

**IN THE INCOME TAX APPELLATE TRIBUNAL,
MUMBAI BENCH "SMC", MUMBAI**

**BEFORE SHRI KULDIP SINGH, JUDICIAL MEMBER
AND
SHRI AMARJIT SINGH, ACCOUNTANT MEMBER**

**ITA No.3694/M/2023
Assessment Year: 2020-21**

M/s. Commerce Center Premises Co. Op. Soc. Limited, 410, Commerce Center Co-operative Society, Tandon Road, Ramnagar, Dombivali (East)-421 201 PAN: AAAAC5951H	Vs.	Assistant Director of Income Tax, CPC, Bengluru (ITO Ward-3(1), Mumbai), Centralized Processing Center, Income Tax Department, Post Box No.1, Electronic City Post Office, Bangalore, Karnataka - 560 100
(Appellant)		(Respondent)

Present for:

Assessee by : Ms. Rutuja N. Pawar, A.R. a/w
Ms. Sneha More, A.R.

Revenue by : Shri S. Arunkumar, D.R.

Date of Hearing : 27 . 02 . 2024

Date of Pronouncement : 28 . 02 . 2024

ORDER

Per : Kuldip Singh, Judicial Member:

The appellant, M/s. Commerce Center Premises Co. Op. Soc. Limited (hereinafter referred to as 'the assessee') by filing the present appeal, sought to set aside the impugned order dated 17.08.2023 passed by the National Faceless Appeal Centre(NFAC)

[Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeals), Delhi] (hereinafter referred to as CIT(A)] qua the assessment year 2020-21 on the grounds inter-alia that :-

“1. That on the facts and in the circumstances of the case of the appellant and in law ld. NFAC has erred in not considering the application of rectification u / s 154 of the Act filed by the appellant.

2. That on the facts and in the circumstances of the case of the appellant and in law ld. NFAC has erred in ignoring the allowable deduction of Rs. 2,64,850/- claimed by the appellant u / s 80P(2)(d) of the Act.

3. That on the facts and in the circumstances of the case of the appellant and in law ld. NFAC has failed in accepting the interest earned on investment in co-operative banks.

4. That on the facts and in the circumstances of the case of the appellant and in law ld. NFAC has erred in not considering the submissions and case laws precedents filed during the course of proceedings before him.

5. That the impugned order being contrary to law, evidence and facts of the case may kindly be set aside, amended and modified in the light of the grounds of appeal enumerated above and the appellant be granted such relief as is called for on the facts and in the circumstances of the case of the appellant and in law.

6. That each of the grounds of appeal enumerated above is without prejudice to and independent of one another.

7. That the appellant craves leave to reserve to himself the right to add, to alter or amend any of the grounds of appeal before or at the end of the hearing and to produce such further evidence, documents and papers as may be necessary.”

2. Briefly stated facts necessary for consideration and adjudication of the issues at hand are : the assessee being a co-operative society limited filed its return of income for the year under consideration by claiming deduction amounting to Rs.2,64,852/- under section 80P(2)(d) of the Income Tax Act, 1961 (for short ‘the Act’) qua the interest income derived from the deposit with co-operative society/cooperative business. The

Centralised Processing Centre (CPC)/Assessing Officer (AO) after declining the contentions raised by the assessee society proceeded to disallow the deductions claimed by the assessee under section 80P of the Act and thereby added the same to the total income of the assessee by framing assessment under section 143(1) of the Act. The assessee further moved an application under section 154 of the Act for rectification which was also dismissed.

3. The assessee carried the matter before the Ld. CIT(A) by way of filing appeal who has confirmed the addition by dismissing the appeal. Feeling aggrieved with the impugned order passed by the Ld. CIT(A) the assessee has come up before the Tribunal by way of filing the present appeal.

4. We have heard the Ld. Authorised Representatives of the parties to the appeal, perused the orders passed by the Ld. Lower Revenue Authorities and documents available on record in the light of the facts and circumstances of the case and law applicable thereto.

5. Undisputedly the assessee society is wholly and exclusively engaged in providing credit facilities to the members of the society and business is also being transacted with the members only. It is also not in dispute that the assessee society has made investment in the form of FDRs in other cooperative society/banks on which it has earned the interest income of Rs.2,64,852/-.

6. In the backdrop of the aforesaid undisputed facts the sole question arises for determination in all the aforesaid appeals is:

“As to whether earning of interest income by the assessee from its funds parked with cooperative society/banks during the years under consideration is to be construed as the profits and gains of the business, thus eligible for deduction under section 80P(2)(a) of the Act?”

7. The Ld. A.R. for the assessee challenging the impugned order passed by the Ld. CIT(A) contended that the entire investment made by the assessee society of its surplus funds in the form of FDR with cooperative banks is in accordance with the rules framed under the Society Act for the ready availability of the required cash for routine business to be carried out for its members and relied upon the decision rendered by co-ordinate Bench of the Tribunal in case of Palm Court M Premises Co-operative Society Ltd. in ITA No.561/M/2021 order dated 09.09.2022.

8. We have perused the order (supra) relied upon by the Ld. A.R. for the assessee which is on identical issue and has decided the same in favour of the assessee by distinguishing the judgment rendered by Hon’ble Supreme Court in case of Totgar’s Co-operative Sale Society Ltd. (2017) 292 ITR 74 (Kar.) and by discussing the decision rendered by Hon’ble Bombay High Court and Hon’ble Gujarat High Court wherein it is held that interest income earned by the Co-operative Society on its investment made with co-operative bank would be eligible for claim of deduction under section 80P(2)(d) of the Act by returning following findings:

“8. We have given a thoughtful consideration to the contentions advanced by the ld. Authorized representatives for both the parties in context of the aforesaid issue under consideration. As stated by the ld. A.R, and rightly so, the issue that interest received by a co-operative society on its deposits with co-operative banks would be eligible for deduction u/s 80P(2)(d) of the Act is covered in assessee’s favour by orders of the various coordinate benches of the Tribunal in the following cases :

- (i). *M/s Solitaire CHS Ltd. Vs. Pr.CIT-26, Mumbai, ITA No.3155/Mum/2019, dated 29.11.2019*
- (ii). *Land and Cooperative Housing Society Ltd. Vs. ITO (2017) 46 CCH 52 (Mum.)*
- (iii). *M/s C. Green Cooperative Housing and Society Ltd. Vs. ITO-21(3)(2), Mumbai (ITA No. 1343/Mum/2017, dated 31.03.2017.*
- (iv). *Marvwanjee Cama Park Cooperative Housing Society Ltd. Vs. ITO-Range 20(2)(2), Mumbai (ITA NO. 6139/Mum/2014, dated 27.09.2017.*
- (v). *Kaliandas Udyog Bhavan Pemises Co-op. Society Ltd. Vs. ITO, 21(2)(1), Mumbai.*

*In the aforesaid orders, it has been held by the Tribunal that though the cooperative banks pursuant to the insertion of sub-section (4) to Sec. 80P of the Act would no more be entitled for claim of deduction u/s 80P of the Act, but as a co-operative bank continues to be a co-operative society registered under the Co-operative Societies Act, 1912 (2 of 1912) or under any other law for the time being in force in any State for the registration of co-operative societies, therefore, the interest income derived by a cooperative society from its investments held with a co-operative bank would be entitled for claim of deduction u/s 80P(2)(d) of the Act. We find that the aforesaid issue had exhaustively been looked into by the ITAT, „G“ bench, Mumbai in the case of *M/s Solitaire CHS Ltd, Vs. Pr.CIT-26, Mumbai ITA No.3155/Mum/2019, dated 29.11.2019, wherein the Tribunal had observed as under :**

“6. We have heard the authorised representatives for both the parties, perused the orders of the lower authorities and the material available on record, as well as the judicial pronouncements relied upon by them. Our indulgence in the present appeal has been sought, for adjudicating, as to whether the claim of the assessee for deduction under section 80P(2)(d) in respect of interest income earned from the investments/deposits made with the co-operative banks is in order, or not. In our considered view, the issue involved in the present appeal revolves around the adjudication of the scope and gamut of sub-section (4) of Sec. 80P as had been made available on the statute, vide the Finance Act 2006, with effect from 01.04.2007. On a perusal of the order passed by the Pr. CIT under Sec. 263 of the Act, we find, that he was of the view that pursuant to insertion of sub-section (4) of Sec. 80P, the assessee would no more be entitled for claim of deduction under Sec. 80P(2)(d) in respect of the interest income that was earned on the amounts which were parked as investments/deposits with co-operative banks, other than a Primary Agricultural Credit Society or a Primary Co-operative Agricultural and Rural Development Bank. Observing, that the co-operative banks from where the assessee was in receipt

of interest income were not co-operative societies, the Pr. CIT was of the view that the interest income earned on such investments/deposits would not be eligible for deduction under Sec. 80P(2)(d) of the Act.

7. After necessary deliberations, we are unable to persuade ourselves to be in agreement with the view taken by the Pr. CIT. Before proceeding any further, we may herein reproduce the relevant extract of the aforesaid statutory provision, viz. Sec. 80P(2)(d), as the same would have a strong bearing on the adjudication of the issue before us. “80P(2)(d) (1). Where in the case of an assessee being a co-operative society, the gross total income includes any income referred to in sub-section (2), there shall be deducted, in accordance with and subject to the provisions of this section, the sums specified in subsection (2), in computing the total income of the assessee. (2). The sums referred to in sub-section (1) shall be the following, namely :-

- (a).....*
- (b).....*
- (c).....*
- (d) in respect of any income by way of interest or dividends derived by the co-operative society from its investments with any other co-operative society, the whole of such income;”*

On a perusal of Sec. 80P(2)(d), it can safely be gathered that interest income derived by an assessee co-operative society from its investments held with any other co-operative society shall be deducted in computing its total income. We may herein observe, that what is relevant for claim of deduction under Sec. 80P(2)(d) is that the interest income should have been derived from the investments made by the assessee co-operative society with any other co-operative society. We are in agreement with the view taken by the Pr. CIT, that with the insertion of sub-section (4) of Sec. 80P, vide the Finance Act, 2006, with effect from 01.04.2007, the provisions of Sec. 80P would no more be applicable in relation to any co-operative bank, other than a primary agricultural credit society or a primary co-operative agricultural and rural development bank. However, at the same time, we are unable to subscribe to his view that the aforesaid amendment would jeopardise the claim of deduction of a co-operative society under Sec. 80P(2)(d) in respect of its interest income on investments/deposits parked with a co-operative bank. In our considered view, as long as it is proved that the interest income is being derived by a co-operative society from its investments made with any other co-operative society, the claim of deduction under the aforesaid statutory provision, viz. Sec. 80P(2)(d) would be duly available. We find that the term

„cooperative society“ had been defined under Sec. 2(19) of the Act, as under:-

“(19) “Co-operative society” means a cooperative society registered under the Cooperative Societies Act, 1912 (2 of 1912), or under any other law for the time being in force in any state for the registration of co-operative societies;”

We are of the considered view, that though the co-operative banks pursuant to the insertion of subsection (4) to Sec. 80P would no more be entitled for claim of deduction under Sec. 80P of the Act, but as a co-operative bank continues to be a co-operative society registered under the Co-operative Societies Act, 1912 (2 of 1912), or under any other law for the time being in force in any State for the registration of co-operative societies, therefore, the interest income derived by a co-operative society from its investments held with a co-operative bank would be entitled for claim of deduction under Sec.80P(2)(d) of the Act.

8. We shall now advert to the judicial pronouncements that have been relied upon by the ld. A.R. We find that the issue that a co-operative society would be entitled for claim of deduction under Sec. 80P(2)(d) on the interest income derived from its investments held with a co-operative bank is covered in favour of the assessee in the following cases:

(i) Land and Cooperative Housing Society Ltd. Vs. ITO (2017) 46 CCH 52 (Mum)

(ii) M/s C. Green Cooperative Housing and Society Ltd. Vs. ITO-21(3)(2), Mumbai (ITA No. 1343/Mum/2017, dated 31.03.2017)

(iii) Marvwanjee Cama Park Cooperative Housing Society Ltd. Vs. ITO-Range-20(2)(2), Mumbai (ITA No. 6139/Mum/2014, dated 27.09.2017.

(iv). Kaliandas Udyog Bhavan Pemises Co-op. Society Ltd. Vs. ITO, 21(2)(1), Mumbai.

We further find that the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka in the case of Pr. Commissioner of Income Tax and Anr. Vs. Totagars Cooperative Sale Society (2017) 392 ITR 74 (Karn) and Hon'ble High Court of Gujarat in the case of State Bank Of India Vs. CIT (2016) 389 ITR 578 (Guj), had held, that the interest income earned by the assessee on its investments with a co-operative bank would be eligible for claim of deduction under Sec. 80P(2)(d) of the Act. Still further, we find that the CBDT Circular No. 14, dated 28.12.2006, also makes it clear beyond any scope of doubt that the purpose behind enactment of sub-section (4) of Sec. 80P was that the co-operative banks which were functioning at par with other banks would no

more be entitled for claim of deduction under Sec. 80P(4) of the Act. Insofar the reliance placed by the Pr. CIT on the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Totgars Co-operative Sale Society Ltd. vs. ITO (2010) 322 ITR 283 (SC) is concerned, we are of the considered view that the same being distinguishable on facts had wrongly been relied upon by him. The adjudication by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the aforesaid case was in context of Sec. 80P(2)(a)(i), and not on the entitlement of a co-operative society towards deduction under Sec. 80P(2)(d) on the interest income on the investments/deposits parked with a co-operative bank. Although, in all fairness, we may herein observe that the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka in the case of Pr. CIT Vs. Totagars co-operative Sale Society (2017) 395 ITR 611 (Karn), had concluded that a co-operative society would not be entitled to claim of deduction under Sec. 80P(2)(d). At the same time, we find, that the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka in the case of Pr. Commissioner of Income Tax and Anr. Vs. Totagars Cooperative Sale Society (2017) 392 ITR 74 (Karn) and Hon'ble High Court of Gujarat in the case of State Bank Of India Vs. CIT (2016) 389 ITR 578 (Guj), had observed, that the interest income earned by a co-operative society on its investments held with a cooperative bank would be eligible for claim of deduction under Sec.80P(2)(d) of the Act. We find that as held by the Hon'ble High Court of Bombay in the case of K. Subramanian and Anr. Vs. Siemens India Ltd. and Anr (1985) 156 ITR 11 (Bom), where there is a conflict between the decisions of non-jurisdictional High Court's, then a view which is in favour of the assessee is to be preferred as against that taken against him. Accordingly, taking support from the aforesaid judicial pronouncement of the Hon'ble High Court of jurisdiction, we respectfully follow the view taken by the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka in the case of Pr. Commissioner of Income Tax and Anr. Vs. Totagars Cooperative Sale Society (2017) 392 ITR 74 (Karn) and Hon'ble High Court of Gujarat in the case of State Bank Of India Vs. CIT (2016) 389 ITR 578 (Guj), wherein it was observed that the interest income earned by a cooperative society on its investments held with a cooperative bank would be eligible for claim of deduction under Sec.80P(2)(d) of the Act. 9. Be that as it may, in our considered view, as the A.O while framing the assessment had taken a possible view, and therein concluded that the assessee would be entitled for claim of deduction under Sec. 80P(2)(d) on the interest income earned on its investments/deposits with cooperative banks, therefore, the Pr. CIT was in error in exercising his revisional jurisdiction u/s 263 for dislodging the same. In fact, as observed by us hereinabove, the aforesaid view taken by the A.O at the time of framing of the assessment was clearly supported by the order of the jurisdictional Tribunal in the

case of Land and Cooperative Housing Society Ltd. Vs. ITO (2017) 46 CCH 52 (Mum). Accordingly, finding no justification on the part of the Pr. CIT, who in exercise of his powers under Sec. 263, had dislodged the view that was taken by the A.O as regards the eligibility of the assessee towards claim of deduction under Sec. 80P(2)(d), we “set aside” his order and restore the order passed by the A.O under Sec. 143(3), date 14.09.2016.”

As the facts and the issue involved in the present case before us remains the same as were there before the Tribunal in the case of M/s Solitaire CHS Ltd. (supra), wherein the order passed by the Pr. CIT u/s 263 of the Act was quashed, we, thus, respectfully follow the same. Backed by our aforesaid deliberations, we are unable to uphold the view taken by the Pr. CIT that the failure on the part of the A.O to be disallow the assessee’s claim for deduction u/s 80P(2)(d) had rendered the assessment order passed by him u/s 143(3) of the Act, dated 31.08.2017 as erroneous in so far it was prejudicial to the interest of the revenue.

9. Accordingly, on the basis of our aforesaid observations, we herein not finding favor with the view taken by the Pr. CIT that the order passed by the A.O u/s 143(3), dated 31.08.2017 was erroneous in so far it was prejudicial to the interest of the revenue within the meaning of Sec. 263 of the Act set-aside the same and restore the order passed by the A.O u/s 143(3) of the Act, dated 31.08.2017.”

9. Hon’ble High Court of Karnataka in case of Pr. CIT & Anr. Vs. Totgar’s Co-operative Sale Society Ltd. (2017) 292 ITR 74 (Kar.) and Hon’ble Gujarat High Court in case of State Bank of India vs. CIT (2016) 389 ITR 578 (Guj.) had held that interest income earned by a co-operative society on its investment held with co-operative bank would be eligible for claim of deduction under section 80P(2)(d) of the Act.

10. So following the decision rendered by Hon’ble Karnataka High Court (supra) and Hon’ble Gujarat High Court (supra), we are of the considered view that assessee society who has earned an amount of Rs.13,85,532/- from its investment of surplus fund with

co-operative banks is entitled for deduction under section 80P(2)(d) of the Act. Resultantly, the Ld. CIT(A) has erred in upholding the denial of deduction by the AO to the assessee under section 80P(2)(d) of the Act.

11. In view of what has been discussed above, we are of the considered view that the Ld. CIT(A) has erred in upholding the denial of deduction by the assessee society claimed under section 80P(2)(d) of the Act, hence, AO is directed to allow the same.

13. Resultantly, appeal filed by the assessee is allowed for statistical purposes.

Order pronounced in the open court on 28.02.2024.

**Sd/-
(AMARJIT SINGH)
ACCOUNTANT MEMBER**

**Sd/-
(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDICIAL MEMBER**

Mumbai, Dated: 28.02.2024.

* Kishore, Sr. P.S.

Copy to: The Appellant
The Respondent
The CIT, Concerned, Mumbai
The DR Concerned Bench

//True Copy//

By Order

Dy/Asstt. Registrar, ITAT, Mumbai.