAI BENCH "SMC", MUMBAI**

BEFORE SHRI D.T. GARASIA, JUDICIAL MEMBER

**ITA Nos.5056 & 5057/M/2017
Assessment Years: 2009-10 & 2010-11**

Shri Noorjahan Niyaz Ahmed Khan, Room No.3, Sangam Market, Netaji Nagar, 90 Feet Rd., Sakinaka, Mumbai-400 072 PAN: ALVPK4821H	Vs.	ITO - 26(2)(3), C-12, Rm No.603, 6 th Floor, Pratyakshkar Bhavan, Bandra (E), Mumbai – 400 051
(Appellant)		(Respondent)

Present for:

Assessee by : Shri Hariprasad Chaurasia, A.R.
Revenue by : Smt. N. Hemalatha, D.R.

Date of Hearing : 06.11.2017
Date of Pronouncement : 30.11.2017

ORDER

Per D.T. Garasia, Judicial Member:

The above titled appeals have been preferred by the assessee against the orders dated 24.04.2017 and 27.04.2017 of the Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeals) [hereinafter referred to as the CIT(A)] relevant to assessment years 2009-10 & 2010 & 11 respectively.

ITA No.5056/M/2017 for A.Y. 2009-10

2. The brief facts of the case are that the assessee is an individual engaged in business of manufacturing of M.S. Washer in the name and style of Riyaz Engineering Works. During the year the Assessing Officer (hereinafter referred to as the AO) found that assessee had made bogus purchases from following parties:

Sr. No.	Name of the party	Amount of Purchase (Rs)
1.	Siddhivinayak Steel	6,50,059/-
2.	Chanchal Tube Corporation	18,50,595/-
3.	Asian Steel	1,50,004/-
4.	Surat Tube Corporation	23,66,350/-
5.	Gulab Trading Co.	1,20,062/-
		51,37,070/-

3. The assessee was asked to produce the above parties for verification. There was no compliance of notice under section 133(6). Therefore, the AO has made the addition on account of bogus purchases of Rs.51,37,070/-.

4. Matter carried to the Ld. CIT(A) and the Ld. CIT(A) has dismissed the claim of the assessee.

5. I have heard the rival contentions of both the parties. Ld. D.R. relied upon the decision of the Tribunal, Ahmedabad Bench in the cases of Shwetambar Steels vs. ITO Ahmedabad and Ganesh Rice Mills vs. CIT (294 ITR 316). The facts in the present case show that assessee could not produce the parties from whom goods are stated to have been purchased. The suppliers were found to be engaged in providing bogus bill without actual dealing of goods. In this regard, the assessee has stated that they had submitted quantitative details of stock with respect of the sales with purchases from the parties during the assessment proceedings. The assessee has submitted the detail of corresponding sales in respect of the purchase from the said parties. As mentioned above the AO has never disputed or examined the

aspect of sales receipts. Since the sales made by the assessee was not doubted or disputed by the AO and he has accepted the sales receipts of the assessee as it is, therefore, the AO cannot deny that purchases were not made by the assessee and the material was not used for its sales. What is under dispute is the purchases from the parties from whom bills have been taken and cheques have been issued to them. Purchases are not in dispute but the parties from whom purchase are shown to have been made are disputed and suspicious. The AO had made the addition as some of the suppliers were declared hawala dealers by the VAT Department. This may be a good reason for making further investigation but the AO did not make any further investigation and merely completed the assessment on suspicion. Once the assessee has brought on record the details of payments by account payee cheque, it was incumbent on the AO to have verified the payment details from the bank of the assessee and also from the bank of the suppliers to verify whether there was any immediate cash withdrawal from their account. No such exercise has been done or findings recorded. There was no detailed investigation made by the AO himself. It is also found that the payments have been made by account payee cheque which are duly reflected in the bank statement of the assessee. There is no evidence to show that the assessee has received cash back from the suppliers. Merely because the suppliers did not appear before the AO or some confirmation letters were not furnished, one cannot conclude that the purchases were not made by the assessee. This view is supported by the decision of *Nikunj Eximp Enterprises vs. CIT 216 Taxman 171 (Bom)*. To this extent, I am of

the view that if the assessee has fulfilled its onus of making the payment by cheque and has supplied the addresses of the sellers then it cannot be presumed that supplier were bogus simply because the sellers were not found at the given address. There is a considerable time gap between the period of purchase transaction and period of scrutiny proceedings. The AO has not brought any material on record to show that there is suppression of sales. It is basic rule of accountancy as well as of taxation laws that profit from business cannot be ascertained without deducting cost of purchase from sales. Estimation of profit ranging from 12.5% to 15% has been upheld by the Hon'ble Gujarat High Court in the case of CIT vs Simit P Sheth 356 ITR 451 (Guj.). Respectfully following the decision of Hon'ble Gujarat High Court in the case of CIT vs. Simit P. Sheth 38 taxman 385 (Guj), I direct the AO to take the GP @ 12.5% of the purchases.

6. In the result, assessee's appeal is partly allowed.

ITA No.5057/M/2017 for A.Y. 2010-11

7. In this appeal, during the year, the AO found that assessee had made purchases from following parties:

Sr. No.	Name of the party	Amount of Purchase (Rs)
1.	Siddhivinayak Steel	5,70,149/-
2.	Chanchal Tube Corporation	5,80,300/-
3.	Surat Tube Corporation	4,50,024/-
4.	Asian Steel	8,00,829/-
5.	Gulab Trading Co.	1,04,000/-
6.	Laxmi Trading Co.	9,65,723/-
		34,71,025/-

8. I find that the assessee has taken the identical grounds in ITA No.5056/M/2017 for A.Y. 2009-10 and the same have already been decided as above. Hence, respectfully following the decision of Hon'ble Gujarat High Court in the case of CIT vs. Simit P. Sheth 38 taxman 385 (Guj), I direct the AO to take the GP @ 12.5% of the purchases.

9. In the result, both the appeals of assessee are partly allowed.

Order pronounced in the open court on 30.11.2017.

**Sd/-
(D.T. Garasia)
JUDICIAL MEMBER**

Mumbai, Dated: 30.11.2017.

* Kishore, Sr. P.S.

Copy to: The Appellant
The Respondent
The CIT, Concerned, Mumbai
The CIT (A) Concerned, Mumbai
The DR Concerned Bench

//True Copy//

By Order

Dy/Asstt. Registrar, ITAT, Mumbai.