

**IN THE INCOME TAX APPELLATE TRIBUNAL
DELHI BENCH 'B', NEW DELHI**

Before Dr. B. R. R. Kumar, Accountant Member

Ms. Astha Chandra, Judicial Member

ITA No. 698/Del/2023 : Asstt. Year : 2014-15

Cobol Technologies Pvt. Ltd., 921A, Ninth Floor, Devika Tower, Nehru Place, New Delhi-110019 (APPELLANT)	Vs.	ACIT, Central Circle-18, New Delhi-110055 (RESPONDENT)
PAN No. AALCS3846C		

Assessee by : None

Revenue by : Sh. Vivek Kr. Upadhyay, Sr. DR

Date of Hearing: 29.08.2023

Date of Pronouncement: 31.08.2023

ORDER

Per Dr. B. R. R. Kumar, Accountant Member:

The present appeal has been filed by the assessee against the order of Id. CIT(A)-27, New Delhi dated 16.01.2023.

2. The Assessing Officer levied penalty u/s 271(1)(c) of the IT Act of Rs.4,19,240/- on account of addition made u/s 68 of the Income Tax Act, 1961 in respect of sundry creditors for the F.Y. 2013-14. The penalty u/s 271(1)(c) has been confirmed by the Id. CIT(A). Aggrieved, the assessee filed appeal before us.

3. We have also gone through the notice u/s 274 r.w.s. 271(1)(c) of the Income Tax Act, 1961 issued by the Assessing Officer on 28.12.2017 which is a part of the record before us. We find that the Assessing Officer has issued the penalty order stating that, **have concealed the particulars of your income or furnished inaccurate particulars of such income.**

4. On this issue, we are guided by the following judgments:

- 1) Karnataka High Court: CIT vs. Manjunatha Cotton and Ginning Factory: 359 ITR 565 held that notice under section 274 should specifically state the grounds mentioned in section 271(1)(c) of the Act, i.e., whether it is for concealment of income or for furnishing of incorrect particulars of income. Sending printed form where all the grounds mentioned in section 271 are mentioned would not satisfy requirement of law.
- 2) Bombay High Court: Mr. Mohd. Farhan A. Shaikh Vs ACIT Section 271(1)(c): Penalty-Concealment-Non-striking off of the irrelevant part while issuing notice u/s 271(1)(c) of the Income Tax Act, order is bad in law. Assessee must be informed of the ground of the penalty proceedings only through statutory notice. An omnibus notice suffers from the vice of vagueness.
- 3) The Hon'ble jurisdictional Delhi High Court in the case of PCIT vs. Sahara India Life Insurance Co. Ltd. in ITA No. 475 of 2019, reiterated that notice under section 274 should specifically state the grounds on which penalty was sought to be imposed as the assessee should know the grounds which he has to meet specifically.
- 4) The aforesaid principle has been reiterated in the in the case of CIT vs. SSA'S Emerald Meadows: 73 taxmann.com 241 (Kar) [Revenue's SLP dismissed in 242 Taxman 180]

5. Hence, respectfully following the order of the Hon'ble Jurisdictional High Court, since the AO has not been specified u/s 274 as to whether penalty is proposed for alleged

'concealment of income' OR 'furnishing of inaccurate particulars of such income', the penalty levied is hereby obliterated.

6. In the result, the appeal of the assessee is allowed.

Order Pronounced in the Open Court on 31/08/2023.

Sd/-

(Astha Chandra)
Judicial Member

Sd/-

(Dr. B. R. R. Kumar)
Accountant Member

Dated: 31/08/2023

Subodh Kumar, Sr. PS

Copy forwarded to:

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

ASSISTANT REGISTRAR