

आयकर अपीलिय अधिकरण, जयपुर न्यायपीठ, जयपुर  
IN THE INCOME TAX APPELLATE TRIBUNAL, JAIPUR BENCHES,"B" JAIPUR

डा० एस. सीतालक्ष्मी, न्यायिक सदस्य एवं श्री राठोड कमलेश जयन्तभाई, लेखा सदस्य के समक्ष  
BEFORE: DR. S. SEETHALAKSHMI, JM & SHRI RATHOD KAMLESH JAYANTBHAI, AM

आयकर अपील सं./ITA. Nos. 435 to 437/JP/2022  
निर्धारण वर्ष / Assessment Years : 2018-19 to 2020-21

M/s Ready Roti India Pvt. Ltd. F-28, RIICO Industrial Area, Sare Khurd, Alwar	बनाम Vs.	CPC, Bangalore ACIT/DCIT, Circle-06, Jaipur
स्थायी लेखा सं./जीआईआर सं./PAN/GIR No.: AAAC 7134 P		
अपीलार्थी / Appellant		प्रत्यर्थी / Respondent

निर्धारिती की ओर से / Assessee by : Shri P. C. Parwal (C.A.)  
राजस्व की ओर से / Revenue by : Smt Runi Pal (Addl. CIT)

सुनवाई की तारीख / Date of Hearing : 19/04/2023  
उदघोषणा की तारीख / Date of Pronouncement : 24/05/2023

आदेश / ORDER

PER: DR. S. SEETHALAKSHMI, J.M.

These three appeals are filed by assessee and is arising out of the order of the National Faceless Appeal Centre, Delhi dated 20/10/2022 [here in after "NFAC/CIT(A)"] for assessment years 2018-19 to 2020-21 respectively.

2. Since, the facts of the cases are identical, we have heard these cases together and passing the order together. The facts and grounds are taken from the folder of M/s Ready Roti India Pvt. Ltd. in ITA No.

435/JP/2022 and this case is taken as lead case. In this appeal the assessee has raised following grounds:-

*“1.The Ld. CIT(A), NFAC has erred on facts and in law in confirming the addition of Rs.1,21,09,240/- u/s 36(1)(va) on account of delayed payment of employees contribution towards PF, ESI & other welfare fund u/s 143(1)(a)(iv) of the Act by not appreciating that this adjustment is not on account of disallowance of expenditure indicated in the audit report but not taken into account in computing the total income.*

*2. The Ld. CIT(A), NFAC has erred on facts and in law in not directing to allow deduction on payment of the amount which is deemed as income u/s 2(24)(x) r.w.s. 36(1)(va).”*

3. In ITA No. 436/JP/2022, the assessee has taken following grounds in this appeal:-

*“1.The Ld. CIT(A), NFAC has erred on facts and in law in confirming the addition of Rs.1,05,76,000/- u/s 36(1)(va) on account of delayed payment of employees contribution towards PF, ESI & other welfare fund u/s 143(1)(a)(iv) of the Act by not appreciating that this adjustment is not on account of disallowance of expenditure indicated in the audit report but not taken into account in computing the total income.*

*2.The Ld. CIT(A), NFAC has erred on facts and in law in not directing to allow deduction on payment of the amount which is deemed as income u/s 2(24)(x) r.w.s. 36(1)(va).”*

4. In ITA No. 437/JP/2022, the assessee has taken following grounds in this appeal:-

*“1.The Ld. CIT(A), NFAC has erred on facts and in law in confirming the addition of Rs.15,44,160/- u/s 36(1)(va) on account of delayed payment of*

*employees contribution towards PF, ESI & other welfare fund u/s 143(1)(a)(iv) of the Act by not appreciating that this adjustment is not on account of disallowance of expenditure indicated in the audit report but not taken into account in computing the total income.*

*2.The Ld. CIT(A), NFAC has erred on facts and in law in not directing to allow deduction on payment of the amount which is deemed as income u/s 2(24)(x) r.w.s. 36(1)(va).”*

5. Briefly the facts of the case are that the assessee is a private limited and filed its return of income for the A.Y. 2018-19 on 30.11.2018 declaring total income of Rs. 19,97,34,220/- which was processed U/s 143(1) of the IT Act and in terms of intimation issued by CPC, it made disallowance of Rs. 1,21,09,240/- towards employee's contribution towards ESI and PF. On appeal, the ld. CIT(A)/ NFAC has confirmed the disallowance made U/s 143(1) on account of assessee's failure to pay the employee's contribution of PF/ESI within the prescribed due dates as per Section 36(1)(va) of the Act.

6. Being aggrieved by the order issued U/s 143(1) of the IT Act, the assessee preferred an appeal before the ld. CIT(A). The assessee filed complete details of the entire payments i.e. employee's PF & ESI contribution paid before the due date of filing of return of income.

7. The Id. CIT(A) after considering the amendment made by Finance Act, 2021 and the decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court in case of Chechmate Services Pvt. Ltd. vs. CIT (2022) 218 DTR 401 confirmed the adjustment made by CPC.

8. Now the assessee is in appeal before us. The Id. AR appearing on behalf of the assessee has placed their written submission which is extracted in below;

*"1. The assessee filed the return along with tax audit report for AY 2018-19 at total income of Rs.19.97 crores, for AY 2019-20 at total income of Rs.17.30 crores and for AY 2020-21 at total income of Rs.10.68 crores. At clause no. 20(b) of Form 3CD the tax auditor has reported the contribution received from the employees towards PF, ESI & other welfare fund along with the due date of making payment of the same to the concerned authorities and the actual date of payment.*

*2. The CPC in processing the return made adjustment of Rs.1,21,09,240/- in AY 18-19, Rs.1,05,76,000/- in AY 19-20 and Rs.15,44,160/- in AY 20-21 u/s 143(1)(a)(iv) stating that there is inconsistency in sum received from employees as contribution to PF or funds set up under ESI Act or any other fund for the welfare of employees to the extent not credited to the employees account on or before the due date u/s 36(1)(va).*

*3. The Ld. CIT(A) after considering the amendment made by FA, 2021 and the decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court in case of Checkmate Services Pvt. Ltd. Vs. CIT (2022) 218 DTR 401 confirmed the adjustment made by CPC.*

*Submission:-*

1. *At the outset it is submitted that the adjustment which can be made u/s 143(1)(a) in processing the return has been specifically provided as under:-*

*143. (1) Where a return has been made under section 139, or in response to a notice under sub-section (1) of section 142, such return shall be processed in the following manner, namely:—*

*(a) the total income or loss shall be computed after making the following adjustments, namely:—*

- (i) any arithmetical error in the return;*
- (ii) an incorrect claim, if such incorrect claim is apparent from any information in the return;*
- (iii) disallowance of loss claimed, if return of the previous year for which set off of loss is claimed was furnished beyond the due date specified under sub-section (1) of section 139;*
- (iv) disallowance of expenditure indicated in the audit report but not taken into account in computing the total income in the return;*
- (v) disallowance of deduction claimed under section 10AA or under any of the provisions of Chapter VI-A under the heading "C.— Deductions in respect of certain incomes", if the return is furnished beyond the due date specified under sub-section (1) of section 139; or*
- (vi) addition of income appearing in Form 26AS or Form 16A or Form 16 which has not been included in computing the total income in the return*

It may be noted that under sub-clause (iv) the adjustment can only be made in respect of disallowance of expenditure indicated in the audit report but not taken into account in computing the total income in the return. However, by Finance Act, 2021 w.e.f. 01.04.2021, apart from disallowance of expenditure, the word 'or increase in income' is also brought into the statute. Thus, so far as AYs under consideration are concerned, what can be adjusted under sub-clause (iv) is only disallowance of expenditure indicated in the audit report. The employees contribution to PF/ ESI/ other welfare fund u/s 36(1)(va) is the sum received by assessee from its employees which is deemed as income u/s 2(24)(x) if such sum is not credited to the employees account in the relevant fund on or before the due date. Thus, the adjustment made u/s 143(1)(a)(iv) in respect of employees contribution to PF/ ESI/ other welfare fund is not as per law and therefore, adjustment confirmed by CIT(A) be directed to be deleted.

2. It may also be noted that tax auditor has only mentioned the due date of remittance of employees contribution to PF/ESI/other welfare fund and the actual date of payment. It did not mention about disallowance of employees contribution to PF/ESI/other welfare fund wherever it was remitted beyond due date. Therefore, the same cannot be disallowed while processing the return u/s 143(1)(a). In this connection reliance is placed on the decision of Hon'ble ITAT Mumbai Bench in case of PR Packaging Service Vs. ACIT (2023) 221 DTR 1 where after distinguishing the decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court in case of Checkmate Services Pvt. Ltd., Hon'ble ITAT at Para 3 & 4 of the order held as under:-

*3. We have heard the rival submissions and perused the materials available on record. It is not in dispute that assessee had remitted the employees, contribution to provident fund beyond the due date prescribed under the Provident Fund Act, but had duly remitted the same before the due date of filing the return of income under s. 139(1) of the Act. This fact of remittance made by the assessee with delay had been reported by the tax auditor in the tax audit report. The copy of the tax audit report is placed on record by the learned Authorised Representative before us together with its annexures. On perusal of the same, we find that the tax auditor had merely mentioned the due date for remittance of provident fund as per the Provident Fund Act and the actual date of payment made by the assessee. The tax auditor had not even contemplated to disallow the employees' contribution to provident fund wherever it is remitted beyond the due date prescribed under the Provident Fund Act. Hence, it is merely recording of facts and a mere statement made by the tax auditor in his audit report. The learned CPC Bangalore had taken up this data from tax audit report and sought to disallow the same while processing the return under s. 143(1) of the Act, apparently by applying the provision of s. 143(1)(a)(iv) of the Act. For the sake of convenience, the relevant provision is reproduced hereunder:*

*"143(1) Where a return has been made under s. 139, or in response to a notice under sub-s. (1) of s. 142, such return shall be processed in the following manner, namely :*

*(a) The total income or loss shall be computed after making the following adjustments, namely:*

*(iv) disallowance of expenditure (or increase in income) indicated in the audit report but not taken into account in computing the total income in the return."*

4. From the aforesaid provisions, it is very clear that the said cl. (iv) would come into operation when the tax auditor had suggested for a disallowance of expense or increase in income, but the same had not been carried out by the assessee while filing the return of income. As stated supra, the tax auditor had not stated in the instant case to disallow Employees' Contribution to Provident Fund wherever it is remitted beyond the due date under the respective Act. Hence, in our considered opinion, the said action of the learned CPC Bangalore in disallowing the employees' contribution to provident fund while processing the return under s. 143(1) of the Act is against the provisions of the Act as it would not fall within the ambit of prima facie adjustments.

3. It is also submitted that section 36(1) which provides for 'other deduction', states that deduction provided for in the specified clauses shall be allowed in respect of matters dealt with therein, in computing the income referred to in section 28. Clause (va) of said section reads as under:-

*any sum received by the assessee from any of his employees to which the provisions of sub-clause (x) of clause (24) of section 2 apply, if such sum is credited by the assessee to the employee's account in the relevant fund or funds on or before the due date.*

*Explanation.—For the purposes of this clause, "due date" means the date by which the assessee is required as an employer to credit an employee's contribution to the employee's account in the relevant fund under any Act, rule, order or notification issued thereunder or under any standing order, award, contract of service or otherwise.*

*From the plain reading of the section it can be noted that due date has been defined in the Explanation to mean the date by which assessee is required to credit the employees contribution in the relevant fund under any Act, rule, order or notification issued thereunder or under any standing order, award, contract of service or otherwise. The section nowhere provides that the due date means the date by which the amount is to be deposited under the relevant Statute. For this reason Hon'ble Karnataka High Court in case of CIT Vs. Sabari Enterprises (2008) 298 ITR 141 at para 12 & 13 of its order held as under:-*

12. After hearing learned counsel for the parties, we have carefully examined the above statutory provisions of the Act including the definition of sections 2(24)(x) and s. 36(1)(va) and 43B(b), which read thus :

"2.(24) 'income' includes,— . . .

*(x) any sum received by the assessee from his employees as contributions to any provident fund or superannuation fund or any fund set up under the provisions of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), or any other fund for the welfare of such employees."*

*"43(b) any sum payable by the assessee as an employer by way of contribution to any provident fund or superannuation fund or gratuity or any other fund for the welfare of employees, or". "36.(1) The deductions provided for in the following clauses shall be allowed in respect of the matters dealt with therein, in computing the income referred to in s. 28— . . .*

*(va) any sum received by the assessee from any of his employees to which the provisions sub-clause (x) of clause (24) of s. 2 apply, if such sum is credited by the assessee to the employee's account in the relevant fund or funds on or before the due date.*

*Explanation.—For the purposes of this clause, 'due date' means the date by which the assessee is required as an employer to credit an employee's contribution to the employee's account in the relevant fund under any Act, rule, order or notification issued thereunder or under any standing order, award, contract of service or otherwise."*

*13. This clause is inserted by the Finance Act with effect from 1st April, 1988. The Explanation to this clause is read very carefully. "Due date" has been explained stating that : means the date by which the assessee is required as an employer to credit contribution to the employees' account in the relevant fund under any Act, rule or order or notification issued thereunder or under any standing order, award, contract of service or otherwise." Prior to the above clause was inserted to s. 36 giving statutory deductions of payment of tax under the provisions of the Act, s. 43B(b) was inserted by the Finance Act, 1983, which came into force with effect from 1st April, 1984. Therefore, again the provision of s. 43B(b) clearly provides that notwithstanding anything contained in the other provisions of the Act including s. 36(1) clause (va) of the Act, even prior to the insertion of that clause the assessee is entitled to get statutory benefit of deduction of payment of tax from the Revenue. If that provision is read along with the first proviso of the said section which was inserted by the Finance Act, 1987, which came into effect from 1st April, 1988, the letters numbered as clause (a), or cl. (c) or cl. (d) or cl. (e) or cl. (f) are omitted from the above proviso and therefore deduction towards the employees contribution paid can be claimed by the assessee. The Explanation to clause (va) of s. 36(1) of the Income-tax Act further makes it very clear that the amount actually paid by the assessee on or before the due date applicable in this case at the time of submitting returns of income under s. 139 of the Act to the Revenue in respect of the previous year can be*

claimed by the assesseees for deduction out of their gross income. The above said statutory provisions of the Income-tax Act abundantly makes it clear that, the contention urged on behalf of the Revenue that deduction from out of gross income for payment of tax at the time of submission of returns under s. 139 is permissible only if the statutory liability of payment of provident fund or other contribution funds referred to in cl. (b) are paid within the due date under the respective statutory enactments by the assesseees as contended by learned counsel for the Revenue is not tenable in law and therefore the same cannot be accepted by us.

4. However, Hon'ble Supreme Court in case of *Checkmate Services Pvt. Ltd. Vs. CIT* (2022) 218 DTR 401 while deciding this issue has observed at Para 51 to 54 held as under:-

51. The analysis of the various judgments cited on behalf of the assessee i.e., [CIT vs. AIMIL Ltd. & Ors. \(2010\) 229 CTR \(Del\) 418 : \(2010\) 35 DTR \(Del\) 68 : \(2010\) 321 ITR 508 \(Del\)](#), (Delhi High Court); [CIT vs. Sabari Enterprises \(2007\) 213 CTR \(Kar\) 269 : \(2008\) 2 DTR \(Kar\) 394 : \(2008\) 298 ITR 141 \(Kar\)](#) (Karnataka High Court); [CIT vs. Pamwi Tissues Ltd. \(2008\) 215 CTR \(Bom\) 150 : \(2008\) 3 DTR \(Bom\) 66 : \(2009\) 313 ITR 137 \(Bom\)](#) (Bombay High Court); [CIT vs. Udaipur Dugdha Utpadak Sahakari Sangh Ltd. \(2014\) 265 CTR \(Raj\) 59 : \(2014\) 98 DTR \(Raj\) 109](#) : (2013) 35 taxmann.com 616 (Raj) [Rajasthan High Court] and *Nipso Polyfabriks* (supra) would reveal that in all these cases, the High Courts principally relied upon omission of second proviso to s. 43B(b). No doubt, many of these decisions also dealt with s. 36(va) with its Explanation. However, the primary consideration in all the judgments, cited by the assessee, was that they adopted the approach indicated in the ruling in *Alom Extrusions*. As noticed previously, *Alom Extrusions* did not consider the fact of the introduction of s. 2(24)(x) or in fact the other provisions of the Act.

52. When Parliament introduced s. 43B, what was on the statute book, was only employer's contribution [s. 36(1)(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 s. 36(1)(va) and simultaneously inserting the second proviso of s. 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 s. 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. Sec. 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 [s. 36(1)(va)]. The other important feature is that this distinction between the employers' contribution [s. 36(1)(iv)] and employees' contribution required to be deposited by the employer [s. 36(1)(va)] was maintained - and continues to be maintained. On the other hand, s. 43B covers all deductions that are permissible as expenditures, or outgoings 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 s. 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 precondition for allowing the expenditure.*

*53. The distinction between an employer's contribution which is its primary liability under law—in terms of s. 36(1)(iv), and its liability to deposit amounts received by it or deducted by it [s. 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 s. 2(24)(x) - unless the conditions spelt by Explanation to s. 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 s. 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 s. 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 assesseees are 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 s. 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.*

*With utmost regard to the decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court, it is submitted that it failed to take into consideration that Explanation to section 36(1)(va) nowhere provides that due date means the date by which employees contribution is to be deposited in the relevant fund under relevant statute but only provides that the amount is to be deposited under the relevant fund under any Act, rule, order or notification issued thereunder or under any standing order, award, contract of service or otherwise. Therefore, this decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court vis-à-vis the amendment made in section 36(1)(va) by introducing Explanation 2 by FA, 2021 be made applicable from AY 2021-22 and not for earlier AYs.*

5. *Without prejudice to above, it is submitted that if it is held that in view of the decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court (supra), the employees contribution to PF/ ESI if not deposited by the due date under the relevant statute, the same is deemed income u/s 2(24)(x) of the Act, then the same ought to be allowed on its actual payment u/s 37 of the Act which provides for allowance of any*

*expenditure not being expenditure of the nature described in section 30 to 36 laid out or expended wholly or exclusively for the purpose of business. As stated above, employees contribution received by the assessee is deemed to be an income u/s 2(24)(x) and thus, it is not an expenditure of the nature described u/s 36 and therefore, such amount when paid needs to be allowed as deduction u/s 37 of the Act. For this proposition reliance is placed on the following decisions:-*

*M/s BBG Metal Syndicate Pvt. Ltd. Vs. DCIT in ITA No.112/CTK/2022 order dt. 17.11.2022 (Cuttack) (Trib.)*

*The Hon'ble ITAT after considering the decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court in case of Checkmate Services Pvt. Ltd. Vs. CIT 218 DTR 401, Hon'ble ITAT at Para 6 & 7 of the order held as under:-*

6. *In the case of Nirakar Security & Consultancy Services Pvt Ltd vs ITO in ITA No.98/CTK/2022 for Assessment Year 2016-17, order dated 17.10.2022, the Co-ordinate Bench of this Tribunal after considering the arguments of Id AR, has restored the issue to the file of the Assessing officer with the following directions:*

*"6. Liberty is granted to the Id AR to make all submissions in respect of allowability of disallowed contribution of the employees to PF and ESI under other relevant provisions in the interest of justice. This direction is being given because Id AR has submitted that as the amount is not allowable under section 36(1)(va) of the Act and same is also not covered under section 43B of the Act, the amount of delayed contribution to PF and ESI in respect of employees contribution would be treated as income in the hands of the assessee u/s 2(24)(x) and on subsequent payment of the same, it would be a business expenditure, which can be claimed u/s.37(1) of the Act. We are not expressing any opinion in regard to his arguments as it has not been examined by the lower authorities. Liberty is also granted to the assessee to raise all arguments as are found necessary by him before the lower authorities."*

7. *As the issue in the present appeal is also identical to the issue in the case of Nirakar Security & Consultancy Services Pvt Ltd.,(supra), on identical findings the issue in this appeal is restored to the file of the AO for re-adjudication after granting the assessee adequate opportunity of being heard.*

*ACIT Vs. Sunila Sahu MA No.23/CTK/2022 (Arising out of ITA No.07/CTK/2022) order dt. 13.01.2023 (Cuttack) (Trib.)*

The Hon'ble ITAT by following the decision of Nirakar Security & Consultancy Services Pvt Ltd vs ITO in ITA No.98/CTK/2022 for Assessment Year 2016-17 order dated 17.10.2022, restored the issue to the file of AO to consider the allowability u/s 37(1) of the Act on the payment of employees contribution to PF & ESI.

In view of above, even if addition is confirmed u/s 36(1)(va) in view of the decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court, amount paid by the assessee during the relevant AYs be directed to be allowed u/s 37(1) of the Act.”

9. Per contra, the Id. Sr. DR supported the contentions raised in the order of the Id. CIT(A) and vehemently argued that the disallowance are evidently not paid in time the same is disallowable and for that he has relied upon the decision of Hon'ble Apex Court in case of Checkmate Services P. Ltd. vs CIT Appeal No. 2833 of 2016 dated 12.10.2022.

10. We have considered the rival contention and perused the orders of the authorities and the material available on record. We find that now this issue has been decided by Hon'ble Supreme Court in favor of revenue in its recent decision in bunch of appeals titled as Checkmate Services P. Ltd. vs. CIT (Civil Appeal No.2833 of 2016 dated 12.10.2022). In this decision, it was noted by Hon'ble Court that there was divergent of opinion amongst various Hon'ble High Courts viz. High Courts of Bombay, Himachal Pradesh, Calcutta, Guwahati and Delhi favoring the interpretation beneficial to the assessee on one hand whereas High Courts of Kerala and Gujarat favoring interpretation in

favour of the Revenue on the other hand. Taking note of legislative history, the matter has finally been put to rest by Hon'ble Court in revenue's favor as under: -

“30. The factual narration reveals two diametrically opposed views in regard to the interpretation of Section 36(1)(va) on the one hand and proviso to Section 43(b) on the other. If one goes by the legislative history of these provisions, what is discernible is that Parliament's endeavour in introducing Section 43B [which opens with its non-obstante clause] was to primarily ensure that deductions otherwise permissible and hitherto claimed on mercantile basis, were expressly conditioned, in certain cases upon payment. In other words, a mere claim of expenditure in the books was insufficient to entitle deduction. The assessee had to, before the prescribed date, actually pay the amounts – be it towards tax liability, interest or other similar liability spelt out by the provision.

31. Section 43B falls in Part-V of the IT Act. What is apparent is that the scheme of the Act is such that Sections 28 to 38 deal with different kinds of deductions, whereas Sections 40 to 43B spell out special provisions, laying out the mechanism for assessments and expressly prescribing conditions for disallowances. In terms of this scheme, Section 40 (which too starts with a non obstante clause overriding Sections 30-38), deals with what cannot be deducted in computing income under the head “Profits and Gains of Business and Profession”. Likewise, Section 40A(2) opens with a non-obstante clause and spells out what expenses and payments are not deductible in certain circumstances. Section 41 elaborates conditions which apply with respect to certain deductions which are otherwise allowed in respect of loss, expenditure or trading liability etc. If we consider this scheme, Sections 40- 43B, are concerned with and enact different conditions, that the tax adjudicator has to enforce, and the assessee has to comply with, to secure a valid deduction.

32. The scheme of the provisions relating to deductions, such as Sections 32-37, on the other hand, deal primarily with business, commercial or

professional expenditure, under various heads (including depreciation). Each of these deductions, has its contours, depending upon the expressions used, and the conditions that are to be met. It is therefore necessary to bear in mind that specific enumeration of deductions, dependent upon fulfilment of particular conditions, would qualify as allowable deductions: failure by the assessee to comply with those conditions, would render the claim vulnerable to rejection. In this scheme the deduction made by employers to approved provident fund schemes, is the subject matter of Section 36 (iv). It is noteworthy, that this provision was part of the original IT Act; it has largely remained unaltered. On the other hand, Section 36(1)(va) was specifically inserted by the Finance Act, 1987, w.e.f. 01-04-1988. Through the same amendment, by Section 3(b), Section 2(24) – which defines various kinds of “income” – inserted clause (x). This is a significant amendment, because Parliament intended that amounts not earned by the assessee, but received by it, - whether in the form of deductions, or otherwise, as receipts, were to be treated as income. The inclusion of a class of receipt, i.e., amounts received (or deducted from the employees) were to be part of the employer/assessee’s income. Since these amounts were not receipts that belonged to the assessee, but were held by it, as trustees, as it were, Section 36(1)(va) was inserted specifically to ensure that if these receipts were deposited in the EPF/ESI accounts of the employees concerned, they could be treated as deductions. Section 36(1)(va) was hedged with the condition that the amounts/receipts had to be deposited by the employer, with the EPF/ESI, on or before the due date. The last expression “due date” was dealt with in the explanation as the date by which such amounts had to be credited by the employer, in the concerned enactments such as EPF/ESI Acts. Importantly, such a condition (i.e., depositing the amount on or before the due date) has not been enacted in relation to the employer’s contribution (i.e., Section 36(1)(iv)).

33. The significance of this is that Parliament treated contributions under Section 36(1)(va) differently from those under Section 36(1)(iv). The latter (hereinafter, “employers’ contribution”) is described as “sum paid by the assessee as an employer by way of contribution towards a recognized

provident fund”. However, the phraseology of Section 36(1)(va) differs from Section 36(1)(iv). It enacts that “any sum received by the assessee from any of his employees to which the provisions of sub-clause (x) of clause (24) of section 2 apply, if such sum is credited by the assessee to the employee's account in the relevant fund or funds on or before the due date.” The essential character of an employees’ contribution, i.e., that it is part of the employees’ income, held in trust by the employer is underlined by the condition that it has to be deposited on or before the due date.

34. It is therefore, manifest that the definition of contribution in Section 2 (c) is used in entirely different senses, in the relevant deduction clauses. The differentiation is also evident from the fact that each of these contributions is separately dealt with in different clauses of Section 36 (1). All these establish that Parliament, while introducing Section 36(1)(va) along with Section 2(24)(x), was aware of the distinction between the two types of contributions. There was a statutory classification, under the IT Act, between the two.

35. It is instructive in this context to note that the Finance Act, 1987, introduced to Section 2(24), the definition clause (x), with effect from 1 April 1988; it also brought in Section 36(1)(va). The memorandum explaining these provisions, in the Finance Bill, 1987, presented to the Parliament, is extracted below:

“Measures of penalising employers mis-utilising contributions to the provident fund or any funds set up under the provisions of the Employees State Insurance Act, 1948, or any other fund for the welfare of employees –

12.1. The existing provisions provide for a deduction in respect of any payment by way of contribution to the provident fund or a superannuation fund or any other fund for welfare of employees in the year in which the liabilities are actually discharged (Section 43B). The effect of the amendment brought about by the Finance act, is that no deduction will be allowed in the assessment of the employer, unless such contribution is paid into the fund on or before the due date. “Due date” means the date by which an employer is required to credit the contribution to the employees account in the relevant fund or under the

relevant provisions of any law or term of the contract of service or otherwise. (Explanation to Section 36 (1) of the Finance Act) 12.2. In addition, contribution of the employees to the various funds which are deducted by the employer from the salaries and wages of the employees will be taxed as income within brackets insertion of new [clause (x) in clause (24) of Section 2] of the employer, if such contribution is not credited by the employer in the account of the employee in the relevant fund by the due date. Where such income is not chargeable to tax under the head “profits and gains of business or profession” it will be assessed under the head “income from other sources.”

36. Significantly, the same Finance Act, 1987 also introduced provisos to Section 43B, through amendment (clause 10 of the Finance Bill). The memorandum explaining the Bill, pertinently states, in relation to second proviso to Section 43B that:

“...The second proviso seeks to provide that no deduction shall be allowed in regard to the sum referred to in clause (b) unless such sum has actually been paid during the previous year on or before the due date. The due date for the purposes of this proviso shall be the due date as under Explanation to clause (va) of sub-section (1) of Section 36.”

37. It is evident that the intent of the lawmakers was clear that sums referred to in clause (b) of Section 43B, i.e., “sum payable as an employer, by way of contribution” refers to the contribution by the employer. The reference to “due date” in the second proviso to Section 43B was to have the same meaning as provided in the explanation to Section 36(1)(va). Parliament therefore, through this amendment, sought to provide for identity in treatment of the two kinds of payments: those made as contributions, by the employers, and those amounts credited by the employers, into the provident fund account of employees, received from the latter, as their contribution. Both these contributions had to necessarily be made on or before the due date.

38. This court had occasion to consider the object of introducing Section 43B, in *Allied Motors*. The court held, after setting out extracts of the Budget speech of the Finance Minister, for 1983-84, that:

"Section 43B was, therefore, clearly aimed at curbing the activities of those tax-payers, who did not discharge their statutory liability of payment of excise duty, employer's contribution to provident fund, etc., for long periods of time but claimed deductions in that regard from their income on the ground that the liability to pay these amounts had been incurred by them in the relevant previous year. It was to stop this mischief that Section 43B was inserted."

39. Original Section 43B(b) enabled the assessee/employer to claim deduction towards contribution as an employer, "by way of contribution to any provident fund". The second proviso was substituted by Finance Act, 1989 with effect from 01.04.1989 and read as under: "...Provided further that no deduction shall in respect of any sum referred to in clause (b) be allowed unless such sum has actually been paid in cash or to by issue of a cheque or draft or by any other mode on or before the due date as defined in the explanation below Clause (va) of sub-section (1) of Section 36, and where such payment has been made otherwise than in cash, the same has been realised within 15 days from the due date."

40. The position in law remained unchanged for 14 years. The Central Government then constituted the Kelkar Committee, to suggest tax reforms. The report suggested amendments inter alia, to Section 43B. The relevant extract of the report is as follows:

"In terms of the provisions of section 43B of the Income-tax Act, deduction for statutory payments relating to labour, taxes and State and public financial institutions are allowed as deductions, if they are paid during the financial year. However, under the provisions payment of taxes and interest to State and public financial institution are deemed to have been paid during the financial year even if they are paid by the due date of filing of return. Further if the liability is discharged in the subsequent year after the due date of filing of return, the payment is allowed as a deduction in the subsequent year. In the case of statutory payment relating to labour, the deduction for the payment is

disallowed if such payment is made any time after the last date of payment of the about related liability. Trade and industry across the country represented that the delayed payment of statutory liability related to labour should be accorded the same treatment as delayed payment of taxes and interest, i.e. they should be allowed in the year of account. Since the objective of the provision is to ensure that a tax-payer does not avail of any statutory liability without actually making a payment for the same, we are of the view that these objectives would be served if the deduction for the statutory liability relating to labour are allowed in the year of payment. The complete disallowance of such payments is too harsh a punishment for delayed payments. Therefore, we recommend that the deduction for delayed payment of statutory liability relating to labour should be allowed in the year of payment like delayed taxes and interest."

Based on the report, the Union introduced amendments to the IT Act, including an amendment to Section 43B; the memorandum explaining the provisions in the Finance Bill, 2003 in the matter of Section 43B. inter alia, reads thus:

"The Bill also proposes to provide that in case of deduction of payments made by the assessee as an employer by way of contribution to any provident fund or superannuation fund or any other fund for the welfare of the employees shall be allowed in computing the income of the year in which such sum is actually paid. In case the same is paid before the due date of filing the return of income for the previous year, the allowance will be made in the year in which the liability was incurred. These amendments will take effect from 1st April, 2004 and will accordingly apply in relation to the assessment year 2004-05 and subsequent years."

41. The Notes on Clauses inter alia, reads as follows:

"It is also proposed to amend the first proviso to the said section so as to omit the references of clause (a), clause (c), clause (d), clause (e) and clause (f) which is consequential in nature.

It is also proposed to omit the second proviso to the said section. These amendments will take effect from 1st April, 2004 and will, accordingly, apply in relation to the assessment year 2004-2005 and subsequent years."

42. The rationale for introduction of Section 43B was explained by this court in *M.M. Aqua Technologies Ltd. vs. Commissioner of Income Tax, Delhi*:

“19. The object of Section 43B, as originally enacted, is to allow certain deductions only on actual payment. This is made clear by the non obstante Clause contained in the beginning of the provision, coupled with the deduction being allowed irrespective of the previous years in which the liability to pay such sum was incurred by the Assessee according to the method of accounting regularly employed by it. In short, a mercantile system of accounting cannot be looked at when a deduction is claimed under this Section, making it clear that incurring of liability cannot allow for a deduction, but only "actual payment", as contrasted with incurring of a liability, can allow for a deduction.”

43. This condition, i.e., of payment of actual amount on or before the due date to enable deduction, continued for 14 years. By the amendment of 2003, the second proviso was deleted. This court interpreted the law, in the light of these developments, in *Alom Extrusions*. The court considered the effect of omission of the second proviso, and observed as follows:

“10. “Income” has been defined under Section 2(24) of the Act to include profits and gains. Under Section 2(24)(x), any sum received by the assessee from his employees as contributions to any provident fund/superannuation fund or any fund set up under the Employees’ State Insurance Act, 1948, or any other fund for the welfare of such employees constituted income. This is the reason why every assessee(s) was entitled to deduction even prior to 1-4-1984, on mercantile system of accounting as a business expenditure by making provision in his books of accounts in that regard. In other words, if an assessee(s) [employer(s)] is maintaining his books on accrual system of accounting, even after collecting the contribution from his employee(s) and even without remitting the amount to the Regional Provident Fund Commissioner (RPFC), the assessee(s) would be entitled to deduction as business expense by merely making a provision to that effect in his books of accounts. The same situation arose prior to 1-4-1984, in the context of assessee(s) collecting sales tax and other indirect taxes from their respective

customers and claiming deduction only by making provision in their books without actually remitting the amount to the exchequer. To curb this practice, Section 43-B was inserted with effect from 1-4-1984, by which the mercantile system of accounting with regard to tax, duty and contribution to welfare funds stood discontinued and, under Section 43-B, it became mandatory for the assessee(s) to account for the aforesaid items not on mercantile basis but on cash basis. This situation continued between 1-4-1984 and 1-4-1988, when Parliament amended Section 43-B and inserted the first proviso to Section 43-B.

11. By this first proviso, it was, inter alia, laid down, in the context of any sum payable by the assessee(s) by way of tax, duty, cess or fee, that if an assessee(s) pays such tax, duty, cess or fee even after the closing of the accounting year but before the date of filing of the return of income under Section 139(1) of the Act, the assessee(s) would be entitled to deduction under Section 43-B on actual payment basis and such deduction would be admissible for the accounting year. This proviso, however, did not apply to the contribution made by the assessee(s) to the labour welfare funds. To this effect, the first proviso stood introduced with effect from 1-4-1988. \*\*\*

15. By the Finance Act, 2003, the amendment made in the first proviso equated in terms of the benefit of deduction of tax, duty, cess and fee on the one hand with contributions to the Employees' Provident Fund, superannuation fund and other welfare funds on the other. However, the Finance Act, 2003, bringing about this uniformity came into force with effect from 1-4-2004. Therefore, the argument of the assessee(s) is that the Finance Act, 2003, was curative in nature, it was not amendatory and, therefore, it applied retrospectively from 1-4-1988, whereas the argument of the Department was that the Finance Act, 2003, was amendatory and it applied prospectively, particularly when Parliament had expressly made the Finance Act, 2003 applicable only with effect from 1-4-2004.

\*\*\* 18. However, as stated above, the second proviso resulted in implementation problems, which have been mentioned hereinabove, and which resulted in the enactment of the Finance Act, 2003, deleting 25 the

second proviso and bringing about uniformity in the first proviso by equating tax, duty, cess and fee with contributions to welfare funds. Once this uniformity is brought about in the first proviso, then, in our view, the Finance Act, 2003, which is made applicable by Parliament only with effect from 1-4-2004, would become curative in nature, hence, it would apply retrospectively with effect from 1-4-1988.

19. Secondly, it may be noted that, in *Allied Motors (P) Ltd. v. CIT* [(1997) 3 SCC 472 : (1997) 224 ITR 677], the scheme of Section 43-B of the Act came to be examined. In that case, the question which arose for determination was, whether sales tax collected by the assessee and paid after the end of the relevant previous year but within the time allowed under the relevant sales tax law should be disallowed under Section 43-B of the Act while computing the business income of the previous year? That was a case which related to Assessment Year 1984-1985. The relevant accounting period ended on 30-6-1983. The Income Tax Officer disallowed the deduction claimed by the assessee which was on account of sales tax collected by the assessee for the last quarter of the relevant accounting year. The deduction was disallowed under Section 43-B which, as stated above, was inserted with effect from 1-4-1984

\*\*\* 22. It is important to note once again that, by the Finance Act, 2003, not only is the second proviso deleted but even the first proviso is sought to be amended by bringing about a uniformity in tax, duty, cess and fee on the one hand vis-à-vis contributions to welfare funds of employee(s) on the other. This is one more reason why we hold that the Finance Act, 2003 is retrospective in operation. Moreover, the judgment in *Allied Motors (P) Ltd.* [(1997) 3 SCC 472 : (1997) 224 ITR 677] was delivered by a Bench of three learned Judges, which is binding on us. Accordingly, we hold that the Finance Act, 2003 will operate retrospectively with effect from 1-4-1988 (when the first proviso stood inserted).

23. Lastly, we may point out the hardship and the invidious discrimination which would be caused to the assessee(s) if the contention of the Department is to be accepted that the Finance Act, 2003, to the above extent, operated

prospectively. Take an example, in the present case, the respondents have deposited the contributions with RPFC after 31st March (end of accounting year) but before filing of the returns under the Income Tax Act and the date of payment falls after the due date under the Employees' Provident Fund Act, they will be denied deduction for all times. In view of the second proviso, which stood on the statute book at the relevant time, each of such assessee(s) would not be entitled to deduction under Section 43-B of the Act for all times. They would lose the benefit of deduction even in the year of account in which they pay the contributions to the welfare funds, whereas a defaulter, who fails to pay the contribution to the welfare fund right up to 1-4-2004, and who pays the contribution after 1-4-2004, would get the benefit of deduction under Section 43-B of the Act.”

44. There is no doubt that in *Alom Extrusions*, this court did consider the impact of deletion of second proviso to Section 43B, which mandated that unless the amount of employers' contribution was deposited with the authorities, the deduction otherwise permissible in law, would not be available. This court was of the opinion that the omission was curative, and that as long as the employer deposited the dues, before filing the return of income tax, the deduction was available.

45. A reading of the judgment in *Alom Extrusions*, would reveal that this court, did not consider Sections 2(24)(x) and 36(1)(va). Furthermore, the separate provisions in Section 36(1) for employers' contribution and employees' contribution, too went unnoticed. The court observed inter alia, that:

“15. ...It is important to note once again that, by Finance Act, 2003, not only the second proviso is deleted but even the first proviso is sought to be amended by bringing about an uniformity in tax, duty, cess and fee on the one hand vis-a-vis contributions to welfare funds of employee(s) on the other. This is one more reason why we hold that the Finance Act, 2003, is retrospective in operation. Moreover, the judgement in *Allied Motors (P) Limited* (supra) is delivered by a Bench of three learned Judges, which is binding on us. Accordingly, we hold that Finance Act, 2003 will operate retrospectively with effect from 1st April, 1988 [when the first proviso stood inserted]. Lastly, we may point out the hardship and the invidious discrimination which would be

caused to the assessee(s) if the contention of the Department is to be accepted that Finance Act, 2003, 2003, to the above extent, operated prospectively. Take an example - in the present case, the respondents have deposited the contributions with the R.P.F.C. after 31st March [end of accounting year] but before filing of the Returns under the Income Tax Act and the date of payment falls after the due date under the Employees' Provident Fund Act, they will be denied deduction for all times. In view of the second proviso, which stood on the statute book at the relevant time, each of such assessee(s) would not be entitled to deduction under Section 43B of the Act for all times. They would lose the benefit of deduction even in the year of account in which they pay the contributions to the welfare funds, whereas a defaulter, who fails to pay the contribution to the welfare fund right upto 1st April, 2004, and who pays the contribution after 1st April, 2004, would get the benefit of deduction under Section 43B of the Act. In our view, therefore, Finance Act, 2003, to the extent indicated above, should be read as retrospective. It would, therefore, operate from 1st April, 1988, when the first proviso was introduced. It is true that the Parliament has explicitly stated that Finance Act, 2003, will operate with effect from 1st April, 2004. However, the matter before us involves the principle of construction to be placed on the provisions of Finance Act, 2003”.

46. A discussion on the Principles of interpretation of tax statutes is warranted. In *Ajmera Housing Corporation & Ors. vs. Commissioner of Income*<sup>17</sup> this court held as follows:

“27. It is trite law that a taxing statute is to be construed strictly. In a taxing Act one has to look merely at what is said in the relevant provision. There is no presumption as to a tax. Nothing is to be read in, nothing is to be implied. There is no room for any intendment. There is no equity about a tax. (See: *Cape Brandy Syndicate v. Inland Revenue Commissioners* (1921) 1 KB 64 and *Federation of A.P. Chambers of Commerce and Industry and Ors. v. State of A.P. and Ors.*(2000) 6 SCC 550. In interpreting a taxing statute, the Court must look squarely at the words of the statute and interpret them. Considerations of hardship, injustice and equity are entirely out of place in

interpreting a taxing statute. (Also see: Commissioner of Sales Tax, Uttar Pradesh v. The Modi Sugar Mills Ltd. 1961 (2) SCR 189.)”

47. Likewise, this court underlined the rule, regarding interpretation of taxing statutes, in Commissioner of Income Tax-III v Calcutta Knitweaves, Ludhiana. 18 Recently, in Union of India & Ors. vs. Exide Industries Limited & Ors, this court examined, and repelled a challenge to the constitutionality of Section 43B, especially the provision requiring actual payment, in respect of leave encashment benefit of employees. The court observations in this regard are relevant:

\*\*\* \*\*

48. One of the rules of interpretation of a tax statute is that if a deduction or exemption is available on compliance with certain conditions, the conditions are to be strictly complied with. 20 This rule is in line with the general principle that taxing statutes are to be construed strictly, and that there is no room for equitable considerations.

49. That deductions are to be granted only when the conditions which govern them are strictly complied with. This has been laid down in State of Jharkhand v Ambay Cements 21 as follows:

23.... In our view, the provisions of exemption clause should be strictly construed and if the condition under which the exemption was granted stood changed on account of any subsequent event the exemption would not operate.

24. In our view, an exception or an exempting provision in a taxing statute should be construed strictly and it is not open to the court to ignore the conditions prescribed in the industrial policy and the exemption notifications.

25. In our view, the failure to comply with the requirements renders the writ petition filed by the respondent liable to be dismissed. While mandatory rule must be strictly observed, substantial compliance might suffice in the case of a directory rule.

26. Whenever the statute prescribes that a particular act is to be done in a particular manner and also lays down that failure to comply with the said requirement leads to severe consequences, such requirement would be mandatory. It is the cardinal rule of interpretation that where a statute provides that a particular thing should be done, it should be done in the manner

prescribed and not in any other way. It is also settled rule of interpretation that where a statute is penal in character, it must be strictly construed and followed. Since the requirement, in the instant case, of obtaining prior permission is mandatory, therefore, non-compliance with the same must result in cancelling the concession made in favour of the grantee, the respondent herein.” 20 See for e.g., *Eagle Flask Industries Ltd. v. Commissioner of Central Excise*, 2004 Supp (4) SCR 35. 21 *State of Jharkhand v Ambay Cements*, (2005) 1 SCC 368. 30 This was also reaffirmed in a number of judgments, such as *Commissioner Income Tax v. Ace Multi Axes Systems Ltd.*

50. The Constitution Bench, in *Commissioner. of Customs v. Dilip Kumar & Co.* 23 endorsed as following:

“24. In construing penal statutes and taxation statutes, the Court has to apply strict rule of interpretation. The penal statute which tends to deprive a person of right to life and liberty has to be given strict interpretation or else many innocents might become victims of discretionary decision-making. Insofar as taxation statutes are concerned, Article 265 of the Constitution [ “265. Taxes not to be imposed save by authority of law.—No tax shall be levied or collected except by authority of law.”] prohibits the State from extracting tax from the citizens without authority of law. It is axiomatic that taxation statute has to be interpreted strictly because the State cannot at their whims and fancies burden the citizens without authority of law. In other words, when the competent legislature mandates taxing certain persons/certain objects in certain circumstances, it cannot be expanded/interpreted to include those, which were not intended by the legislature.

\*\*\* 34. The passages extracted above, were quoted with approval by this Court in at least two decisions being *CIT v. Kasturi & Sons Ltd.* [*CIT v. Kasturi & Sons Ltd.*, (1999) 3 SCC 346] and *State of W.B. v. Kesoram Industries Ltd.* [*State of W.B. v. Kesoram Industries Ltd.*, (2004) 10 SCC 201] (hereinafter referred to as “*Kesoram Industries case* [*State of W.B. v. Kesoram Industries Ltd.*, (2004) 10 SCC 201]”, for brevity). In the later decision, a Bench of five Judges, after citing the above passage from Justice G.P. Singh's

treatise, summed up the following principles applicable to the interpretation of a taxing statute:

- ‘(i) In interpreting a taxing statute, equitable considerations are entirely out of place. A taxing statute cannot be interpreted on any presumption or assumption. A taxing statute has to be interpreted in the light of what is clearly expressed; it cannot imply anything which is not expressed; it cannot import provisions in the statute so as to supply any deficiency;
- (ii) Before taxing any person, it must be shown that he falls within the ambit of the charging section by clear words used in the section; and
- (iii) If the words are ambiguous and open to two interpretations, the benefit of interpretation is given to the subject and there is nothing unjust in a taxpayer escaping if the letter of the law fails to catch him on account of the legislature's failure to express itself clearly.’”

51. The analysis of the various judgments cited on behalf of the assessee i.e., Commissioner of Income-Tax v. Aimil Ltd. 24; Commissioner of Income-Tax and another v. Sabari Enterprises<sup>25</sup>; Commissioner of Income Tax v. Pamwi Tissues Ltd. 26; Commissioner of Income-Tax, Udaipur v. Udaipur Dugdh Utpadak Sahakari Sandh Ltd. 27 and Nipso Polyfabriks (supra) would reveal that in all these cases, the High Courts principally relied upon omission of second proviso to Section 43B (b). No doubt, many of these decisions also dealt with Section 36(va) with its explanation. However, the primary consideration in all the judgments, cited by the assessee, was that they adopted the approach indicated in the ruling in Alom Extrusions. As noticed previously, Alom Extrusions did not consider the fact of the introduction of Section 2(24)(x) or in fact the other provisions of the Act.

52. When Parliament introduced Section 43B, what was on the statute book, was only employer's contribution (Section 34(1)(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 isto 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 are 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 later 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 34 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.”

It has finally been held by Hon’ble Court that there is clear distinction between 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 from its employees’ [in terms of Sec. 36(1)(va)]. The former forms part of the employers’ income, and the later retains its character as an income (albeit deemed), by virtue of Section 2(24)(x) and therefore, subjected to conditions spelt out by Explanation to Section 36(1)(va) 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 contributions – the employer’s liability is to be paid out of its income whereas the second is deemed to be 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. If the same is not deposited as per mandate of Sec.36(1)(va), the deduction of the same would not be available to the assessee. Thus, this issue stands in favor of revenue and we respectfully follow the same.

11. At the same time, we are of the considered opinion that this decision of Hon'ble Court would relate back to the date of consequential amendment brought in by legislatures in respective provisions of the act and it was to be presumed that the legal position was always like that i.e., both the contributions were to be treated differently since inception and the Employee's contribution was always subjected to rigors of Sec.36(1)(va). If the assessee complies with the same only then the deduction would be allowed to the assessee otherwise the same would continue to form the income of the assessee. The said decision, in our opinion, is to be given full consequential effect.

12. Respectfully following the recent decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court in case of Checkmate Services P. Ltd Vs. CIT (Civil appeal No. 2833 of 2016 dated 12.10.2022) and considering our findings and adjudication in preceding paragraphs, the impugned disallowances stand confirmed.

13. The fact of the case in ITA No. 436 & 437/JP/2022 is similar to the case in ITA No. 435/JP/2022 and we have heard both the parties and persuaded the materials available on record. The bench has noticed that the issues raised by the assessee in this appeal Nos. 436 & 437/JP/2022 is equally similar on set of facts and grounds. Therefore, it is not imperative to repeat the facts and various grounds raised by both the parties. Hence,

the bench feels that the decision taken by us in ITA No. 435/JP/2022 for the Assessment Year 2018-19 shall apply mutatis mutandis in the case of in ITA No. 436 & 437/JP/2022 for the Assessment Years 2019-20 & 2020-21.

In the result, appeals of the assessee are dismissed.

Order pronounced in the open Court on 24/05/2023

Sd/-

( राठोड कमलेश जयन्तभाई )  
(RATHOD KAMLESH JAYANTBHAI)  
लेखा सदस्य / Accountant Member

Sd/-

( डॉ.एस.सीतालक्ष्मी )  
(Dr. S. Seethalakshmi)  
न्यायिक सदस्य / Judicial Member

जयपुर / Jaipur

दिनांक / Dated:- 24/05/2023

\*Ganesh Kr.

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

1. अपीलार्थी / The Appellant- M/s Ready Roti India Pvt. Ltd., Jaipur
2. प्रत्यर्थी / The Respondent- CPC, Bangalore/ACIT/DCIT, Circle-06, Jaipur
3. आयकर आयुक्त / CIT
4. आयकर आयुक्त / CIT(A)
5. विभागीय प्रतिनिधि, आयकर अपीलीय अधिकरण, जयपुर / DR, ITAT, Jaipur.
6. गार्ड फाईल / Guard File { ITA Nos. 435 to 437/JPR/2022 }

आदेशानुसार / By order

सहायक पंजीकार / Asst. Registrar