

आयकर अपीलीय अधिकरण "सी" न्यायपीठ पुणे में ।
IN THE INCOME TAX APPELLATE TRIBUNAL "C" BENCH, PUNE

BEFORE SHRI R.S.SYAL, VP AND
SHRI PARTHA SARATHI CHAUDHURY, JM

आयकर अपील सं. / ITA No. 2049/PUN/2017

निर्धारण वर्ष / Assessment Year : 2009-10

The Deputy Commissioner of Income Tax,
Circle 1(2), Pune.

.....अपीलार्थी / Appellant

बनाम / V/s.

FIS Solutions Software Pvt. Ltd.
(Earlier known as Sungard Software
Solutions Pvt. Ltd.)
Embassy Icon, No.3, Infantry Road,
Bangalore- 560 001.
PAN: AAECA9056B

.....प्रत्यर्थी / Respondent

Assessee by : Shri Goutam Jain &
Shri Darpan Kirplani

Revenue by : Shri T. Vijaya Bhaskar Reddy, CIT

सुनवाई की तारीख / Date of Hearing : 21.01.2020

घोषणा की तारीख / Date of Pronouncement : 22.01.2020

आदेश / ORDER

PER PARTHA SARATHI CHAUDHURY, JM :

This appeal preferred by the Revenue emanates from the order of the
Ld. CIT(Appeals)-4, Pune dated 26.12.2016 for the assessment year 2009-10
as per the following grounds of appeal on record:

“1. The Ld. CIT(A) erred on facts and circumstances of the case in law in allowing deduction u/s.10A for unit II as a separate eligible unit, even though the stipulated conditions for availing such benefit were not satisfied in this case and in not considering the order of DRP in A.Ys. 2010-11 and 2011-12 on this issue.

2. The Ld. CIT(A) erred on facts and circumstances of the case in holding that the exemption u/s.10A of the Act should be computed after excluding communication expenses, insurance and travel expenses from the total turnover relying on the decision of the Hon’ble Bombay High Court in the case of Gem Plus Jewellery India Ltd. whereas the Department has not accepted the decision of Bombay High Court and filed SLP before the Hon’ble Supreme Court.

3. The Ld. CIT(A) erred on the facts and circumstances of the case in holding that the interest income is eligible for deduction u/s.10A denying the facts of the case that the interest was earned on bank deposits kept in the normal course of business.

4. The Ld. CIT(A) erred on the facts and circumstances of the case in holding that foreign exchange gain is eligible for deduction u/s.10A relying on the decision of the Hon’ble Bombay High Court in the case of Jem Plus Jewellery India Ltd. whereas the Department has not accepted the decision of Bombay High Court and filed SLP before the Hon’ble Supreme Court.”

2. **Ground No.1** relates to the deduction u/s.10A of the Income Tax Act, 1961 (hereinafter referred to as ‘the Act’) being granted for unit II treating it as a separate eligible unit by the Ld. CIT(Appeals). The Revenue is against this allowance of deduction u/s.10A of the Act.

3. The brief facts with regard to this ground are that the assessee during the scrutiny proceedings, produced Form No.56F for Unit II and in the said Form No.56F, against column No. 8, it was mentioned that it is 2nd year of the claim. However, it was also observed during the scrutiny assessment proceedings for the previous year i.e. A.Y. 2008-09, the assessee had nowhere mentioned about another Unit of the assessee company. To show the current year’s claim as 2nd year, the assessee should have made a claim for the same in the previous assessment year i.e. A.Y. 2008-09. On such an observation, the assessee was asked to submit details about the 2nd Unit vide

the office of the Assessing Officer and notice u/s.142(2) dated 07.03.2013 was issued wherein the Assessing Officer show caused the assessee by stating as follows:

“It is learnt from the details furnished by you that deduction u/s.10A is being claimed for the 2nd consecutive year, whereas, from the details furnished for A.Y.2008-09, it is seen that there is no mention of claim made for deduction u/s.10A for the 2nd Unit. Please substantiate.”

In reply, the assessee vide its letter dated 18.03.2013 submitted as follows:

“However, the company inadvertently in its return of income for AY 2008-09 claimed the deduction under section 10A of the Act after clubbing the details for Unit II under Unit I.”

This contention of the assessee did not find favour with the Assessing Officer and he held it to be an unrealistic. As per the Act, the Assessing Officer observed that the assessee has to follow certain conditions so as to enable itself eligible for claiming deduction u/s.10A of the Act which are as follows:

- (i) The assessee has to furnish a return of his income on or before the due date specified u/s.139(1) of the Act.
- (ii) It has begun or begins to manufacture or produce articles or things or computer software, in any electronic hardware technology park or as the case may be, software Technology Park.
- (iii) It is not formed by the splitting up or the reconstruction of a business already in existence.
- (iv) It is not formed by the transfer to a new business of machinery or plant previously used for any purpose.

According to the Assessing Officer, these conditions should be mandatorily followed by the assessee and these conditions have to be verified when an assessee starts a new unit.

3.1 Thereafter, the Assessing Officer worked out the chronology of events and derived findings that claim of deduction which was not made in the previous year was not an inadvertent mistake on the part of the assessee but it was an afterthought. The Assessing Officer vide Para 4.5.6, 4.5.7, 4.5.8 and 4.5.9 of the assessment order has observed that the claim of deduction u/s.10A of the Act should not be allowed to the assessee which is on record. Basically, the Assessing Officer arrived at a finding that the assessee has not started up a new unit but has rather expanded the existing unit or split the existing business into another part and therefore, there is no entity of a new separate unit in the case of assessee and therefore, deduction u/s.10A of the Act was rejected by the Assessing Officer with respect to Unit II and addition was made in the hands of the assessee at Rs.4,28,97,730/-.

4. Being further aggrieved, the assessee took up this matter before the Ld. CIT(Appeals) wherein detailed written submissions were filed which are on record. The CIT(Appeals) after considering the submissions of the assessee, assessment order and facts of the case has observed and held from Para 5.3 to Para 5.3.3 of his order by analyzing in detailed the facts and circumstances of the case and given reasons for his decision and finally held that the assessee was eligible to claim deduction u/s.10A of the Act on the profits of Unit II separate from deduction u/s.10A of the Act on profits of Unit I and the addition made by the Assessing officer was therefore, deleted by the Ld. CIT(Appeals). Para 5.3.2 and Para 5.3.3 of the CIT(Appeals)'s order are relevant for extraction which are as follows:

“5.3.2. The main reason given by the AO to hold that Unit II is part of Unit I and not a separate and independent unit is reference given by STPI in the approval dated 5 February, 2008 to its approval dated 25

April 2007 for expansion of Unit I. Since the letter dated 5 February 2008 was again rectified by the STPI on to June 2008 wherein the STPI categorically mentions that the approval is for expansion for Unit II, the objection of the AO does not hold good. Various documents/ returns such as separate custom bonded warehouse licenses, separate annual reports filed with STPI, separate monthly reports submitted to Superintendent of Customs for Unit I and Unit II further confirm that Unit II is separate and independent from Unit I and its separate existence is acknowledged by various government authorities.

5.3.3. In the light of the above and after considering the rival contentions and perusing the evidences available on the record, I am of a considered opinion that Unit II is a new unit and is separate and independent from Unit I. This fact has also been accepted by the AO in his remand report submitted to this office. Thus, I hold the Appellant to be eligible to claim deduction u/s.10A on the profits of Unit II separate from deduction u/s.10A on profits of Unit I. I therefore hold that the addition made by the AO on this account was not justified and the same is hereby deleted. Ground No.1 raised by the appellant is accordingly allowed.”

5. At the time of hearing, the Ld. DR vehemently argued that the assessee should have made a claim of deduction u/s.10A of the Act in the previous year i.e. A.Y. 2008-09. However, in the scrutiny assessment proceedings, for A.Y. 2008-09, the assessee had nowhere mentioned about another unit of the assessee company. The Ld. DR further invited our attention Para 4.5.7 of Assessing Officer's order wherein the Assessing Officer observed that vide letter dated 25.04.2007, the STPI had given approval only for expansion as sought for by the assessee. That further, the assessee has not furnished any separate Master Service Agreement and statement of work which would have necessitated the purposes/work assignment of Unit II. This Agreement was not furnished before the Department instead as evident from Para 4.5.9 of the Assessing Officer's order that the assessee had enclosed a few sample copies of purchase orders for the relevant assessment year which are enclosed at Page 66 to 70 of the paper book. That on perusal of these purchase orders, nothing is clear whether Unit II is new unit of the assessee or is expanded of the earlier unit which was being carried out for assessment year 2008-09. The assessee himself disclosed that they had not claimed deduction u/s.10A of the Act during that period i.e. A.Y. 2008-09. Therefore, there was ambiguity

in the submissions of the assessee. The Ld. DR further submitted that the assessee never furnished this relevant agreement before the Assessing Officer for verification.

6. Per contra, the Ld. AR of the assessee took up to the remand report issued by the Assessing Officer himself which is enclosed at Page 645 onwards of the Paper book. The Ld. AR drew our attention at Para 5 of the remand report wherein the Assessing Officer writes the following:

1. Unit 1- Located at 1st Floor, DS Chambers, No.11 O'Shaugnessy Road, Bengaluru engaged in creating products for higher education industry.
2. Unit 2- Located at 3rd Floor, DS Chambers, No.11, O'Shaugnessy Road, Bengaluru engaged in creating products for banking and finance industry.

Therefore, categorically, it is evident that Unit II is basically for creating products for banking and finance industry whereas Unit I is for creating products for higher education industry. That apart, at Para 7 of the remand report, the Assessing Officer writes as follows:

“7..... I have perused the rectified approval letter, the same appears to be in order. In the rectified approval, the STPI has specifically mentioned that the approval is for expansion of Unit 2. The AR has argued that by granting such approval, STPI confirmed that Unit 2 exists separate and independent of Unit 1.

The assessee again applied for further expansion of Unit 2 for which the STPI granted its approval on 14th July, 2010. I have perused the said approval for expansion and the same is free for any mistakes. As per the AR this shall be treated as further confirmation by the STPI of separate existence of Unit 2.

8. The AR claimed that the main reason given by the AO to hold that Unit 2 is part of Unit 1 and not a separate and independent unit is reference given by STPI in the approval dated 5 February 2008 to its approval dated 25 April 2007 for expansion of Unit 1. The AR has contended that since the letter dated 5 February 2008 was again rectified by the STPI on 10 June 2008, wherein the STPI has categorically mentioned that the approval is for expansion for Unit 2.

9. The assessee has further submitted various documents/ returns such as separate custom bonded warehouse licenses, separate annual reports filed with STPI, separate monthly reports submitted to Superintendent of Customs for Unit 1 and Unit 2 to support its contention that Unit 2 is separate and independent from Unit 1 and its separate existence is acknowledged by various government authorities. The evidences have been placed on record.”

Therefore, the Ld. AR of the assessee submitted that STPI itself has confirmed that Unit II exists separate and independent of Unit 1 and the Assessing Officer categorically states in the said remand report that he has perused the approval given by the STPI and the same is free for any mistakes.

7. We have perused the case records and heard the rival contentions. We have also analyzed the facts and circumstances of this case. That on perusal of the remand report placed on record, it is absolutely clear that there were existence of two units i.e. Unit 1 is for creating products for higher education industry and Unit 2 is for creating products for banking and finance industry. That apart, the STPI has confirmed that Unit 2 exists separate and independent of Unit 1 of which approval, the Assessing Officer in his remand report arrived at findings that the same is free for any mistakes. The Ld. AR further submitted that STPI being an independent authority would accord its approval to a new unit only after due verification of the application and credentials of an applicant. In the case of the assessee, the approval was granted by STPI only after due verification of the facts of the case. The Ld. AR addressed another objection raised by the Assessing Officer that most of the employees of both units are same and with regard to this, the Ld. AR submitted that the skill set/qualification required by the software developers for the finance and banking industry are completely different as compared to that required for higher education industry. The Ld. AR further submitted that as on 31st March, 2008 (end of first financial year), out of 32 employees

in Unit II, only 7 were old employees. This further justifies the contention of the assessee that Unit II was to be a new and independent unit. It is admitted fact as appearing in the remand report of the Assessing Officer that STPI itself has held Unit 2 to be a new unit and granted requisite approval. The facts herein further demonstrate that Unit 1 and Unit 2 are basically two different and distinct units of the assessee. There is neither expansion nor splitting one unit into another. The Ld. DR was unable to bring on record any material/document in support of the Revenue substantiating that both units are one and the same. The Ld. DR relied on the observation of the Assessing Officer that Master Service Agreement was not furnished but how that agreement could have helped the revenue additionally was not substantiated by the Ld. DR because of the fact that as on record in the order of the Ld. CIT(Appeals) at Para 5.3.2 and Para 5.3.3, it is mentioned by the First Appellate Authority that various documents/returns such as separate custom bonded warehouse licenses, separate annual reports filed with STPI, separate monthly reports submitted to Superintendent of Customs for Unit I and Unit II further confirm that Unit II is separate and independent from Unit I. These facts were not disputed by the Ld. DR before us.

8. In view of the examination of facts on record, we are of the considered view that Unit II of the assessee company is absolutely a new and separate unit and independent from Unit I. Therefore, the Ld. CIT(Appeals) was justified in holding that the assessee is eligible to claim of deduction u/s.10A of the Act on the profits of Unit II separate from deduction u/s.10A of the Act on profits of Unit I. Thus, we do not find any infirmity with the findings of the Ld. CIT(Appeals) and relief provided to the assessee by the Ld. CIT(Appeals) is

hereby sustained. Thus, **ground No.1 raised in appeal by the Revenue is dismissed.**

9. With regard to **Ground No.2**, the contentions of the Revenue is that the Ld. CIT(Appeals) had erred in holding that the exemption u/s.10A of the Act should be computed after excluding communication expenses, insurance and travel expenses from the total turnover.

The contention raised by the assessee with regard to this ground is that the Assessing Officer has erred in reducing following expenses only from 'Export Turnover' without appreciating that such expense should also be reduced from 'Total turnover' while computing benefit u/s.10A of the Act.

10. The brief facts with regard to this issue are that the Assessing Officer during assessment proceedings found that as against the export turnover, the total turnover is not defined in the Act. Hence, the Assessing Officer contended that the intention of the legislature was to consider the turnover in its totality without any exclusion. The very fact that the total turnover is not defined in comparison with export turnover proves this and hence, as per provisions of section 10A of the Act, there is no scope for any adjustment to total turnover. Further any reference to section 80HHC is not acceptable as they are specifically applicable to section 80HHC and principles enunciated therein, if any cannot be stretched to the other provisions of the Act to purport any meaning not defined by the Act and not intended by the legislature as such. Hence, the total turnover for the sake of computation of deduction under section 10A of the Act will be Rs.50,38,94,398/- and whatever reduced above from the export turnover cannot be excluded from the total turnover as it is not specifically provided by the Act.

11. Before the Ld. CIT(Appeals), the assessee filed detailed written submissions which are on record and the Ld. CIT(Appeals) after considering the submissions of the assessee, assessment order and facts on the issue held as follows:

“8.3 DECISION: I have perused the assessment order and the submissions made by the appellant as above carefully. After considering the rival contentions, I am of the view that the facts of the case with respect to this ground are squarely covered by Hon’ble Jurisdictional Bombay High Court’s judgment in the case of CIT Vs. Gem Plus Jewellery India Ltd. (330 ITR 175) (2011). Respectfully following with judgment of the Hon’ble High Court and other decisions quoted by the appellant, the AO is hereby directed to calculate deduction under section 10A after reducing the expenses which are reduced from export turnover, from total turnover as well. Ground No.4 raised by the appellant is accordingly allowed.”

12. The Ld. AR of the assessee placed strong reliance on the findings of the Ld. CIT(Appeals) and also submitted that this issue is covered by the decision of the Hon’ble Supreme Court of India in the case of **CIT Vs. HCL Technologies Ltd. 404 ITR 719** wherein the Hon’ble Apex Court has held that *“when object of formula in section 10A for computation of deduction is to arrive at profit from export business, expenses excluded from export turnover have to be excluded from total turnover also; otherwise, any other interpretation makes formula unworkable and absurd and hence, such deduction shall be allowed from total turnover in same proportion as well.”* The decision is rendered in favour of the assessee.

13. We take guidance from the decision of the Hon’ble Supreme Court as referred above and respectfully, following this decision, we are of the considered view that the Ld. CIT(Appeals) was correct in directing the Assessing Officer to calculate deduction u/s.10A of the Act after reducing the

expenses which are reduced from export turnover, from total turnover as well. Thus, relief provided to the assessee by the Ld. CIT(Appeals) is hereby sustained. Thus, **ground No.2 raised in appeal by the Revenue is dismissed.**

14. **Ground No.3** pertains to “whether the Ld. CIT(Appeals) erred in holding that interest income is eligible for deduction u/s.10A of the Act when the facts of the case are that interest was earned on bank deposits.

15. The facts relating to Ground No.3 are that in financial year 2008-09, the assessee received following interest income:

<i>Particulars</i>	<i>Amount (in Rs.)</i>
<i>Interest on bank deposits</i>	42,48,636/-
<i>Interest on deposits with custom authorities.</i>	37,833/-
Total	42,86,469/-

The Assessing Officer held that interest from bank deposits in a bank was not income derived from export business within the meaning of section 10A of the Act. It was treated by the Assessing Officer as ‘income from other source’ by placing reliance on the decision in the case of **Shams Tabrez Vanti (2005) 273 ITR 299 (AAR New Delhi)**. The assessee on this context submitted that the interest income on bank deposits of Rs.42,48,636/- was earned on amounts kept in bank deposits for a very short period on account of surplus funds available as a matter of commercial prudence and business financial management. The assessee instead of keeping the amount idle, since it did not require the same for its immediate business activity, had deposited the amount by way of short term deposit in the bank and the

amount so deposited pertain to funds which it had received towards the export made by it during the course of its business. Therefore, the amounts so deposited in the bank and the interest income derived thereon have a close link with the business activity of the assessee.

16. That before the Ld. CIT(Appeals), the assessee submitted that interest income would form part of profits of the business of the undertaking and would be eligible for deduction u/s.10A of the Act. In this regard, the assessee has placed reliance on the decision of Karnataka High Court in the case of **CIT & Anrs. Vs. Motorola India Electronics P. Ltd. (265 CTR 94) (2014)** where the assessee had earned interest income on account of deposits with EFFC account and inter corporate advances. The Hon'ble High Court held as follows:

“There is a direct nexus between this income and the income of the business of the undertaking. Though it does not partake the character of a profit and gains from the sale of an article, it is the income which is derived from the consideration realized by export of articles. In view of the definition of ‘Income from profits and gains’ incorporated in the sub section (4) the assessee is entitled to the benefit of exemption of the said amount as contemplated u/s.10B of the Act.”

The aforesaid judgment of Karnataka High Court has been followed by the Bangalore Tribunal in assessee's own case wherein the Tribunal allowed deduction u/s.10A of the Act on interest income. The Ld. CIT(Appeals) on this issue has held as follows:

“DECISION: I have perused the assessment order and the submissions made by the appellant as above carefully. After considering the rival contentions, I am of the view that the facts in respect of this ground are squarely covered by Hon'ble Karnataka High Court's judgment in the case of CIT & Anr. Vs. Motorola India Electronics P. Ltd. (265 CTR 94) (2014). Respectfully following judgment of the Hon'ble High Court as well as the decision of Hon'ble Bangalore Tribunal in the Appellant's own case, the AO is hereby directed to allow deduction u/s.10A on interest

income of Rs.42,86,469/-. Ground No.5 raised by the appellant is accordingly allowed.”

17. We have perused the case records and given considerable thought to the findings of the Ld. CIT(Appeals). We find the Ld. CIT(Appeals) has based his decision following the judgment of the Hon'ble Karnataka High Court (supra.) and the decision of the Co-ordinate Bench of the Tribunal, Bangalore in assessee's own case (supra.) while directing the Assessing Officer to allow deduction u/s.10A of the Act on interest income of Rs.42,86,469/-. The Ld. DR could not bring any contrary decision of any Higher Forum in support of the Revenue nor could bring any relevant documents/materials opposing the already established facts in favour of the assessee. Therefore, we do not find any infirmity with the findings of the Ld. CIT(Appeals) which is thereby upheld. Thus, **ground No.3 raised in appeal by the Revenue is dismissed.**

18. **Ground No.4** pertains to “whether the Ld. CIT(Appeals) had erred in holding that foreign exchange gain is eligible for deduction u/s.10A relying on the decision of the Hon'ble Bombay High Court in the case of Jem Plus Jewellery India Ltd. (supra.)”

19. The brief facts relating to this ground are that during the assessment proceedings, the Assessing Officer found that the assessee had arrived at Rs.18,41,35,472/- as profit from the business. However, it was observed that the assessee had not reduced the 'other income' which was not having any direct nexus with the profit of the undertaking for the purpose of computation of deduction u/s.10A of the Act. Other income included Rs.2,95,28,156/- which represented exchange gain and Rs.42,86,469/- which was from bank and other interest. The assessee in its Form 56F had

shown profit of the undertaking at Rs.18,41,35,472/- without reducing other income to the tune of Rs.3,38,14,625/- which was not forming part of profit of the undertaking. The Hon'ble Supreme Court while considering the legislative intent behind the use of the word 'derived from' in the case of **Pandian Chemicals Limited Vs. CIT(262 ITR 78)** had affirmed that what is eligible for the deduction is strictly the income derived by the undertaking and not any other income that may be incidental or attributable to, even though such income is computed under the head "business". Further the Hon'ble Supreme Court had considered the legislative intent behind the use of the word "derived from" in the case of **Liberty India and Others Vs. CIT (317 ITR 218)** and reaffirmed that the word "derived from" are narrower in connotation as compared to the words "attributable to". In other words by using the expression "derived from", the Parliament intended to cover sources not beyond the first degree. Hence, the said amount of Rs.3,38,14,625/- was reduced from the profit of the undertaking and the eligible profit of the undertaking was arrived at Rs.15,03,20,847/-. Accordingly, after exclusion of the said other income, the profit of the undertaking would be Rs.15,03,20,847/- (Rs.18,41,35,472/- (-) Rs.3,38,14,625/-).

20. Before the Ld. CIT(Appeals), the Ld. AR of the assessee filed detailed written submissions which are on record. The Ld. CIT(Appeals) after considering the submissions of the assessee, assessment order and facts of the case has held as follows:

"DECISION: I have perused the assessment order and the submission of the appellant as above carefully. After considering the rival contentions, I am of the view that the facts in respect of this ground are squarely covered by Hon'ble Jurisdictional Bombay High Court's judgment in the case of CIT Vs. Gem Plus Jewellery India Ltd. (330 ITR 175) (2011). Respectfully following judgment of the Hon'ble High Court and other decisions quoted by the Appellant in its favour, the Assessing Officer is hereby directed to allow deduction u/s.10A of the Act on interest income

of Rs.2,95,28,156/-. Ground No.6 raised by the appellant is accordingly allowed.”

21. We have perused the case records and given considerable thought to the findings of the Ld. CIT(Appeals). We find the Ld. CIT(Appeals) has based his findings relying on the decision of Hon'ble Jurisdictional High court in the case of **CIT Vs. Gem Plus Jewellery India Ltd. (330 ITR 175)** wherein the Hon'ble Bombay High Court has held as follows:

“The gains from foreign exchange fluctuation realized within stipulated period forms part of the sales proceeds and is directly related with the export activities and such gains should be considered as income derived from export activities eligible for exemption u/s.10A in the year in which export took place.”

21.1 We further find the Hon'ble Madras High Court in the case of **CIT Vs. Pentasoft Technologies Ltd. (347 ITR 578) (2012)** held that “ *the exchange value based on upward or downward of the Rupee value is not in the hands of the assessee. In other words, the assessee does not determine the exchange value of the Indian Rupee. It has to be remembered but for the fact that the assessee is an export house, there was no question of earning any foreign exchange. Therefore, when the fluctuation in foreign exchange rate was solely relatable to the export business of the assessee and the higher Rupee value was earned by virtue of such exports carried out by the assessee, there is no reason why the benefit of section 10(A) should not be allowed to the assessee.*”

In view of above, respectfully following the judgments of the Hon'ble High Courts as referred above, we do not find any infirmity with the findings of the Ld. CIT(Appeals) and relief provided to the assessee by the Ld. CIT(Appeals) is hereby sustained. Thus, **ground No.4 raised in appeal by the Revenue is dismissed.**

22. In the result, **appeal of the Revenue is dismissed.**

Order pronounced on 22nd day of January, 2020.

Sd/-
R.S.SYAL
VICE PRESIDENT

Sd/-
PARTHA SARATHI CHAUDHURY
JUDICIAL MEMBER

पुणे / Pune; दिनांक / Dated : 22nd January, 2020.

SB

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

1. अपीलार्थी / The Appellant.
2. प्रत्यर्थी / The Respondent.
3. The CIT(Appeals)-4, Pune.
4. The Pr. CIT-3, Pune.
5. विभागीय प्रतिनिधि , आयकर अपीलीय अधिकरण, "सी" बेंच,
पुणे / DR, ITAT, "C" Bench, Pune.
6. गार्ड फ़ाइल / Guard File.

// True Copy //

आदेशानुसार / BY ORDER,

निजी सचिव / Private Secretary
आयकर अपीलीय अधिकरण, पुणे / ITAT, Pune.

		Date	
1	Draft dictated on	21.01.2020	Sr.PS/PS
2	Draft placed before author	22.01.2020	Sr.PS/PS
3	Draft proposed and placed before the second Member		JM/AM
4	Draft discussed/approved by second Member		AM/JM
5	Approved draft comes to the Sr. PS/PS		Sr.PS/PS
6	Kept for pronouncement on		Sr.PS/PS
7	Date of uploading of order		Sr.PS/PS
8	File sent to Bench Clerk		Sr.PS/PS
9	Date on which the file goes to the Head Clerk		
10	Date on which file goes to the A.R		
11	Date of dispatch of order		