

आयकर अपीलीय अधिकरण, जयपुर न्यायपीठ, जयपुर
IN THE INCOME TAX APPELLATE TRIBUNAL, JAIPUR BENCHES,"A" 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. No. 135/JPR/2023
निर्धारण वर्ष / Assessment Years : 2017-18

Alsisar Hotels & Resorts Pvt. Ltd. Alsisar Haveli, Sansar Chandra Road, Jaipur,	बनाम Vs.	Assistant Commissioner Income Tax, Jaipur.
स्थायी लेखा सं./जीआईआर सं./PAN/GIR No.: AADCA 4733 C		
अपीलार्थी / Appellant		प्रत्यर्थी / Respondent

निर्धारिती की ओर से / Assessee by : Shri Neeraj Rathore (C.A.)
राजस्व की ओर से / Revenue by : None

सुनवाई की तारीख / Date of Hearing : 25/04/2023
उदघोषणा की तारीख / Date of Pronouncement : 26/05/2023

आदेश / ORDER

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

This appeal filed by the assessee is directed against order of the Id.
CIT(A), National Faceless Appeal Centre (for short "NFAC"), Delhi
dated 31.01.2023 for the assessment year 2017-18.

2. The assessee has raised the following ground:-

*"That the ACIT Circle-3, Jaipur erred in disallowing the PF and ESI
payment amounting to Rs. 2,82,166/- deposited before the due date of the
filing of return during the year.*

*2. That the petitioner raves to add, alter or amend all or any of the grounds
of appeal on or before the due date of hearing."*

3. Briefly the facts of the case are that the assessee is a private limited company running a Hotel and Restaurant and filed its return of income for the A.Y. 2017-18 declaring total income of Rs. 3,12,80,855/- which was processed U/s 143(1) of the IT Act and in terms of intimation issued by CPC, it made disallowance of Rs. 2,82,166/- towards employee's contribution towards ESI and PF. On appeal, the Id. 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.

4. Being aggrieved by the order issued U/s 143(1) of the IT Act, the assessee preferred an appeal before the Id. 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.

5. The Id. CIT(A) after considering the amendment made by Finance Act, 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.

6. 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:-

“The assessee is a Private Limited company running a Hotel and Restaurant. The assessee had filed the return of income at Rs. 3,09,81,634/-. The ld. AO while passing the order u/s 143(3) of the income tax act has disallowance Rs. 2,82,166/- under various expenses and has calculated the income as under:-

Income of the assessee by the ld. AO is computed as under:-

Particulars	Amount Rs.	Amount Rs.
Income declared as per return		3,09,81,634/-
Add:		
Disallowance on account of late payment of ESI/PF but paid before due date of filing of the return	2,82,166/-	
Total income		3,12,80,855/-
Rounded off		3,12,80,860/-

Aggrieved by the assessment order of Ld. AO, the assessee has filed before CIT(A) NFAC.

CIT(A) NFAC also rejected the claim of the assessee and taxed the same taking view of the Supreme Court in case of Chechmate Services (P) Ltd. v CIT (2022)143 taxmann.com 178(SC).

Issues

Ground No. 1

That the ld. ACIT, Circle-3, Jaipur erred in disallowing the PF and ESI payment amounting to Rs. 2,82,166/- deposited before the due date of the filing of return during the year.

That during the year the assessee has late paid contribution the PF to amounting to Rs. 2,82,166/- but before the due date of filing of the return.

That the amount so paid if is income u/s 2(24)(x) of the Income Tax Act, 1961, then it would qualify as business expenditure u/s 37(1) of the Income Tax Act,1961.

Similar view was also taken in the below given cases:

Nirkar Sukurity & consultancy v/s ITO, Ward-2 (3), held with the Income Tax Appellate Tribunal, Cuttack bench, Cuttack for AY. 2016-17 vide order No. ITA No. 98/CTK/2022 on 17 October, 2022. (copy Inclosed). The relevant para of the decision is as under:”

“Per Bench This is an appeal filed by the assessee against the order of the Id CIT(A), National Faceless Appeal Centre (NFAC), Delhi in Appeal No.ITBA/NFAC/S/250/2021 year 2016-17.

2. Shri K.K.Bal, Id AR appeared for the assessee and S.C.Mohanty, Id Sr DR appeared for the revenue.

3. It was submitted by Id AR that the issue involv delayed payment of PF and ESI in respect of employees contribution. It was submitted by Id AR that the payments have been made within the grace period of 5 days in some cases and in some cases, there has been delay in payment in respect of salary itself, which consequently affect the payment of PF and ESI. It was the prayer that the issue may be restored to the file of the Assessing Officer for verification and re-adjudication.

4. In reply, Id Sr DR submitted that the issue is now squarely covered by the decision of the Hon’ble Supreme Court in the case of Checkmate Services Pvt Ltd vs CIT in Civil Appeal No.2833 of 2016 dated 12.10.2022, wherein, the Hon’ble Supreme Court has categorically held that if the employees contribution to PF and ESI has been paid beyond the time prescribed under the relevant PF Act, then same is not allowable under section 43B even after the payment has been made before the due date of filing of return under the Income tax Act. It was the submission that the amount of employees contribution to PF and ESI, which has not been paid within the due date as prescribed under the relevant Act, has been held by Hon’ble Supreme Court to be not allowable u/s.36(1)(va) of the Act. It was the submission that the Hon’ble Supreme Court in paras 52 & 53 has also categorically held that the provisions of section 43B would not apply to the employees’ contribution to PF and ESI.

5. We have considered the rival submissions. Admittedly, the Hon’ble Supreme Court in the case of Checkmate Services Pvt Ltd(supra) has categorically held that the employees contribution to PF and ESI to the

extent it is not paid within due date prescribed under the PF Act, is not allowable u/s.36(1)(va) of the Act. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has also admittedly held that the provisions of section 43B would not apply to the provisions of section 36(1)(va) of the Act in respect of employees contribution. However, as ld AR submitted that the employees contribution to PF and ESI has been paid in some cases within grace period provided under the respective Act and also in some cases the salary has been paid belatedly, consequently, there was delay in payment of employees contribution to PF and ESI. This issue is restored to the file of the Assessing Officer for reexamination and re-adjudication after granting the assessee adequate opportunity of being heard.

6. Liberty is granted to the ld 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 ld 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. In the result, appeal of the assessee stands partly allowed for statistical purposes. Order dictated and pronounced in the open court on 17/10/2022.”

The same has also been covered in the below mentioned case and has similar facts.

BBG Metal Syndicate Pvt Ltd. v/s DCIT, ASMNT Circle (2)I, Cuttack, held with the Income Tax Appellate Tribuna, Cuttack Bench, Cuttack for AY. 2018-19 vide order No. ITA No. 112/CTK/2022 on 17 November, 2022. (copy Encoled). The relevant para of the decision is as under:”

“3. It was submitted by ld AR that the issue involved delayed payment of PF and ESI in respect of employees contribution. was submitted by ld AR that the payments have been made within the grace period of 5 days

in some cases and in some cases, there has been delay in payment in respect of salary itself, which consequently affect the payment of PF and ESI. It was the prayer that the issue may be restored to the file of the Assessing Officer for verification and re-adjudication.

4. In reply, Id Sr DR submitted that the issue is now squarely covered by the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Checkmate Services Pvt Ltd vs CIT in Civil Appeal No.2833 of 2016 dated 12.10.2022, wherein, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has categorically held that if the employees contribution to PF and ESI has been paid beyond the time prescribed under the relevant PF Act, then same is not allowable under section 43B even after the payment has been made before the due date of filing of return under the Income tax Act. It was the submission that the amount of employees contribution to PF and ESI, which has not been paid within the due date as prescribed under the relevant Act, has been held by Hon'ble Supreme Court to be not allowable u/s.36(1)(va) of the Act. It was the submission that the Hon'ble Supreme Court in paras 52 & 53 has also categorically held that the provisions of section 43B would not apply to the employees' contribution to PF and ESI.

5. We have considered the rival submissions. Admittedly, the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Checkmate Services Pvt Ltd(supra) has categorically held that the employees contribution to PF and ESI to the extent it is not paid within due date prescribed under the PF Act, is not allowable u/s.36(1)(va) of the Act. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has also admittedly held that the provisions of section 43B would not apply to the provisions of section 36(1)(va) of the Act in respect of employees contribution. However, as Id AR submitted that the employees contribution to PF and ESI has been paid in some cases within grace period provided under the respective Act and also in some cases the salary has been paid belatedly, consequently, there was delay in payment of employees contribution to PF and ESI. This issue is restored to the file of the Assessing Officer for reexamination and re-adjudication after granting the assessee adequate opportunity of being heard.

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.” Since the payment were made before the due date of filing of the return, the same may be allowed while computing the taxable income.

Ground No. 2

That the order passed by the learned AO is bad in law as well as on fact. That since the order passed by the learned AO is bad in law as well as on facts, it is requested that the addition may be deleted and obliterated.”

7. Per contra, the ld. Sr. DR is absent and but forwarded the decision of Hon’ble Apex Court in case of Hon’ble Supreme Court in the case of Checkmate Services Pvt. Ltd. vs CIT-1, 143 Taxmann.com 178 (SC)/Civil Appeal No. 2833 of 2016 with a request to consider the same.

8. We have heard the ld. AR and perused the materials available on record including the case laws cited by both the parties. In this case, it is noted that the AO disallowed the amount of Rs.2,82,166/- u/s 36(1)(va) of the Act on the ground that payments of employees contribution towards EPF and PF had not been made on or before the due date by the employer as per respective Acts which has been confirmed by the ld. CIT(A). It is not imperative to repeat the facts of the case and the case laws cited by both the parties. The Bench has observed that the recently the Hon’ble Supreme Court has opined in the case of Checkmate

Services Pvt. Ltd. vs CIT-1, 143 Taxmann.com 178 (SC)/Civil Appeal No. 2833 of 2016 held that the provision of Section 43B of the Act shall not apply to employee's contribution to PF/ESI and the due date specified u/s 36(1)(va) of the Act shall apply for determination of deductibility of employee's contribution to PF/ESI. The relevant portion of the Judgement of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Checkmate Services Pvt. Ltd. vs CIT-1 (supra) is reproduced as under:-

“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 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 [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.”

Similar issue has also been decided by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of PCIT vs Strides Arcolab Ltd. vide its order dated 29-11-2022

(Civil Appeal No.9009 of 2021 [2023] 147 taxmann.com 202 SC)]. The relevant head note is reproduced as under:-

Section 36(1)(va), read with section 2(24) and 43B of the Income Tax Act – Employee’s contributions (PF/ESI) – High Court by impugned order held that Tribunal was correct in deleting disallowance made under section 36(1)(va) being employee’s contribution to Provident Fund and ESI even though same were not deposited in respective fund within stipulated time – Apex Court in case of Checkmate Services (P) Ltd. vs CIT [2022] 143 taxmann.com 178/ [2023] 290 Taxman 19/[2022] 448 ITR 518/2022 SCC Online Sc 1423, held that non obstante clause under section 43B could not apply in case of employee’s contribution which were deducted from their income and was not part of assessee-employer’s income and, thus, said clause would not absolve assessee-employer from its liability to deposit employee’s contribution on or before due date as a condition for deduction. – Whether in view of the said judgement of Supreme Court, impugned order of High Court was to be set aside – Held , yes [Para 4) [In favour of Revenue]

For the sake of convenience and brevity of the case, the order passed by the Supreme Court in the case of PCIT vs Strides Arcolab Ltd. (supra) is also reproduced as under:-

“1.Leave granted.

2. As per the Office record, Service is complete on the sole respondent but none has entered appearance on behalf of the Respondnet Assessee.

3. Mr. Balbir Sharma, learned Additional Solicitor General appearing for the appellant submits that the issue involved in this appeal is squarely answered in favour of the Revenue by a Three-Judge Bench of this Court vide judgement dated 12-10-2022 in Checkmate

Services (P) Ltd. vs CIT [2022] 143 taxmann.com
178/[2023] 290 Taxman 19/[2022] 448 ITR 518/2022
SCC Online SC 1423

4. In view of the above, the impugned judgement dated 22-03-2019 passed by the High Court of Judicature at Bombay is set aside and the appeal is allowed in terms of the cited decision.”

It may be mentioned that similar issue has also been decided by the ITAT Delhi Bench in favour of the Revenue in the case of Salveen Kaur Vs Income Tax Office vide its order dated 9th January 2023 (in IT Appeal Nos. 2197,2249, 2250 and 2293 (Delhi) of 2022 – A.Y. 2017-18 to 2019-20 [2023] 147 taxmann.co. 402 (Delhi-Trib) by observing as under:-

“4. The undisputed fact in the captioned appeals is that there was a delay in depositing the employees’ contribution and the contribution has been deposited beyond the date stipulated under the relevant Fund Act.

5. Though the quarrel is no more res integra, as it has been settled by the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Checkmate Services Pvt Ltd 143 Taxmann.com 178. But, before us, the decision of the co-ordinate bench at Mumbai has been placed in the case of PR Packaging Service in ITA No. 2376/MUM/2022 and it has been seriously argued that the co-ordinate bench has considered the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court and yet decided the quarrel in favour of the assessee and against the Revenue.

6. Another argument taken before us is that the disallowance made by the CPC Bengaluru while processing the return u/s 143(1) of the Act is beyond the scope of provisions of section 143(1(a) of the Act and, therefore, cannot be sustained.

7. We have carefully perused the decision of the co-ordinate bench in the case of M/s P R Packaging Services [supra]. We find that the co-ordinate bench has not given any independent finding but has simply relied upon another decision of the co-

ordinate bench in the case of Kalpesh Synthetics Pvt Ltd 195 ITD 142 wherein the co-ordinate bench has based its decision on the interpretation and binding decision of the Hon'ble Jurisdictional High Court. In the case of Kalpesh Synthetics Pvt Ltd [supra], the Tribunal has held that the CPC Bengaluru cannot override the binding decision of the Hon'ble Bombay High Court while making the impugned disallowance on account of delay in the deposit of employees' contribution to PF/ESI.

8. It would be apt to refer to the relevant part of the decision of the Tribunal in the case of Kalpesh Synthetics [supra] followed in P R Packaging Service [supra] wherein it has been held as under:-

“8. When the law enacted by the legislature has been construed in a particular manner by the Hon'ble jurisdictional High Court, it cannot be open to anyone in the jurisdiction of that Hon'ble High Court to read any other manner than as read by the Hon'ble jurisdictional High Court. The views expressed by the tax auditor in such a situation, cannot be reason enough to disregard the binding views of the Hon'ble jurisdictional Court. To that extent, the provisions of section 143(1)(a)(iv) must be read down. What essentially follows is the adjustments under section 143(1)(a) in respect of” disallowance of expenditure indicated in the audit report but not taken into account in computing the total income in the return” is to be read as, for example, subject to the rider “except in a situation in which the audit report has taken a stand contrary to the law laid down by Hon'ble Courts above”. That is where the quasi judicial exercise of dealing with the objections of the assessee against proposed adjustments under section 143(1), assumes critical importance in the processing of returns, also important to bear in mind the fact that what constitutes jurisdictional High Court will essentially depend upon the location of the jurisdictional Assessing Officer. While dealing with jurisdiction for the appeals, rule 11(1) of the Central Processing of Returns Scheme, 2011 states that “Where a return is processed at the Centre, the appeal proceedings relating to the processing of the return shall lie with Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeals) [CIT(A)] having jurisdiction over the jurisdictional Assessing Officer” Thensitus of the CPC or the Assessing Office

CPC is thus irrelevant for the purpose of ascertaining the jurisdictional High Court. Therefore, in the present case, whether the CPC is within the jurisdiction of Hon'ble Bombay High Court or not, as for the regular Assessing Officer of the assessee and the assessee are located in the jurisdiction of Hon'ble Bombay High Court, the jurisdictional High Court, for all matters pertaining to the assessee, will be Hon'ble Bombay High Court. In our considered view, it cannot be open to the Assessing Officer CPC to take a view contrary to the view taken by the Hon'ble jurisdictional High Court- more so when his attention was specifically invited to binding judicial precedents in this regard. For this reason also, the inputs in question in the tax audit report cannot be reason enough to make the impugned disallowance. The assessee must succeed for this reason as well.”

9. With our utmost respect to the findings of the coordinate bench [supra], we are of the considered view that the coordinate bench has ignored the binding ratio decidendi of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Checkmate Services Pvt Ltd [supra]. It would be pertinent to refer to the most relevant observations of the Hon'ble Supreme Court on the impugned quarrel which read as under:-

“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 fulfillment 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.”

XXXXXX

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) foremployers' 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”.

XXXX

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. Eagle Flask Industries Ltd Vs. Commissioner of Central Excise 2004Supp (4) SCR 35. 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 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.”

XXXX

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.

54. 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."

10. In our understanding, the aforementioned binding observations of the Hon'ble Supreme Court cannot be brushed aside simply because the decision was rendered in the context where the assessment was framed u/s 143(3) and not u/s 143(1)(a) of the Act. In our considered opinion, the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court is in the context of allowability of deposit of PF/ESI after due date specified in the relevant Act.

11. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has categorically held that the employees' contribution deposited after respective due date cannot be allowed as deduction, and, therefore, it would be incorrect to say that the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court is applicable only in the case of an assessment framed u/s 143(3) of the Act. In our considered view, the ratio decidendi is equally applicable for the intimation framed u/s 143(1) of the Act.

12. Now coming to the challenge that the impugned adjustment is beyond the powers of the CPC Bengaluru u/s 143(1) of the Act is also not correct. In light of the aforementioned decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court [supra], as mentioned elsewhere, it cannot be stated that the impugned adjustment u/s 143(1) of the Act is beyond the powers of the CPC, Bengaluru.

13. The provisions of section 143(1)(a) read 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 143, 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 [or increase in income] 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 income", 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;”*

13.1 A perusal of the afore-stated provisions show that at every stage in sub-section (1) of the Act, the return submitted by the assessee forms the foundation, with respect to which, if any of the inconsistencies referred to in various sub-clauses are found, appropriate adjustments are to be made. It is an open secret that hardly 3 to 5% of the returns are selected for scrutiny assessment, out of which, more than 50% are because of AIR Information under CASS and the Assessing Officer cannot go beyond the reasons for scrutiny selection and such cases are called Limited Scrutiny cases and only the remaining returns are taken up for complete scrutiny u/s 143(3) of the Act.

13.2 Meaning thereby, that exercise of power under sub-section (2) of section 143 of the Act leading to the passing of an order under sub-section (3) thereof, is to be undertaken where it is considered necessary or expedient to ensure that the assessee has not understated income or has not computed excessive loss, or has not under paid the tax in any manner.

14. If any narrow interpretation is given to the decisions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Checkmate Services Pvt Ltd [supra], it would not only defeat the very purpose of the enactment of the provisions of section 143(1) of the Act but also defeat the very purpose of the Legislators and the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court would be made redundant because there would be discrimination and chaos, in as much as, those returns

which are processed by the CPC would go free even if the employees' contribution is deposited after the due date and in some cases the employer may not even deposit the employees' contribution and those whose returns have been scrutinized and assessed u/s 143(3) of the Act would have to face the disallowance.

15. This can neither be the intention of the Legislators nor the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court has to be interpreted in such a way so as to create such discrimination amongst the tax payers. Such interpretation amounts to creation of class [tax payer] within the class [tax payer] meaning thereby that those tax payers who are assessed u/s 143(3) of the Act would have to face disallowance because of the delay in deposit of contribution and those tax payers who have been processed and intimated u/s 143(1) of the Act would go scot-free even if there is delay in deposit of contribution and even if they do not deposit the contribution.

16. We are of the considered view that the ratio decidendi of the Hon'ble Supreme Court is equally applicable to the intimation u/s 143(1) of the Act and, therefore, the decision of the co-ordinate bench relied upon by the assessee is distinguishable. Therefore, respectfully following the binding decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court [supra], all the three appeals of the assessee are dismissed and that of the revenue is allow

17. In the result, all the three appeals of the assessee in ITA No. 249/DEL/2022, 2250/DEL/2022 and 2197/DEL/2022 are dismissed whereas the appeal of the Revenue in ITA No. 2293/DEL/2022 is allowed.''

In view of the above deliberations and the decision taken by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Checkmate Services (P) Ltd. vs CIT-1(supra), PCIT vs Strides Arcolab Ltd. and also the decision of ITAT Delhi Bench in the case of Savleen Kaur (supra), the Bench sustains the

addition confirmed by the Id. CIT(A) by dismissing the Ground No. 1 of the assessee.

In the result, appeal of the assessee is dismissed.

Order pronounced in the open Court on 26/05/2023

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:- 26/05/2023

*Santosh Kr.

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

अपीलार्थी / The Appellant- Alsisar Hotels & Resorts Pvt. Ltd., Jaipur

1. प्रत्यर्थी / The Respondent- ACIT, Jaipur
2. आयकर आयुक्त / CIT
4. आयकर आयुक्त / CIT(A)
5. विभागीय प्रतिनिधि, आयकर अपीलीय अधिकरण, जयपुर / DR, ITAT, Jaipur.
6. गार्ड फाईल / Guard File { ITA No. 135/JPR/2023 }

आदेशानुसार / By order

सहायक पंजीकार / Asst. Registrar