

आयकर अपीलीय अधिकरण, हैदराबाद पीठ में
IN THE INCOME TAX APPELLATE TRIBUNAL
HYDERABAD BENCHES "B", HYDERABAD

BEFORE
SHRI RAMA KANTA PANDA, ACCOUNTANT MEMBER
&
SHRI K.NARASIMHA CHARY, JUDICIAL MEMBER

आ.अपी.सं / ITA No. 526/Hyd/2022
(निर्धारण वर्ष / Assessment Year: 2018-19)

Purushothama Reddy Vs. ADIT (INTN Taxation)-1,
Vankireddy Hyderabad
Tirupathi
[PAN No. AETPV4382D]

अपीलार्थी / Appellant

प्रत्यर्थी / Respondent

S.A. No. 19/Hyd/2022
(Arising out of ITA No.526/Hyd/2022)
(निर्धारण वर्ष / Assessment Year: 2018-19)

Purushothama Reddy ADIT (INTN Taxation)-1,
Vankireddy Vs Hyderabad
Tirupathi
[PAN No. AETPV4382D]

आवेदक / Applicant

प्रत्यर्थी / Respondent

निर्धारिती द्वारा / Assessee by: Shri H. Srinivasulu, AR
राजस्व द्वारा / Revenue by: Ms. Swapna, DR

सुनवाई की तारीख/Date of hearing: 29/11/2022
घोषणा की तारीख/Pronouncement on: 05/12/2022

आदेश / ORDER

PER K. NARASIMHA CHARY, JM:

Aggrieved by the order dated 11/08/2022 passed by the learned
Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeals)-10, Hyderabad ("Ld. CIT(A)"), in the

case of Purushothama Reddy Vankireddy (“the assessee”) for the assessment year 2018-19, assessee preferred this appeal.

2. Only issue involved in this appeal revolves around the grievance of the assessee that foreign tax paid by him should have been given credit to, which the authorities below denied stating that under rule 128(9) Of the Income tax Rules, 1963 (“the Rules”), the assessee should have furnished the statement in Form 67 before the due date specified for furnishing the return of income under sub-section (1) of Section 139 of the of the Income Tax Act, 1961 (for short “the Act”), whereas in this case, the assessee furnished such Form 67 along with the return of income filed under section 139(5) of the Act.

3. Brief facts, relevant for the disposal of the case are that the assessee is an individual, employed with Micro Soft Global Resources GMBH. During the year 2018-19, he was a resident and ordinarily resident and, therefore, he offered his global income for taxation in India. Such income includes foreign income on which the assessee paid the tax as per rules and claims credit thereof. Assessee, however, uploaded the Form 67 along with the revised return of income. Authorities below, therefore, denied to give credit of the foreign tax paid by the assessee holding that the assessee violated the mandatory requirement of furnishing Form 67 before the due date specified for furnishing the return of income under section 139(1) of the Act.

4. According to the learned AR, Rule 128(9) of the Rules does not provide for disallowance of Foreign Tax Credit (FTC) in case of delay in filing Form 67 and, therefore, it has consistently been held by various Benches of the Tribunal that filing of Form 67 is a directory requirement, but not a mandatory one inasmuch as Article 25(2)(a) of India-USA Double Taxation Avoidance Agreement (DTAA) vests a right in the assessee to claim the credit thereof. He placed reliance on the decisions reported in Babu Rao Atluri Vs. DCIT in ITA No. 108/Hyd/2022, ITAT, Hyderabad ‘B’ Bench, Ms.

Brinda Rama Krishna Vs. LTO, ITAT, SMC-B Bench, Bangalore, M/s. 42 Hertz Software India (P) Ltd Vs. ACIT, Sri Govindarajan Roopkumar Vs. ADIT, ITAT 'B' Bench, Chennai and Sanjay Patil Vs. A.O. Circle-3(2), ITAT, Surat in ITA No. 189/Srt/2021, dt. 18/05/2022.

5. Per contra, Learned DR submitted that when the language employed in Rule 128(9) is clear in its purport in saying 'certificate or the statement shall be furnished on or before the date specified for furnishing the return of income under sub-section (1) of section 139', it is not open for the assessee to contend that it is not mandatory requirement. She placed reliance on the view taken by the Visakhapatnam Bench of the Tribunal in the case of Murali Krishna Vaddi Vs. ACIT (2022) 142 taxmann.com 32.

6. We have gone through the record in the light of the submissions made on either side. It could be seen from the view taken in Murali Krishna Vaddi (supra), the decision of the Bangalore Tribunal in the case of M/s. 42 Hertz Software India (P) Ltd (supra), was brought to the notice of the Bench, but looking at the abnormal delay of more than two years without any valid and reasonable cause, the Bench held that such delayed filing of Form 67 was in compliance with Rule 128(9) of the Rules.

7. Coming to the decisions relied upon by the assessee it could be seen that in the case of M/s. 42 Hertz Software India (P) Ltd (supra), reliance was placed on the decision in Ms. Brinda Rama Krishna (supra) and all the other decisions were following of the same. In Ms. Brinda Rama Krishna (supra), the Bench considered the issue in the light of the provisions of DTAA, section 295(1) of the Act, the decisions of the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of Mangalore Chemicals & Fertilizers Ltd. Vs. Deputy Commissioner (1992 Supp (1) SCC 21), Sambhaji Vs. Gangabai (2008) 17 SCC 117 and a lot many decisions of the Hon'ble Apex Court including the case in Union of India Vs. Azadi Bachao Andolan (2003) 263 ITR 706 (SC) etc. and reached a conclusion that since Rule 128(9) of the Rules does not

provide for disallowance of FTC in the case of delay in filing Form 67 and such filing within the time allowed for filing the return of income under section 139(1) of the Act is only directory, since DTAA over rides the Act, and the Rules cannot be contrary to the Act.

8. We find from Article 25(2)(a) of the DTAA that where a resident of India derives income which, in accordance with the provisions of the convention, may be taxed in the United States, India shall allow as a deduction from the tax on the income of the resident an amount equal to the income tax paid, paid in the United States, whether directly or by deduction. In view of this provision over riding the provisions of the Act, according to us, Rule 128(9) of the Rules has to be read down in conformity thereof. Rule 128(9) of the Rules cannot be read in isolation. Rules must be read in the context of the Act and the DTAA impacting the rights, liabilities and disabilities of the parties.

9. With this view of the matter, we are of the considered opinion that the decisions relied upon by the assessee are applicable to the facts of the case on hand while respectfully following the same, we allow the appeal, and direct the Learned Assessing Officer to verify the details of the foreign tax paid by the assessee on the earnings at foreign source and take a view inconformity with the established law discussed above.

10. Inasmuch as the appeal is allowed, request for stay becomes Infructuous and the same is dismissed.

11. In the result, appeal of the assessee is allowed and the stay application is dismissed.

Order pronounced in the open court on this the 5th day of December, 2022.

Sd/-

(RAMA KANTA PANDA)

ACCOUNTANT MEMBER

Hyderabad, Dated: 05/12/2022

TNMM

Sd/-

(K. NARASIMHA CHARY)

JUDICIAL MEMBER

Copy forwarded to:

1. Purushothama Reddy Vankireddy, Plot No. 171, Gazetted Officers Colony, Near Garuda Enclave, Sai Super Market, Thatithopu, Tirupathi.
2. ADIT(INTN Taxation)-1, Hyderabad.
3. CIT(Appeals)-10, Hyderabad.
4. CIT(IT & TP)-Hyderabad.
5. DR, ITAT, Hyderabad.
6. GUARD FILE

TRUE COPY

ASSISTANT REGISTRAR
ITAT, HYDERABAD