

**आयकर अपीलीय अधिकरण, कोलकाता पीठ 'बी', कोलकाता**  
**IN THE INCOME TAX APPELLATE TRIBUNAL "B" BENCH KOLKATA**

**श्री संजय गर्ग, न्यायिक सदस्य एवं श्री गिरीश अग्रवाल, लेखा सदस्य के समक्ष**  
**Before Shri Sanjay Garg, Judicial Member and Shri Girish Agrawal, Accountant Member**

**I.T.A. No.734/Kol/2019**  
Assessment Year: 2014-15

**Parashar Coke P Ltd..... Appellant**  
**C/o S.N Ghosh and Associates, Advocates,**  
**2, Garstin Place, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, Suite No.203,**  
**Off Hare Street, Kol-1.**  
**[PAN: AAKCS0653G]**

**vs.**

**ITO, Ward-11(2), Kolkata..... Respondent**

**Appearances by:**

None appeared on behalf of the appellant.

Shri Sanjay Mukherjee, CIT-DR, appeared on behalf of the Respondent.

Date of concluding the hearing : April 20, 2023

Date of pronouncing the order : June 06, 2023

**आदेश / ORDER**

**संजय गर्ग, न्यायिक सदस्य द्वारा / Per Sanjay Garg, Judicial Member:**

The present appeal has been preferred by the assessee against the order dated 30.01.2019 of the Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeals)-4, Kolkata [hereinafter referred to as 'CIT(A)'] passed u/s 250 of the Income Tax Act (hereinafter referred to as the 'Act').

2. No one has put in appearance on behalf of the assessee despite notice. Earlier, Shri Somnath Ghosh, Advocate, appeared on behalf of the assessee on 18.04.2023. The date of hearing was informed to him in open court. Today, neither anyone has appeared nor any adjournment has been requested. A perusal of the assessment order as well as impugned order of the CIT(A) would reveal that no one represented either before the Assessing Officer or before the CIT(A). In the above

circumstances, it is apparent that the assessee is not interested in pursuing the present appeal, therefore, we proceed to decide the appeal after hearing the ld. DR.

3. The brief facts of the case are that the Assessing Officer during the assessment proceedings noted that the assessee had invested Rs.11,50,00,000/- as well as short term borrowing also increased Rs.11,50,00,000/-. The Assessing Officer required the ld. AR to produce the details of investment with the confirmations, creditworthiness, bank statement, source of fund of creditors. However, the ld. AR was unable to produce the same. Show-cause notice was issued to the director of the company but neither the director himself nor the AR of the assessee appeared with confirmations before the Assessing Officer. The Assessing Officer, thereafter, proceeded to frame the assessment and noticed that the assessee had failed to produce evidences relating to the identity and creditworthiness of the creditors and genuineness of transactions. The assessee had failed to prove the source of the investments. He under the circumstances invoked the provisions of section 68 of the Act and made the impugned addition of Rs.11,50,00,000/- as unexplained income of the assessee. The Assessing Officer also made additions in respect of expenditure incurred for earning tax exempt income of Rs.40,53,738/-.

4. Being aggrieved by the above order of the Assessing Officer, the assessee preferred appeal before the CIT(A) but neither anyone has appeared before the CIT(A) nor any documents furnished. The ld. CIT(A) thereafter concluded that the assessee has no evidence to prove his transactions and relying upon various case laws confirmed the additions so made by the Assessing Officer.

5. Since, neither anyone has appeared nor any submissions filed and after going through the order of the CIT(A), we do not find any infirmity in the order of the CIT(A) and the same is upheld.

6. In the result, the appeal of the assessee is hereby dismissed.

**Kolkata, the 6<sup>th</sup> June, 2023.**

Sd/-

[गिरीश अग्रवाल /Girish Agrawal]  
लेखा सदस्य/Accountant Member

Sd/-

[संजय गर्ग /Sanjay Garg]  
न्यायिक सदस्य/Judicial Member

Dated: 06.06.2023.

RS

*Copy of the order forwarded to:*

1. Parashar Coke P Ltd
2. ITO, Ward-11(2), Kolkata
3. CIT  
(A)-
4. CIT- ,
5. CIT(DR),

//True copy//

By order

Assistant Registrar, Kolkata Benches