

आयकर अपीलीय अधिकरण, जयपुर न्यायपीठ, जयपुर  
IN THE INCOME TAX APPELLATE TRIBUNAL, JAIPUR BENCHES,"A" JAIPUR

श्री राठौड़ कमलेश जयंतभाई, लेखा सदस्य एवं श्री सुधीर पारीक, न्यायिक सदस्य के समक्ष  
BEFORE: SHRI RATHOD KAMLESH JAYANTBHAI, AM & SHRI SUDHIR PAREEK, JM

आयकर अपील सं./ITA. No. 751 & 752/JPR/2024

|   |             |                               |
|---|-------------|-------------------------------|
| Ananvaya Nyasah<br>16-A Shubham Vihar Royal City<br>Kalwar Road, Hathoj, B.O.,<br>Jaipur. | बनाम<br>Vs. | The CIT-Exemption,<br>Jaipur. |
| स्थायी लेखा सं./जीआईआर सं./PAN/GIR No.: AAITA3590P  |             |                               |
| अपीलार्थी / Appellant   |             | प्रत्यर्थी / Respondent       |

निर्धारिती की ओर से / Assessee by : Shri Anoop Bhatia (C.A.)  
राजस्व की ओर से / Revenue by : Mrs. Meenakshi Vohra ( CIT ) ( Th. V.C.)

सुनवाई की तारीख / Date of Hearing : 18/12/2024  
उदघोषणा की तारीख / Date of Pronouncement : 19/12/2024

आदेश / ORDER

PER: RATHOD KAMLESH JAYANTBHAI, AM

The present two appeals filed by assessee, are arising out of the order of the learned Commissioner of Income Tax (Exemptions), Jaipur both dated 24.03.2024 [ for short "CIT(E)"] rejecting the registration u/s 12AB as sought and rejecting the recognition for the benefit of section 80G of the Income Tax Act [ for short Act ]. Both these appeal were heard together and are disposed off with this common order.

2.1 At the outset of hearing, the Bench observed that there is delay of 01 days in filing of the appeals by the assessee for which the Id. AR of the assessee filed applications for condonation of delay with following prayers and the assessee to this effect also filed an affidavit also :-

“In the aforesaid context, it is humbly submitted that appeal against the order passed by Id. CIT(Exemption) was served on the assessee on 24.03.2024 and appeal against the said order was supposed to have been filed latest by 23.05.2024. But due to the reason that the trust is registered in Jaipur, the Trustee (signatory) was residing in Ghaziabad at that time. Therefore, the signed documents could not reach the counsel office on time & therefore, the filing of appeal got marginally delayed by one day.”

In support of the contentions so raised the Authorized signatory filed an affidavit to support the contentions raised in the prayer for condonation of delay in filing the appeal.

2.2 The Id. AR of the assessee appearing in these appeals submitted that the assessee is serious on the duties and the delay of 01 days in filling an appeal was due to postal delay signing the document by the trustee and thus, the assessee has sufficient reasons for making the appeal with delay of one day. Considering that aspect of the matter and the decision of the apex court in the case of Collector, Land & Acquisition Vs. Mst. Katiji& Others 167

ITR 471(SC) wherein it was directed the other courts to consider the liber approach in deciding the petition for condonation as the assessee is not going to achieve any benefit for the delay in fact the assessee is at risk.

2.3. During the course of hearing, the Id. DR fairly did not objected to assessee's application for condonation of delay and prayed that Court may decide the issue as deem fit and proper in the interest of justice.

2.4 We have heard both the parties and perused the materials available on record. The Bench noted that the reasons advanced by assessee for condonation of delay of 01 days are sufficient to condone the delay as they have received the document late duly signed in post and that is why there is delay of one day. We considered the reasons advanced by the assessee. Thus, we concur with the submission of the assessee and condone the delay 01 days in filing the appeals by the assessee in view of the decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Collector, land Acquisition vs. Mst. Katiji and Others, 167 ITR 471 (SC) as the assessee was prevented by sufficient cause.

3.1 In ITA No.752/JPR/2024 the assessee has raised following

grounds: -

“1. Under the facts and circumstances of the case and in law Learned CIT, Exemptions has erred in denying the approval to the assessee under Section 12AB of the Income Tax Act 1961.

2. Under the facts and circumstances of the case and in law Ld. CIT, Exemptions has erred in rejecting the application of approval under section 12AB of the Income Tax Act 1961 on the technical grounds, such action being absolutely unjustified, unlawful as well as against the concept of natural justice hence the order passed by Ld. CIT, Exemptions deserves to be quashed.

3. Under the facts and circumstances of the case and in law Ld. CIT, Exemptions has erred in rejecting the application on the ground that appellant trust was not able to substantiate the genuineness of activities which is absolutely incorrect. Appellant prays rejecting the application without considering or rebutting the documents and material filed before the Ld. CIT being bad in law and in violations to the principles of natural justice deserves to be rolled back.

4. The appellant reserves the right to add, amend, modify, or alter any ground or grounds of appeal.

3.2 In ITANo.751/JPR/2024 the assessee has raised following

grounds: -

*“1. 1. Under the facts and circumstances of the case and in law Learned CIT, Exemptions has erred in denying the approval to the assessee under Section 80G of the Income Tax Act 1961.*

*2. Under the facts and circumstances of the case and in law Ld. CIT, Exemptions has erred in rejecting the application of approval under section 80G of the Income Tax Act 1961 on the technical terms, such action being absolutely unjustified, unlawful as well as against the concept of natural justice hence the order passed by Ld. CIT, Exemptions deserves to be quashed.*

*3. Under the facts and circumstances of the case and in law Ld. CIT, Exemptions has erred in rejecting the application on the ground that objects of the appellant trust was non charitable which is absolutely incorrect. Appellant prays rejecting the application without considering or rebutting the documents and material filed before the Ld. CIT being bad in law and in violations to the principles of natural justice deserves to be rolled back.*

*4. The appellant reserves the right to add, amend, modify, or alter any ground or grounds of appeal.”*

4. First, we take up the appeals of the assessee in ITA no. 752/JPR/2024, wherein the brief fact of the case is that the assessee filed online application in Form No. 10AB seeking registration u/s 12AB of the Act which was filed on 29.09.2023. A letter/notice dated 19.12.2023 was issued at the e- mail/address provided in the application requiring the assessee to submit certain documents/explanations by 29.12.2023, in response assessee filed request to adjourn the case for 2 weeks, considering the request case further fixed on 22.01.2024 vide letter dated 13.01.2024. In response, assessee filed reply on 20.01.2024 which was examined and found some discrepancies. A show cause letter was given on 26.02.2024 fixing the case on 04.03.2024. In response assessee filed reply dated 04.03.2024. Reply along with annexure examined and assessee not found eligible for the registration. Thereby the registration u/s. 12AB rejected on the following grounds:

- Non registration under Rajasthan Public Trust Act, 1959.
- Non genuineness of activities.

5. So far as the appeal in ITA No. 751/JPR/2024 we note that the said application for registration u/s. 80G of the Act was rejected on the following grounds:-

- Approval u/s 80G cannot be granted without registration u/s 12AB.
- Religious objects violation of 80G(5)(ii)

Ld. CIT(E) also noted that since the assessee failed to give proper justification for regularization of provisional approval, thus, he also cancelled the provisional registration granted to the assessee.

6. Assessee aggrieved from the rejection of approval / recognition assessee has preferred the present appeal on the grounds as raised here in above. Apropos to the ground so raised the Id. AR of the assessee submitted that the reasons advanced for rejection are curable and the assessee was not given sufficient opportunity of being heard before the Id. CIT(E) and even though the assessee was on the Bonafide belief that with registration under RPT no registration will be granted and thereby there are adverse observation of the Id. CIT(E). The Id. AR of the assessee also submitted that the trust has already applied for registration

under the Rajasthan Public Trust Act and to that effect he has filed the copy of public notice to be issued.

7. Per contra, the Id. DR relied on the orders of the Id. CIT(E) and submitted that the assessee even though various opportunities were given has not submitted required details and therefore, the plea of the assessee is not maintainable. Not only that the assessee is not coming out with the facts on the observation of the Id. CIT(E) about the non-genuine activity of the trust.

8. We have heard the rival contentions and perused material available on record. The Bench noted that the Id. CIT(E) in the application of the assessee pertaining to registration application u/s 12AB of the Act has been rejected on the ground of Non-registration with RPT Act, 1959 and also upon one notice the assessee partly complied the notice and balance details to be submitted by the assessee but before that the application for registration was rejected. Thus, the bench noted that the reasons advanced by the Id. CIT(E) while rejecting the application of the assessee are curable in nature and considering the peculiar facts of the case that the assessee already applied

for Registration as per Rajasthan Public Trust Act and thus, the liberal view of the matter is required to be taken in this case as the defect pointed out are not that much serious and if given a chance the assessee is in a position to clear the defects pointed out by the Id. CIT(E). Considering this aspect of the case the Bench does not want to go into merit of the case, but it is imperative that the assessee must be provided adequate opportunity of being heard and be given a fair chance by the Id. CIT(E) to cure the defect / non submission of the certain information. In the light of this aspect of the case, the Bench feels that the assessee should be given one more chance to contest the case before the Id. CIT(E) and the assessee is directed to produce all the relevant papers concerning both the application so filed before the Id. CIT(E) to settle the dispute raised hereinabove.

9. Before parting, we may make it clear that our decision to restore the matter back to the file of the Id. CIT(E) shall in no way be construed as having any reflection or expression on the merits of the dispute, which shall be adjudicated by the Id. CIT(E) independently in accordance with law.

In the result, the appeals of the assessee in ITA No.751/JPR/2024 and ITA No. 752/JPR/2024 are allowed for statistical purposes.

Order pronounced in the open Court on 19/12/2024.

Sd/-  
(सुधीर पारीक)

(SUDHIR PAREEK)  
न्यायिक सदस्य / Judicial Member  
जयपुर / Jaipur  
दिनांक / Dated:- 19/12/2024

\*Santosh

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

1. अपीलार्थी / The Appellant- Ananvaya Nyasah, Jaipur.
2. प्रत्यर्थी / The Respondent- CIT-Exemption, 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 No. 751 & 752/JPR/2024 }

आदेशानुसार / By order

सहायक पंजीकार / Asst. Registrar