

आयकर अपीलीय अधिकरण, 'बी' न्यायपीठ, चेन्नई

IN THE INCOME TAX APPELLATE TRIBUNAL  
'B' BENCH, CHENNAI

श्री एन.आर.एस. गणेशन, न्यायिक सदस्य एवं श्री एस. जयरामन, लेखा सदस्य केसमक्ष

BEFORE SHRI N.R.S. GANESAN, JUDICIAL MEMBER AND  
SHRI S. JAYARAMAN, ACCOUNTANT MEMBER

आयकर अपील सं./ITA No.135/Chny/2019  
निर्धारण वर्ष /Assessment Year : 2015-16

Ms. Suchita Raju Mehta,  
40/41, Ranga Nivas,  
Barnaby Road, Kilpauk,  
Chennai - 600 010.

v. The Income Tax Officer,  
Non Corporate Ward 10(4),  
Chennai.

PAN : ARJPS 7890 Q

(अपीलार्थी/Appellant)

(प्रत्यर्थी/Respondent)

अपीलार्थी की ओर से / Appellant by : Shri K. Balasubramanian,  
Advocate

प्रत्यर्थी की ओर से / Respondent by : Ms.G.D. Jayanthi Angayarkanni,  
JCIT

सुनवाई की तारीख / Date of Hearing : 19.08.2019

घोषणा की तारीख / Date of Pronouncement : 11.10.2019

### **आदेश /ORDER**

**PER N.R.S. GANESAN, JUDICIAL MEMBER:**

This appeal of the assessee is directed against the order of the Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeals) -12, Chennai, dated 19.11.2018 and pertains to assessment year 2015-16.

2. Shri K. Balasubramanian, the Ld.counsel for the assessee, submitted that the assessee claimed exemption under Section 10(38) of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (in short 'the Act') in respect of long term capital gains arising out of sale of shares to the extent of ₹9,29,100/-. In fact, according to the Ld. counsel, the assessee invested in shares of M/s Shubham Granites Ltd., which was subsequently changed to Blazon Marbles Ltd. The Ld. counsel further submitted that the Assessing Officer mainly placed his reliance on the investigation report of Directorate of Investigation, Kolkata. According to the Ld. counsel, a copy of the said investigation report was not furnished to the assessee. Therefore, the Ld. counsel submitted that an opportunity may be given to the assessee by remitting back the matter to the file of the Assessing Officer.

3. On the contrary, Ms. G.D. Jayanthi Angayarkanni, the Ld. Departmental Representative, submitted that she is placing reliance on the orders of the Assessing Officer as well as the CIT(Appeals).

4. We have considered the rival submissions on either side and perused the relevant material available on record. The assessee made investments in the shares of M/s Blazon Marbles Ltd. From the order of the Assessing Officer it appears that the assessee sold

18000 shares of M/s Blazon Marbles Ltd. and on sale of these shares, the assessee disclosed long term capital gains to the extent of ₹9,29,100/-. This was disallowed by the Assessing Officer on the ground that the company in which the assessee invested is a penny stock company. However, it is not brought on record how the assessee is involved in promoting the penny stock company and how the assessee involved in inflating the shares of the company. Moreover, the copy of the investigation report said to be received from the Investigation Wing of the Department at Kolkata was not furnished to the assessee. On identical circumstances, this Tribunal in the case of Kanhaiyalal & Sons (HUF) v. ITO in I.T.A. No.1849/Chny/2018, has remitted back the matter to the file of the Assessing Officer for reconsideration. In fact, this Tribunal has observed at para 4 of its order dated 06.02.2019 as follows:-

“4. We heard Shri AR.V. Sreenivasan, the Ld. Departmental Representative also. Admittedly, the Assessing Officer disallowed the claim of the assessee on the basis of the information said to be received from the Investigation Wing of the Department at Kolkata with regard to investment made by the assessee in the penny stock company. It is not in dispute that a copy of the investigation report said to be received from Kolkata was not furnished to the assessee. Moreover, details of the enquiries said to be made by the Assessing Officer were also not furnished to the assessee. In those circumstances, this Tribunal

is of the considered opinion that the Assessing Officer has to reconsider the issue afresh after furnishing the material relied upon by the Assessing Officer. Accordingly, the orders of both the authorities below are set aside and the entire issue is remitted back to the file of the Assessing Officer. The Assessing Officer shall bring on record the role of the assesseees in promoting the company and the relationship of the assesseees, if any with the promoters, role of the assesseees in inflating the price of shares, etc. The Assessing Officer shall also furnish a copy of the investigation report said to be received from the Investigation Wing of the Department at Kolkata and other materials if anything in his possession and thereafter decide the issue afresh in accordance with law, after giving a reasonable opportunity to the assesseees.”

5. In view of the above, this Tribunal is of the considered opinion that the matter needs to be re-examined by the Assessing Officer. Accordingly, orders of both the authorities below are set aside and the issue raised by the assessee with regard to deduction under Section 10(38) of the Act is remitted back to the file of the Assessing Officer. The Assessing Officer shall examine the matter as directed by this Tribunal in the case of Kanhaiyalal & Sons (HUF) (supra) and thereafter decide the issue afresh in accordance with law, after giving a reasonable opportunity to the assessee.

6. In the result, the appeal filed by the assessee is allowed for statistical purposes.

Order pronounced in the court on 11<sup>th</sup> October, 2019 at Chennai.

sd/-

(एस. जयरामन)

(S. Jayaraman)

लेखा सदस्य/Accountant Member

sd/-

(एन.आर.एस. गणेशन)

(N.R.S. Ganesan)

न्यायिक सदस्य/Judicial Member

चेन्नई/Chennai,

दिनांक/Dated, the 11<sup>th</sup> October, 2019.

Kri.

आदेश की प्रतिलिपि अग्रेषित/Copy to:

1. अपीलार्थी/Appellant
2. प्रत्यर्थी/Respondent
3. आयकर आयुक्त (अपील)/CIT(A)-12, Chennai
4. Principal CIT-3, Chennai
5. विभागीय प्रतिनिधि/DR
6. गार्ड फाईल/GF.