

आयकर अपीलीय अधिकरण, 'सी' न्यायपीठ, चेन्नई
IN THE INCOME TAX APPELLATE TRIBUNAL, 'C' BENCH : CHENNAI

श्री इंटूरी रामा राव, लेखा सदस्य एवं
श्री धुव्वुरु आर.एल रेड्डी, न्यायिक सदस्य के समक्ष

[BEFORE SHRI INTURI RAMA RAO, ACCOUNTANT MEMBER
AND SHRI DUVVURU RL REDDY, JUDICIAL MEMBER]

आयकर अपील सं./I.T.A. No.3102/CHNY/2017.
निर्धारण वर्ष /Assessment year : 2014-2015.

Shri. Sriramulu,
Mettu Street,
Kalingamalai Village,
Vazhuthavur Post,
Villupuram Taluk 605 502.

Vs. The Income Tax Officer,
Ward -1,
Villupuram.

[PAN DBWPS 2992M]
(अपीलार्थी/Appellant)

(प्रत्यर्थी/Respondent)

अपीलार्थी की ओर से/ Appellant by : None
प्रत्यर्थी की ओर से /Respondent by : Shri. J. Pavithran Kumar, JCIT.

सुनवाई की तारीख/Date of Hearing : 11-12-2019
घोषणा की तारीख /Date of Pronouncement : 12-12-2019

आदेश / ORDER

PER INTURI RAMA RAO, ACCOUNTANT MEMBER

This is an appeal filed by the assessee directed against
the order of the Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeals)- Puducherry,

('CIT(A)' for short) dated 11.10.2017 for the Assessment Year (AY) 2014-2015.

2. The brief facts of the case are as under:

The appellant is an individual, deriving income under the heads "income from capital gains" and "income from other sources". The return of income for the AY 2014-15 was filed on 18.01.2016 disclosing total income of Rs.97,280/-. Against the said return of income, the assessment was completed by the Income Tax Officer, Ward 1, Villupuram (hereinafter referred as "Assessing Officer") vide order dated 29.12.2016 passed u/s. 143(3) of the Income Tax Act, 1961 (for short 'the Act') at total income of ₹56,08,665/-. While doing so, the Assessing Officer made addition of ₹50,00,000/- as unexplained cash deposits and disallowed an expenditure incurred in computing capital gains on sale of property of ₹6,08,665/- as assessee had failed to substantiate the expenditure incurred for land reclamation charges of ₹7,00,000/- and building construction expenses of ₹2,00,000/-.

3. Being aggrieved by the above additions, the assessee preferred an appeal before Id. CIT(A), who vide impugned order had dismissed the appeal rejecting the contention of the assessee that

cash deposited in bank account were made out of accumulated income earned from dairy farm and gift of ₹25,00,000/- received from his mother. As regards to the disallowance of claim towards land reclamation charges of ₹7,00,000/- and building construction expenditure of ₹2,00,000/-, the Id. CIT(A) confirmed the addition as assessee failed to substantiate the claim.

4. Being aggrieved, the appellant is in appeal before us in the present appeal. On the day of hearing, none appeared on behalf of the assessee despite due service of notice.

5. On the other hand, the Id. Sr. Departmental Representative placed reliance on the orders of lower authorities.

6. We heard the Id. Sr. Departmental Representative and perused the material on record. We do not find any reason to interfere with the order of the Id. CIT(A) as the Id. CIT(A) has passed well reasoned order considering the material on record and the submissions made by the assessee. Thus, we do not find any merits in the appeal filed by the assessee.

7. In the result, the appeal filed by the assessee stands dismissed.

Order pronounced on 12th day of December, 2019, at Chennai.

Sd/-
(धुव्वुरु आर.एल रेड्डी)
(DUVVURU RL REDDY)
न्यायिक सदस्य/JUDICIAL MEMBER

Sd/-
(इंटूरी रामा राव)
(INTURI RAMA RAO)
लेखा सदस्य/ACCOUNTANT MEMBER

चेन्नई/Chennai

दिनांक/Dated: 12th December, 2019.

KV

आदेश की प्रतिलिपि अग्रेषित/Copy to:

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