

आयकर अपीलीय अधिकरण, जयपुर न्यायपीठ, जयपुर
IN THE INCOME TAX APPELLATE TRIBUNAL, JAIPUR BENCHES, JAIPUR

श्री विजय पाल राव, न्यायिक सदस्य एवं श्री विक्रम सिंह यादव, लेखा सदस्य के समक्ष
BEFORE: SHRI VIJAY PAL RAO, JM & SHRI VIKRAM SINGH YADAV, AM

आयकर अपील सं./ITA No. 92/JP/2015
निर्धारण वर्ष / Assessment Year : 2008-09

M/s Rajasthan State Industrial Development & Investment Corp. Ltd. Udyog Bhawan, Tilk Marge, C-Scheme, Jaipur.	बनाम Vs.	The ACIT, Circle-6 Jaipur.
स्थायी लेखा सं./जीआईआर सं./PAN/GIR No.: AABCR4695J		
अपीलार्थी / Appellant		प्रत्यर्थी / Respondent

आयकर अपील सं./ITA No. 206/JP/2015
निर्धारण वर्ष / Assessment Year : 2008-09

The DCIT, Circle-6 Jaipur.	बनाम Vs.	M/s Rajasthan State Industrial Development & Investment Corp. Ltd. Udyog Bhawan, Tilk Marge, C-Scheme, Jaipur.
स्थायी लेखा सं./जीआईआर सं./PAN/GIR No.: AABCR4695J		
अपीलार्थी / Appellant		प्रत्यर्थी / Respondent

निर्धारिती की ओर से / Assessee by : Shri P.C. Parwal (C.A.)
राजस्व की ओर से / Revenue by : Shri Varindera Mehta (CIT)

सुनवाई की तारीख / Date of Hearing : 25/01/2018
उदघोषणा की तारीख / Date of Pronouncement: 20/02/2018

आदेश / ORDER

PER BENCH:

These cross appeals are directed against the order dated 31.12.2014 of Id. CIT (A), Jaipur for A.Y. 2008-09. The assessee has raised the following grounds as under:-

- "1. The Ld. Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeals) has erred on facts and in law in confirming the validity of order passed u/s 147.*
- 2. The Ld. Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeals) has erred on facts and in law in confirming the disallowance of claim of deduction u/s 80IA in respect of other income on the ground that same is not derived from an eligible business.*
- 3. The Ld. Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeals) has erred on facts and in law in confirming the disallowance of Rs. 17,56,304 u/s 14A by application of Rule 8D(2)(iii) of the IT Rules. He has further erred in applying Rule 8D(2)(iii) by holding that the word 'investment' used in this Rule would include shares/securities held as stock in tread.*
- 4. The assessee craves right to add, alter or amend any of the grounds of the appeals.*
- 5. The appropriate cost be awarded to the assessee."*

The Revenue has raised the following grounds as under:-

- "1. Whether on the facts and circumstances of the case, the Id. CIT(A) was justified in allowing set-off of lossess of units of Rs. 1,36,34,565/- of earlier years from gross deduction u/s 80A (4) of Rs. 98,13,07,575/- instead of Rs. 95,11,66,028/- claimed by the assessee.*
- 2. Whether on the facts and circumstances of the case, the Id. CIT(A) was justified in allowing deduction u/s 80IA on interest income including penal interest income and on other income.*

3. Whether on the facts and circumstances of the case, the Id. CIT(A) was justified in allowing relief to the assessee out of addition u/s 14A of Income Tax Act.

4. The appellant craves its rights to add, amend or alter any of the grounds on or before the hearing."

2. Ground Nos. 1 to 3 of appeal filed by the assessee are regarding validity of reopening of the assessment. The assessee filed its return of income on 24.09.2008 declaring income of Rs. 81.29 Crores after claiming deduction u/s 80IA(4)(iii) of the Act to the tune of Rs. 95.11 Crores. The AO accepted the claim of deduction 80IA of the Act while completing assessment u/s 143(3) on 22.12.2010. Thereafter the AO proposed to rectify the order by issuing a notice u/s 154 on 08.06.2012 on the issue of excess deduction u/s 80IA was allowed without adjusting the loss of previous year amounting to Rs. 1,36,34,565/- in respect of two units. The assessee filed its reply dated 15.06.2012 and explained that even after adjustment of the loss of Rs. 1,36,34,565/- the eligible profit for deduction u/s 80IA would be more than the claim of Rs. 95.11 Crores allowed in the original assessment. The AO then issued notice u/s 148 dated 21.11.2012 for the reasons that while calculating the deduction u/s 80IA the assessee has not considered the loss of Rs. 1,36,34,565/- in respect of two units. The assessee again

raised the objections against the notice issued u/s 148 but the AO did not accept the objection of the assessee and passed the reassessment order u/s 143(3) r.w.s. 147 on 09.01.2014. The assessee challenged the validity of reopening of the AO before the Id. CIT(A) but could not succeed.

3. Before us, Id. AR of the assessee has submitted that the assessee vide its letter dated 17.09.2013 explained that in the course of assessment proceedings complete details of working of deduction u/s 80IA along with the audit certificate were filed. In these details the loss in respect of two units was separately reflected and the assessee even has not claimed deduction u/s 80IA of Rs. 3,01,41,548/- in respect of 7 units though there is no withdrawal of notification. Thus, Id. AR has submitted that the assessee pointed out that even when the earlier loss of Rs. Rs. 1,36,34,565/- in respect of two units is set off against the profits of these two units in this year, the eligible deduction would be Rs. 96.76 Crores as against Rs. 95.12 Crores allowed by the AO. Hence, the assessee contended that there is no escapement so as to warrant issue notice u/s 148 of the Act. The Id. AR has further contended that the assessment u/s 147 can be made only when the AO has reason to believe that any income chargeable to tax has escaped assessment. As

per explanation 2 an income has been made a subject matter of excessive relief under this Act, the same would be deemed to be a case where income chargeable to tax has escaped assessment. In the case of the assessee the profit of Industrial undertaking on which deduction u/s 80IA was allowed of Rs. 98.13 Crores but after considering the previous year loss of Rs. 1,36,34,565/- the current deduction u/s 80IA of the Act is eligible to the assessee comes to Res. 96.76 Crores. As against this, the assessee has claimed deduction u/s 80IA of Rs. 95.11 Crores. Therefore, the assessee was not allowed any excessive relief under the Act nor has the income chargeable to tax has been under assessed. The assessee filed complete details of claim of deduction u/s 80IA along with the audit financial statement of each undertaking with audited report in Form No. 10CCB vide letter dated 14.07.2010. Therefore, the AO allowed the claim after considering the material on record including details as well as audited financial statements of each undertaking along with audit report. The Id. AR has thus submitted that where the AO initiated the proceedings u/s 154 which was pending then initiating proceeding u/s 147 for taxing the same income is only a change of opinion. In support of his contention he has relied upon the following decisions:-

- **Berger Paints India Ltd. vs. DCIT 322 ITR 369 (Cal.)**
- **Mahinder Freight Carrier vs. DCIT 56 DTR 247 (Mum.)**
- **Sterilite Industries India Ltd. vs. ACIT 209 Taxmann 76 (Mad)**

The Id. AR has submitted that in the above cited decision it was held that while proceeding u/s 154 were pending the initiation of proceeding u/s 147 on the same issue is not permissible as there cannot be parallel proceedings on the same issue.

4. On the other hand, Id. DR has submitted that there is no estoppel against issuing the notice u/s 148 of the Act even where the proceeding u/s 154 are pending. He has further submitted that once the AO issued notice u/s 148 of the Act on the same issue it amounts to closer of the proceedings u/s 154 of the Act. Since, the issue could not be adjudicated u/s 154 due to the limited jurisdiction and debatable issue and limitation of scope of section u/s 154 of the Act , therefore, the AO dropped the proceeding u/s 154 and initiated the appropriate proceeding u/s 148 of the Act. He has further submitted that there is no dispute that in computation of deduction u/s 80IA of the Act the assessee did not adjust the earlier year loss of Rs. 1,36,34,565/- in respect of two units and therefore it was detected by the AO after

completion u/s 143(3) of the Act. The New fact came to the knowledge of the AO are sufficient to form the belief that income assessable to tax has escaped assessment to the extent of loss of Rs. Rs. 1,36,34,565/- was not adjusted against the profit before claiming the deduction u/s 80IA of the Act. He has relied upon the orders of the authorities below.

5. We have considered the rival submissions as well as relevant material on record. The scrutiny assessment u/s 143(3) was completed on 22.12.2010 whereby the AO accepted the claim of deduction u/s 80IA of Rs. 95,11,66,038/-. Thereafter, the AO issued a notice u/s 154/155 of the Act dated 8.06.2012 to rectify the mistake of not adjusting the loss of the previous year of Rs. Rs. 1,36,34,565/- in respect of two units while allowing the deduction u/s 80IA of the Act. For ready reference we reproduce the gist of the notice issue u/s 154 dated 08.06.2012 as under:-

*"Notice under Section 154 of the Income Tax Act, 1961
The assessment/refund order u/s 143(3) for the assessment year 2008-09 made on 22.12.2010 requires to be amended as there is a mistake apparent from the record within the meaning of Section 154/155 of the Income Tax Act, 1961. The rectification of the mistake, as per particulars given below, will have the effect of enhancing the assessment/reducing the refund/increasing your liability.*

In respect of allowing units loss of A.Y. 2007-08 has been not set off an per provisions of Sec. 80IA CS before the profit of the subsequent year as under:-

<i>S.No.</i>	<i>Unit</i>	<i>Initial year</i>	<i>Profit of the year 08-09</i>	<i>Loss of the A.Y. 07-08</i>
<i>1.</i>	<i>EPIP Sitapura-1st</i>	<i>A.Y. 2005-06</i>	<i>Rs. 16770973</i>	<i>Rs. 5020008</i>
<i>2.</i>	<i>Borhada</i>	<i>A.Y. 2005-06</i>	<i>Rs. 38561187</i>	<i>Rs. 8614556</i>
			<i>Total</i>	<i>1,36,34,564</i>

It is apparent from the notice u/s 154 of the Act that the AO proposed to rectify the mistake in respect of the loss of Rs. Rs. 1,36,34,564/- to be adjusted against the profits of the eligible undertaking for deduction u/s 80IA of the Act. In response to the said notice issued u/s 154 the assessee filed its reply dated 15.06.2012 as under:-

" We are in receipt of your aforesaid notice in which you have propose to reduce deduction u/s 80IA by Rs. Rs. 1,36,34,564/-, in this connection we are to submit that during the year assessee has claimed deduction u/s 80IA in respect of various industrial area and for which audit certificate u/s 80IA has also been submitted during the course of assessment proceedings completed u/s 143(3). Total eligible profit u/s 80IA of all these industrial area works out to Rs. 98,13,07,585/- against which assessee has claimed deduction u/s 80IA at Rs. 95,11,66,037/-. If the loss of two unit i.e. EPIP, Sitapura & Boranada of Rs. 1,36,34,564/- is considered while working out eligible amount of deduction u/s 80IA then eligible deduction works out to Rs.

96,76,73,021/- (98,13,07,585- 1,36,34,564) against which assessee has claimed deduction u/s 80IA at Rs. 95,11,66,037/- only. Since assessee has already claimed deduction u/s 80IA at lesser amount as compared to computed by your good self, thus there is no need to make any adjustment u/s 154/155."

Thus, the assessee clearly explained that the profit of the assessee eligible deduction u/s 80IA is Rs. 96,76,73,021/- even after the adjustment of the said loss of Rs. 1,36,34,564/-. Hence, the deduction allowed in the assessment order of Rs. 95,11,66,037/- is not a mistake as stated in the notice u/s 154 of the Act. The AO then issued notice u/s 148 of the Act on 21.11.2012 by recording the reasons as under:-

" Reasons for initiating proceedings u/s147 and issue of notice u/s 148 of the I.T. Act, 1961 in the case of M/s Rajasthan State Industrial Development & Investment Corporation Ltd., Jaipur (PAN No. AABCR4695 A.Y. 2008-09.

The assessment in case was completed u/s 143(3) on 22.12.2010. Later it has been noticed that the assessee has worked out Deduction u/s 80IA in respect of various eligible projects at Rs. 98,13,07,575/-. However, it has claimed the deduction at Rs. 95,11,66,028/- anticipating that deduction allowed in earlier years to certain units may be withdrawn (though not withdrawn till date). While calculating the deduction u/s 80IA the assessee has not considered the loss in respect of two units viz. Sitapura EPIP-I at SEZ Boranada amounting to Rs. 50,20,009/- and Rs. 86,14,565/- respectively totaling to Rs. 1,36,34,565/- which would have further reduced from Rs. 95,11,66,028/- while working out the deduction u/s 80IA.

- 2. In view of above facts and circumstances I have sufficient reasons to believe that an amount of Rs. 1,36,34,565/- has escaped assessment within the meaning of sec. 147 of the I.T. Act, 1961.*
- 3. Issue notice u/s 148 for the A.Y. 2008-09 in which the sand transaction falls."*

It is apparent that the reasons for issuing the notice u/s 154 as well as the reasons recorded for reopening of the assessment u/s 147/148 of the Act are same to re-compute the deduction u/s 80IA after adjustment of loss of Rs. 1,36,34,564/-. The assessee has raised a legal objection against the initiation of proceeding u/s 147/148 while the proceeding u/s 154 of the Act were pending and not reached to the finality either by dropping the same or passing any order u/s 154 of the Act, the initiation of proceeding u/s 147/148 is not permissible. The Bench asked the Id. CIT DR to produce the assessment record to show that the status of the proceeding u/s 154 on the date of initiating of proceedings u/s 147/148 of the Act. It was found that the AO has not passed any order either for dropping the proceeding or concluding the proceeding u/s 154 prior to issuing notice u/s 148 of the Act. Thus, it is not disputed that there is no record of closing the proceeding u/s 154 of the Act. There is no quarrel that the doctrine of estoppel is not applicable against the initiation of proceedings u/s 147/148 even when

the AO initiated the proceedings u/s 154 of the Act. However, when the issue in the two proceedings initiated u/s 154 as well as u/s 147 of the Act is the same than without considering the proceeding u/s 154 of the Act the AO cannot initiate parallel proceeding u/s 147/148 of the Act on the same issue. The Hon'ble Madras High Court in case of Sterilite Industries India Ltd. vs. ACIT(supra) while dealing with an identical issue of jurisdiction of the AO has held in paras 28 o 30 as under:-

"28. As already pointed out, in respect of the assessment year 2003-04, the first respondent herein issued notice under Section 154 on 20.7.2006, wherein, the Officer proposed to disallow the claim under Section 80 HHC, provision for bad debts and diminution of value of current investment and income tax debited in respect of Section 115 JB assessment and on the regular assessment under Section 143(3) in respect of the alleged mistake in granting deduction under Section 80 IB, for income tax and wealth tax debited in the profit and loss account and the share issue expenses and FRN issue expenses written off to be disallowed, being capital in nature.

29. A reading of the notice under Section 154 of the Act and the reassessment notice dated 11th May 2009 shows that there is absolutely no material difference on the issues sought to be considered under these notices, except the fact that while in the proceedings under Section 154, the notice is based on the view that there was a mistake apparent on the face of the record warranting a rectification, the proceedings under Section 147 alleged that by reason of the untrue and incorrect particulars given by the assessee, there had been an escapement of tax. Given the fact that the area of operation of both these provisions are on totally different fields, the simultaneous assumption of

jurisdiction under Sections 154 and 147 on the self same issue, plainly shows the contradiction in the reasoning of the second respondent and as without logic or reason.

30. *As rightly pointed out by the learned senior counsel appearing for the petitioner placing reliance on the decision reported in Premier Automobiles Ltd. (supra), when once the assessment order has been the subject matter of rectification under Section 154, the self same issue cannot be the subject matter of reassessment by taking recourse to Section 147 of the Act. Thus, on the facts that are available today, as far as the assessment year 2003-2004 is concerned, there are two proceedings, one under Section 154 and another under Section 147 of the Act. The jurisdiction given under both the Sections thus operating on different fields, (as far as this assessment year is concerned), and with the doubt in the mind of the Officer as to which direction he has to go, I have no hesitation in holding that the notice lacks the very basis for assumption of jurisdiction under Section 147 of the Act. For the reasons that there cannot be two parallel proceedings on the self same issue as one based on the view that there were materials available on record which warranted exercise of jurisdiction under Section 154 and the other initiated under Section 147 that there was escapement of income from tax on account of the failure of the assessee from disclosing the full and correct particulars, I have no hesitation in quashing the notice on reassessment."*

The Hon'ble High Court as held that then cannot be two parallel proceedings on the self same issue as are based on the view that there were materials available on record which warranted exercise of jurisdiction u/s 154 and the other initiated u/s 147 that there was escapement of income from tax. The Mumbai Bench of the Tribunal in

case of Mahinder Freight Carrier vs. DCIT 129 ITD 278 has held in para 10 as under:-

"10. In this case, the Assessing Officer initiated the proceeding under section 154 of the Act and said proceeding, as per record, has not reached the finality, either by dropping the same or passing any order in the said proceeding. As per the reasons recorded by the Assessing Officer as the assessee did not respond to the notice issued under section 154, the Assessing Officer initiated the proceedings under section 147 and in consequence issued the notice under section 148. It is also admitted fact that except the return of income of the assessee and its enclosures, no other extra material or information was in possession of the Assessing Officer. It is true that the assessee filed the return of income in response to the notice issued by the Assessing Officer under section 148 of the Act showing the rental income as an income from house property, but the assessee has every right to challenge proceeding initiated by the Assessing Officer under section 147 of the Act. Now it is well-settled principle by different judicial pronouncements that there cannot be any 'estoppel' against the statutory provisions. Admittedly, in this case, the mandate of section 147 is not fulfilled for the reasons that the Assessing Officer himself was not sure whether the issue in controversy could be the subject-matter of section 154 or the same can be the subject-matter of proceedings under section 147. Ld. D.R. placed his heavy reliance in the case of Damodar H. Shah(supra). In the said case the Hon'ble High Court has explained in details the difference between section 154 viz-a-viz section 147. As per said decision there is no bar to evoke section 147 but Assessing Officer has to demonstrate why he was required to do so. Nothing has been demonstrated by Assessing Officer in this case. In our opinion, for the reasons given above, the Assessing Officer was not justified in issuing the notice to the assessee under section 148 and we, accordingly,

hold the same as void ab initio and quash the proceedings initiated by the Assessing Officer under section 147. Accordingly, this issue is decided in favour of the assessee and Ground Nos. 1 to 3 are allowed. As the assessee succeeds on the issue of the validity of the notice under section 148, we do not consider it necessary to go into the merits of the case."

It is manifest from the record that all relevant materials and facts necessary for assessments were available with the Assessing officer at the time of original assessee passed u/s 143(3) of the Act and further the claim of deduction allowed while passing the order u/s 143(3) would not be excessive even if proposed adjustment of loss of previous year is made against the profit of the current year. The assessee reminded the AO in its reply to the notice u/s 154 that even after the adjustment of loss of Rs. 1.36 Crores allowable deduction would be more than Rs. 95.11 Crores allowed in the original assessment. Thereafter, the AO without bringing the proceedings u/s 154 of the IT Act to a logical conclusion had initiated the proceedings u/s 147 of the Act on the basis of the same fact and material available on the assessment record. Thus, reopening on the basis of the material available on assessment record is nothing but based on change of opinion. The Hon'ble Calcutta High Court in case of Berger Paints India Ltd. vs. DCIT (supra) has held in paras 42 to 53 are as under:-

"42. *However, if the Assessing Officer is of the view that income has escaped assessment by reason of a mistake apparent from records, and takes recourse to section 154, but finds later, that there is no apparent mistake, then he cannot, in the absence of any other ground on the basis of which he still has reason to believe that the income has escaped assessment, start reassessment proceedings under section 147 of the Act. In other words, the Assessing Officer cannot again start reassessment proceedings on the basis of the same reasons.*

43. *The Assessing Officer has not disclosed the reasons for the Assessing Officer to still believe that income that was the subject-matter of rectification had still escaped assessment though that was not due to any obvious mistake, borne out from existing records.*

44. *The judgment in GKN Driveshafts (India) Ltd. v. ITO reported in [\[2003\] 259 ITR 19](#), cited by Mr. Bhowmik was rendered by the Supreme Court in the particular facts of that case. The Supreme Court held (page 20) :*

"We see no justifiable reason to interfere with the order under challenge. However, we clarify that when a notice under section 148 of the Income-tax Act is issued, the proper course of action for the noticee is to file a return and if he so desires, to seek reasons for issuing notices. The Assessing Officer is bound to furnish reasons within a reasonable time. On receipt of reasons) the noticee is entitled to file objections to issuance of notice and the Assessing Officer is bound to dispose of the same by passing a speaking order. In the instant case, as the reasons have been disclosed in these proceedings, the Assessing Officer has to dispose of the objections, if filed, by passing a speaking order, before proceeding with the assessment in respect of the abovesaid five assessment years."

45. *The condition precedent for initiation of reassessment proceedings is, in any case, the formation of the belief, based on new materials that any income had escaped assessment. A notice*

under section 148 of the Income-tax Act may not be issued merely on change of opinion.

46. *In normal circumstances, on receipt of a notice of reassessment under section 148 of the Income-tax Act, the assessee should file a return, ask for the reasons and then file its objection. However, where the condition precedent for issuance of a notice are absent, the notice might be challenged by filing a writ petition under article 226 of the Constitution of India.*

47. *In Calcutta Discount Co. Ltd. v. ITO [1961] 41 ITR 201, the Supreme Court held that in exercise of power under article 226, the court might examine whether the conditions precedent for exercise of jurisdiction to reassess existed. The Supreme Court, inter alia, held as follows (page 207 and 208) :*

"The existence of such alternative remedy is not however always a sufficient reason for refusing a party quick relief by a writ or order prohibiting an authority acting without jurisdiction from continuing such action.

In the present case, the company contends that the conditions precedent for the assumption of jurisdiction under section 34 were not satisfied and came to the court at the earliest opportunity. There is nothing in its conduct which would justify the refusal or proper relief under article 226. When the Constitution confers on the High Courts the power to give relief it becomes the duty of the courts to give such relief in fit cases and the courts would be failing to perform their duty if relief is refused without adequate reasons."

48. *Moreover, in this case, where the writ petition had been entertained and kept pending for about six years and directions issued for filing of affidavits, this court is not inclined to decline relief only on the ground of existence of an alternative remedy of filing an objection before the Assessing Officer and then taking recourse to an appeal upon reassessment.*

49. *In Raymond Woollen Mills Ltd. v. ITO reported in [\[1999\] 236 ITR 34 \(SC\)](#) cited by Mr. Bhowmick, the Supreme Court was satisfied on facts that jurisdiction to reassess had validly been assumed.*

50. *If there are reasons to believe that income has escaped assessment, and jurisdiction to issue notice of reassessment under section 148 of the Income-tax Act has been exercised, the court ought not to weigh the sufficiency of the reasons in exercise of its extraordinary writ jurisdiction under article 226 of the Constitution of India.*

51. *The court may, however, in exercise of its power of judicial review examine whether the conditions precedent for exercise of jurisdiction to reopen assessment at all exist. In the absence of any new and/or fresh materials, on the basis of which the Assessing Officer could have formed the opinion that income has escaped assessment, the Assessing Officer lacked jurisdiction to reopen assessment.*

52. *The reassessment notice has been issued for virtually the same reasons for which rectification proceedings had earlier been initiated but dropped. The Assessing Officer has not disclosed any new materials for reopening assessment. Assessment cannot be reopened merely on change of opinion, as has apparently been done in this case. The Assessing Officer on being satisfied that there was no apparent error in computation of income, on the basis of existing records, dropped the rectification proceedings. In the absence of any new and/or fresh materials and in the absence of any reason for formation of belief that even otherwise, income had escaped assessment even though there was no apparent mistake or error, the Assessing Officer lacked jurisdiction to issue the impugned notice.*

53. *For the reasons discussed above, the impugned notice under section 148 of the Income-tax Act is set aside. The writ petition is disposed of accordingly."*

In view of the above discussion as well as the decisions cited (supra) we are of the considered opinion that the reopening is not sustainable when the proceedings u/s 154 of the Act were pending on the same issue. Accordingly, we set aside the initiation of proceeding u/s 147/148 of the Act and consequential reassessment order. As we have set aside the initiation of proceeding u/s 147/148 and consequential reassessment order, therefore, the other grounds raised on the merits becomes infructuous.

In the result, the appeal of the assessee is allowed and Revenue appeal is dismissed.

Order pronounced in the open court on 20/02/2018

Sd/
(विक्रम सिंह यादव)
(Vikram Singh Yadav)
लेखा सदस्य / Accountant Member

Sd/-
(विजय पाल राव)
(Vijay Pal Rao)
न्यायिक सदस्य / Judicial Member

जयपुर / Jaipur

दिनांक / Dated:- 20/02/2018.

*Santosh.

आदेश की प्रतिलिपि अग्रेषित / Copy of the order forwarded to:

1. अपीलार्थी / The Appellant- M/s Rajasthan State Industrial Development & Investment Corp. Ltd, Jaipur.
2. प्रत्यर्थी / The Respondent- ACIT/DCIT, Circle-6, Jaipur.
3. आयकर आयुक्त / CIT
4. आयकर आयुक्त / CIT(A)
5. विभागीय प्रतिनिधि, आयकर अपीलीय अधिकरण, जयपुर / DR, ITAT, Jaipur.

6. गार्ड फाईल / Guard File {ITA No. 92 & 206/JP/2015}

आदेशानुसार / By order,

सहायक पंजीकार / Asst. Registrar