

**IN THE INCOME TAX APPELLATE TRIBUNAL
DELHI BENCH “SMC”: NEW DELHI**

BEFORE SHRI KUL BHARAT, JUDICIAL MEMBER

ITA No. 585/DEL/2023

Assessment Year: 2018-19

M/s VS Rubber Private Limited, 65, Shiv Puri, Meerut.	<u>Vs</u>	ACIT, Circle-(1)2(1)/CPC, Meerut.
PAN- AAACO1621J		
APPELLANT		RESPONDENT
Assessee represented by	None	
Department represented by	Shri Om Parkash, Sr. DR	
Date of hearing	22.05.2023	
Date of pronouncement	22.05.2023	

ORDER

PER KUL BHARAT, JM:

This appeal, by the assessee, is directed against the order of the learned Commissioner of Income-tax (Appeals), National Faceless Appeal Centre (NFAC), Delhi, dated 30.11.2022, pertaining to the assessment year 2018-19. The assessee has raised following grounds of appeal:

“1. That the learned Commissioner Income Tax (Appeals) has grossly erred both in law and on facts in partly sustaining an assessment under section 143(1) of the Act at an income of Rs. 25,07,633/- as against returned income of Rs. 17,44,580/-

2. That having regards to the facts and circumstances of the case, the Ld. Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeals) has erred both in law and on facts in sustaining disallowance of Rs. 7,63,053/- made while processing the income tax return u/s 143(1) of the act, based on the statement made in the

tax audit report in relation to delay in deposit of ESI/PF (Employee's share) with the due date as prescribed in the respective ESI/PF acts.

3. *That having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, the learned Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeals) has further erred both in law and on facts in sustaining the disallowance of Rs. 7,63,053/- made u/s 36(l)(va) of the act towards the payment of contribution of employees provident fund and Employees state insurance corporation, even though the same was paid during the year itself and much before the due date of Income Tax return and that too by recording incorrect facts and findings and without observing the principal of natural justice and by disregarding the submission, evidences and material placed on record by the assessee.*

4. *That in any case and in view of the matter, action of the learned Assessing Officer in making the disallowance of Rs. 7,63,053/- made u/s 36(1)(va) of the act towards the payment of contribution of employees provident fund and Employees state insurance corporation, even though the same was paid during the year itself, is bad in law and against the facts and circumstances of the case.*

5. *That with prejudice to the above ground and that having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, the learned Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeals) has further erred both in law and on facts in not allowing the deduction towards the payment of employees contribution of employees provident fund and employees state insurance corporation, even though the same is paid before the due date u/s 139(1) of the Act in compliance of the provision of section 43 B / 37 of the Act and that too by recording incorrect facts and findings and without observing the principal of natural justice and by disregarding the submission, evidences and material placed on record by the appellant.*

6. *That in any case and in view of the matter, action of the learned Assessing Officer in not allowing he deduction towards the payment of employees contribution of employees provident fund and employees state insurance corporation, even though the same is paid before the due date u/s 139(1) of the Act in compliance of the provision of section 43B / 37 of the Act, is bad in law and against the facts and circumstances of the case.*

7. *That the appellant craves the leave to add, modify amend or delete*

any of the grounds of appeal at the time of hearing and all the above grounds are with prejudice to each other.”

2. At the time of hearing no one attended the proceedings on behalf of the assessee. The notice of hearing sent at the address furnished by the assessee in form no. 36 has returned unserved with the postal remark “left”. The assessee has not provided its current address, if any. Under these facts, appeal is taken up for hearing in the absence of the assessee and is being decided on the basis of material available on record.

3. The learned DR submitted that the issue relating to employees’ contribution towards EPF and ESI, involved for adjudication in the instant appeal, is squarely covered against the assessee by the recent judgment of the Hon’ble Supreme Court dated 12.10.2022 in the case of Checkmate Services P. Ltd. vs. CIT (along with batch of appeals).

4. I have heard the learned DR and perused the material available on record. I find that the Hon’ble Supreme Court in the case of Checkmate Services P Ltd. vs. CIT (supra), on the issue relating to payment of employees’ contribution towards PF and ESI, has ruled against the assessee, inter alia, by observing as under:

“52. When Parliament introduced Section 43B, what was on the statute book, was only employer’s contribution (Section 34(l)(iv)). At that point in time, there was no question of employee’s contribution being considered as part of the employer’s earning. On the application of the original principles of law it could have been treated only as receipts not amounting to income. When Parliament introduced the amendments in 1988-89, inserting Section 36(1)(va) and simultaneously inserting the second proviso of Section 43B, its intention was not to treat the disparate nature of the amounts, similarly. As discussed previously, the memorandum introducing the Finance Bill clearly stated that the provisions - especially second proviso to Section 43B

- was introduced to ensure timely payments were made by the employer to the concerned fund (EPF, ESI, etc.) and avoid the mischief of employers retaining amounts for long periods. That Parliament intended to retain the separate character of these two amounts, is evident from the use of different language. Section 2(24)(x) too, deems amount received from the employees (whether the amount is received from the employee or by way of deduction authorized by the statute) as income - it is the character of the amount that is important, i.e., not income earned. Thus, amounts retained by the employer from out of the employee's income by way of deduction etc. were treated as income in the hands of the employer. The significance of this provision is that on the one hand it brought into the fold of "income" amounts that were receipts or deductions from employees income; at the time, payment within the prescribed time - by way of contribution of the employees' share to their credit with the relevant fund is to be treated as deduction (Section 36(1)(va)). The other important feature is that this distinction between the employers' contribution (Section 36(1)(iv)) and employees' contribution required to be deposited by the employer (Section 36(1)(va)) was maintained - and continues to be maintained. On the other hand, Section 43B covers all deductions that are permissible as expenditures, or out-goings forming part of the assessee's liability. These include liabilities such as tax liability, cess duties etc. or interest liability having regard to the terms of the contract. Thus, timely payment of these alone entitle an assessee to the benefit of deduction from the total income. The essential objective of Section 43B is to ensure that if assessee is following the mercantile method of accounting, nevertheless, the deduction of such liabilities, based only on book entries, would not be given. To pass muster, actual payments were a necessary pre-condition for allowing the expenditure.

53. The distinction between an employer's contribution which is its primary liability under law - in terms of Section 36(1)(iv), and its liability to deposit amounts received by it or deducted by it (Section 36(1)(va)) is, thus crucial. The former forms part of the employers' income, and the latter retains its character as an income (albeit deemed), by virtue of Section 2(24)(x) - unless the conditions spelt by Explanation to Section 36(1)(va) are satisfied i.e., depositing such amount received or deducted from the employee on or before the due date. In other words, there is a marked distinction between the nature and character of the two amounts - the employer's liability is to be paid out of its income whereas the second is deemed an income, by definition, since it is the deduction from the employees' income and held in

trust by the employer. This marked distinction has to be borne while interpreting the obligation of every assessee under Section 43B.

54. In the opinion of this Court, the reasoning in the impugned judgment that the non-obstante clause would not in any manner dilute or override the employer's obligation to deposit the amounts retained by it or deducted by it from the employee's income, unless the condition that it is deposited on or before the due date, is correct and justified. The non-obstante clause has to be understood in the context of the entire provision of Section 43B which is to ensure timely payment before the returns are filed, of certain liabilities which are to be borne by the assessee in the form of tax, interest payment and other statutory liability. In the case of these liabilities, what constitutes the due date is defined by the statute. Nevertheless, the assessee is given some leeway in that as long as deposits are made beyond the due date, but before the date of filing the return, the deduction is allowed. That, however, cannot apply in the case of amounts which are held in trust, as it is in the case of employees' contributions- which are deducted from their income. They are not part of the assessee employer's income, nor are they heads of deduction per se in the form of statutory pay out. They are others' income, monies, only deemed to be income, with the object of ensuring that they are paid within the due date specified in the particular law. They have to be deposited in terms of such welfare enactments. It is upon deposit, in terms of those enactments and on or before the due dates mandated by such concerned law, that the amount which is otherwise retained, and deemed an income, is treated as a deduction. Thus, it is an essential condition for the deduction that such amounts are deposited on or before the due date. If such interpretation were to be adopted, the non-obstante clause under Section 43B or anything contained in that provision would not absolve the assessee from its liability to deposit the employee's contribution on or before the due date as a condition for deduction.

55. In the light of the above reasoning, this court is of the opinion that there is no infirmity in the approach of the impugned judgment. The decisions of the other High Courts, holding to the contrary, do not lay down the correct law. For these reasons, this court does not find any reason to interfere with the impugned judgment. The appeals are accordingly dismissed."

5. In view of the above binding precedent I do not see any reason to interfere in the finding of the lower authorities. The same is hereby affirmed. Grounds of appeal of the assessee are dismissed.

7. In the result, assessee's appeal is dismissed.

Order pronounced in open court on 22.05.2023.

Sd/-
(KUL BHARAT)
JUDICIAL MEMBER

MP

Copy forwarded to:

1. Appellant
2. Respondent
3. CIT
4. CIT(Appeals)
5. DR: ITAT

ASSISTANT REGISTRAR
ITAT, NEW DELHI

Draft dictated	22.05.2023
Draft placed before author	22.05.2023
Approved Draft comes to the Sr. PS/PS	
Order signed and pronounced on	
File comes to P.S.	
File sent to the Bench Clerk	
Date on which file goes to the AR	
Date on which file goes to the Head Clerk	
Date of dispatch of Order	
Date of uploading on the website	