

**IN THE INCOME TAX APPELLATE TRIBUNAL DELHI
BENCH "SMC"
BEFORE SHRI YOGESH KUMAR U.S., JUDICIAL MEMBER
AND
SHRI MANISH AGARWAL, ACCOUNTANT MEMBER
I.T.A. No.69/DDN/2025 (A.Y 2017-18)**

Anandi Committee Line Mallital Nanital Nanital 263001 PAN No. ATLPA1481H	Vs.	ITO Ward- 2(3)(1) Nanital
Appellant		Respondent
Appellant by	Sh. Pavan Kumar Nath, Advocate	
Respondent by	Sh. Amar Pal Singh, JCIT DR	
Date of Hearing	10/09/2025	
Date of Pronouncement	17/09/2025	

ORDER

PER MANISH AGARWALAM:

The appeal is filed by the Assessee against the order of the ADDL/JCIT(A)-10, Mumbai Appeal No.CIT(A),Haldwani/10299/2019-20 arising out of the order dated 20.11.2019 passed by the Assessing Officer for A.Y. 2017-18.

2. Brief facts of the case are that the assessee is an individual and filed her return of income on 28.03.2018 declaring total income at Rs.2,32,490/-.The case was selected for scrutiny for the reason large Value of cash deposited in Specified Bank Notes (SBN) during demonetization period as compared to income declared in return of income filed. Various notices were issued which were duly served and

after considering the submissions of the assessee addition of Rs.6,48,000/-was made u/s.69A r.w.s. 115BBE of the Act out of total cash deposited in SBN during demonetization period at Rs.13,48,000/-. The AO accepted deposits of Rs.7.00 lacs as genuine and remaining as unexplained cash.

3. Against the order of AO, assessee preferred an appeal before CIT(A) who vide impugned order dated 22.11.2024 dismissed the appeal of the assessee, therefore, aggrieved by the said order assessee is in appeal before the Tribunal.

4. The only ground of appeal is with respect to the addition of Rs.6,48,000/- made u/s 69A of the Act.

5. Before us the Ld. AR of the assessee submits that assessee was in Government service and after retirement had some savings alongwith previous withdrawals from the bank on various dates which were accumulated and stood deposited during demonetization in SBN into the bank accounts.

6. The Ld.AR submits that assessee was in receipts of cash on many occasion as per the customary traditions in Indian families which were accumulated with the assessee. Further the assessee is making regular cash withdrawal from the bank accounts for contingencies which were also accumulated. Besides this the assessee was of the age of around 62

years when the demonetization was announced and looking to the old age savings of approx. 7.00 lacs were quite reasonable. He further submits that assessee is unmarried and has no liability whatsoever and amounts received on various occasions from family members was kept by her as savings and the said cash was deposited during demonetization. He thus, requested with the addition so made.

7. On the other hand, Ld. Sr DR vehemently supported the orders of the lower authorities and requested for the confirmation of the additions made.

8. Heard both the parties and perused the material available on record. Assessee since beginning of the proceedings claimed that cash was deposited during demonization period out of the cash withdrawals made on various dates which were tabulated at page 2 of the order by the AO. Besides assessee has also had past savings in cash which were received by her on various occasions and out of bank withdrawals. The AO has accepted the cash withdrawal made during the period from 1.4.2016 to 8.11.2016 as tabulated at page 3 of the order however, did not accept the cash claimed to have accumulated out of past withdrawals and savings out of cash received on various occasions. Assessee was around 62 years of age and availability of cash of Rs. 6,48,000/-with the assessee cannot be treated as excessive. Assessee also filed an affidavit

before the lower authorities confirming these facts but the same was rejected without any contrary material. Looking to these facts, in our considered opinion explanation of the assessee with respect to the availability of cash as accumulation of the past savings cannot be brushed aside. Accordingly, we direct the AO to delete the addition.

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

Order pronounced in the open court on 17th September, 2025.

Sd/-

Sd/-

**(YOGESH KUMAR U.S.)
JUDICIAL MEMBER**

**(MANISH AGARWAL)
ACCOUNTANT MEMBER**

Date:- 17.09.2025

NEHA, Sr.P.S*

Copy forwarded to:

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

**ASSISTANT REGISTRAR
ITAT, NEW DELHI**