

**IN THE INCOME TAX APPELLATE TRIBUNAL
“B” BENCH : BANGALORE**

**BEFORE SHRI N.V. VASUDEVAN, VICE PRESIDENT AND
SHRI CHANDRA POOJARI, ACCOUNTANT MEMBER**

ITA No.419/Bang/2021
Assessment Year : 2019-20

M/s. Sonicwall Technology Systems India Private Limited (formerly known as Dell Software India Pvt. Ltd.,) Embassy Tech Village 3 rd and 4 th Floor, Block-F, Devarabisanahalli, Varthur Hobli, Bengaluru – 560 103. PAN : AAACQ 1441 N	Vs.	ITO, Ward International Taxation – 1(2), Bengaluru.
---	-----	---

Assessee by	:	Smt. Tanmayee Rajkumar, Advocate
Revenue by	:	Shri. Priyadarshi Mishra, Additional CIT(DR)(ITAT), Bengaluru

Date of hearing	:	08.11.2021
Date of Pronouncement	:	10.11.2021

ORDER

Per N. V. Vasudevan, Vice President

This is an appeal filed by the assessee against the order dated 09.07.2021 of CIT(A) National Faceless Appeal Centre (NFAC), Delhi, relating to Assessment Year 2019-20.

2. The Assessee is a Private Limited Company engaged in the business of rendering business support services. The Assessee filed return of income for AY 2019-20 declaring total income of Rs.16,03,32,680/-. In an intimation dated 01.05.2020, the Centralized Processing Centre (CPC) made addition of a

sum of Rs.17,03,784/- as income representing employees share of contribution to PF to the extent not paid on or before the due date as mentioned in Sec 36(1)(va) of the Income Tax Act 1961.

3. It is the case of the assessee that in so far as contribution, the same has been paid before the due date for filing of return u/s.139(1) of the Act and hence has been considered allowable on the basis of decision of Supreme Court in CIT vs. Alom Extrusions Ltd (2009) 319 ITR 306 (SC) and other cases such as CIT Vs Magus Customers Dialog (P) Ltd (Kar), CIT Vs Sabri Enterprises (2008) 298 ITR 141 (Kar), Consultants India P Ltd Vs CIT Bangalore III (2013) 597/34 Taxman.com 20 (Kar).

4. Aggrieved by the aforesaid order of the Central Processing Centre (CPC), assessee filed application under section 154 of the Act on 07.08.2020 but the same was rejected by an order dated 27.08.2020 in so far as it relates to delayed remittance of employees' share of contribution to PF.

5. The assessee preferred appeal before the CIT(A) against the order dated 27.08.2020. With regard to employee's share of contribution to PF, the CIT(A) referred to the amendment made to section 36(1)(va) and 43B of the Act by the Finance Act, 2021. The Finance Act, 2021 has amended section 36, sub-section (1), in clause (va), by inserting Explanation-2 which reads thus:

"Explanation 2.—For the removal of doubts, it is hereby clarified that the provisions of section 43B shall not apply and shall be deemed never to have been applied for the purposes of determining the "due date" under this clause;".

The finance Act, 2021 also amended section 43B by inserting Explanation-5 thereto which reads thus:

"Explanation 5.—For the removal of doubts, it is hereby clarified that the provisions of this section shall not apply and shall be deemed

never to have been applied to a sum received by the assessee from any of his employees to which the provisions of sub-clause (x) of clause (24) of section 2 applies."

According to the CIT(A), by virtue of newly inserted Explanation 2 to clause (va) of sub-section (1) of the said section, the provisions of section 43B shall not apply and shall be deemed never to have been applied for the purposes of determining the "due date" under the said clause. The CIT(A) also held that Section 43B of the Income-tax Act relates to allowing certain deductions only on actual payments. Clause (b) of the said section provides that any sum payable by the assessee as an employer by way of contribution to any provident fund or superannuation fund or gratuity fund or any other fund for the welfare of employees shall be allowed (irrespective of the previous year in which the liability to pay such sum was incurred by the assessee according to the method of accounting regularly employed by him) only in computing the income referred to in section 28 of that previous year, in which such sum is actually paid by him. Proviso to the said section provides that nothing contained in this section shall apply in relation to any sum which is actually paid by the assessee on or before the due date applicable in his case for furnishing the return of income under sub-section (1) of section 139 in respect of the previous year in which the liability to pay such sum was incurred as aforesaid and the evidence of such payment is furnished by the assessee along with such return. By virtue of insertion of Explanation 5 to this section, the provisions of the said section shall not apply and shall be deemed never to have been applied to a sum received by the assessee from any of his employees to which the provisions of subclause (x) of clause (24) of section 2 applies.

6. The CIT(A) accepted that the Assessee had paid the employees share of contribution on or before the due date for filing return of income u/s.139(1) of the

Act for the relevant AY. He was however of the view was of the view that Section 36(1)(va) and section 43B(b) operate on totally different footings and have different parameters for due dates, i.e., employee's contribution is linked to payment before the due dates specified in the respective Acts or Funds and employer's contribution is linked to the payment before the prescribed due date for filing of return u/s.139(1) Income Tax Act, 1961. The result of any failure to pay within the prescribed dates also leads to different results. In the case of employee's contribution, any failure to pay within the prescribed due date under the respective PF Act or Scheme will result in negating employer's claim for deduction permanently forever u/s.36(1)(va). On the other hand, delay in payment of employer's contribution is visited with deferment of deduction on payment basis u/s.43B and is therefore not lost totally. This legal distinction between employees' contribution and employer's contribution under the Act was duly recognised by the Courts also. The CIT(A) in this regard referred to the following judicial pronouncement wherein the aforesaid distinction has been accepted viz., CIT v. Gujarat State Road Transport Corpn. [2014] 41 taxmann.com 100/ 366 ITR 170/223 Taxman 398 (Guj.), CIT v. Merchant Ltd. [2015] 61 taxmann.com 119/235 Taxman 291/378 ITR 443 (Ker.).

7. The CIT(A), thereafter held that the amendment to section 36(1)(va) by insertion of explanation 2 and the amendment to section 43B by insertion to explanation 5 by the Finance Bill 2021 was only declaratory / clarificatory in nature and there therefore was applicable with retrospective effect by necessary intendment of deeming nature expressly stated therein. The CIT(A) finally upheld the action of the AO.

8. Aggrieved by the order of the CIT(A), the assessee is in appeal before the Tribunal. We have heard the rival submissions. We find that similar issue has been considered and decided in the following of judicial decisions:

M/s Mahadev Cold Storage vs Jurisdictional AO - ITA.No.41 & 42/Agra/2021

M/s Essae Teraoka (P.) Ltd vs DCIT - [2014] 43 taxmann.com 33 (Karnataka)

Anand Kumar Jain vs ITO - ITA NO 4192/MUM/2012

ValueMomentum Software Services Private Limited vs. DCIT I.T.A. No. 2197/HYD/2017 [Assessment Year: 2013-14] dated 19.05.2021

Mohan Ram Chaudhary vs. ITO ITA No. 51&54-55/Jodh/2021 [Assessment Year: 2018-19] dated 28.09.20

9. The Hon'ble Karnataka High Court in the case of Essae Teraoka Pvt. Ltd., (supra) has taken the view that employee's contribution under section 36(1)(va) of the Act would also be covered under section 43B of the Act and therefore if the share of the employee's share of contribution is made on or before due date for furnishing the return of income under section 139(1) of the Act, then the assessee would be entitled to claim deduction. Therefore, the issue is decided in favour of the Assessee by the decision of the Hon'ble Karnataka High Court. The next aspect to be considered is whether the amendment to the provisions to section 43B and 36(1)(va) of the Act by the Finance Act, 2021, has to be construed as retrospective and applicable for the period prior to 01.04.2021 also. On this aspect, we find that the explanatory memorandum to the Finance Act, 2021 proposing amendment in section 36(1)(va) as well as section 43B is applicable only from 01.04.2021. These provisions impose a liability on an assessee and therefore cannot be construed as applicable with retrospective effect unless the legislature specifically says so. In the decisions referred to by us in the earlier paragraph of this order on identical issue the tribunal has taken a view that the

aforesaid amendment is applicable only prospectively i.e., from 1.4.2021. We are therefore of the view that the impugned additions made under section 36(1)(va) of the Act deserves to be deleted.

10. In the result, appeal of the assessee is allowed.

Pronounced in the open court on the date mentioned on the caption page.

Sd/-

(CHANDRA POOJARI)
Accountant Member

Sd/-

(N. V. VASUDEVAN)
Vice President

Bangalore.

Dated: 10.11.2021.

/NS/*

Copy to:

- | | |
|---------------|---------------|
| 1. Appellants | 2. Respondent |
| 3. CIT | 4. CIT(A) |
| 5. DR | 6. Guard file |

By order

Assistant Registrar,
ITAT, Bangalore.