



IN THE INCOME TAX APPELLATE TRIBUNAL  
PUNE BENCHES "B", PUNE

BEFORE DR.MANISH BORAD, ACCOUNTANT MEMBER  
AND SHRI VINAY BHAMORE, JUDICIAL MEMBER

आयकर अपील सं. / ITA No.2637/PUN/2025  
Assessment Year : 2013-14

Shri Shivaji College, Principal Officer, Parbhani Basmat Road, Parbhani – 431 401 Maharashtra PAN : AABTM0727H	Vs.	ACIT, CPC-TDS, Ghaziabad UttarPradesh
Appellant		Respondent

आयकर अपील सं. / ITA No.2639/PUN/2025  
Assessment Year : 2013-14

Yashwantrao Chavan Institute of Polytechnic Beed, Principal Officer, 001, Vidya Nagri, Barshi Road, Beed – 431 112 Maharashtra PAN : AABTM0727H	Vs.	ACIT, CPC-TDS, Ghaziabad UttarPradesh
Appellant		Respondent

Appellant by	:	Shri Shubham N. Rathi (Virtual)
Respondent by	:	Shri Sanjay Dhivare (Virtual)
Date of hearing	:	22.12.2025
Date of pronouncement	:	06.01.2026

**आदेश / ORDER**

**PER DR. MANISH BOARD, ACCOUNTANT MEMBER :**

The captioned appeals at the instance of two different assesseees pertaining to A.Y. 2013-14 are directed against the orders dated 10.09.2025 framed by Addl/JCIT(A)-1, Coimbatore arising out of respective Intimation Orders dated



ITA Nos.2637 and 2639/PUN/2025  
Shri Shivaji College and  
Yashwantrao Chavan Institute of  
Polytechnic Beed

26.03.2025 passed 154 r.w.s.u/s.200A/206CB of the Income Tax Act, 1961.

2. We find that common issue has been raised by the assessee(s), therefore, these appeals were heard together and are being disposed of by this consolidated order for the sake of convenience.

3. We will take up the facts from ITA No.2637/PUN/2025 in the case of Shri Shivaji College. Assessee has raised following grounds of appeal :

*“1. The learned Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeals) [“the Ld. CIT(A)] has erred in affirming the order u/s 154 read with section 200A of the Income tax Act, 1961 [“the Act”] and confirming the levy of late fees of Rs. 41,000/- u/s 234E of the Act in the intimation generated u/s 200A passed in respect of TDS statement filed in Form 26Q for Quarter 2 of A.Y. 2013-14.*

*2. The Ld. CIT(A) has failed to appreciate that in respect of the TDS statements filed for the period prior to 01.06.2015, the late fee u/s 234E could not have been levied in the intimation order u/s 200A and hence, the levy of late fee in respect of the TDS statement filed for A.Y. 2013-14 (Q2) was not justified and deserves to be deleted.*

*3. The Appellant craves leave to add, alter, amend, delete or substitute any of the above grounds of appeal.”*

4. At the outset, ld. Counsel for the assessee submitted that common issue raised in the instant two appeals is squarely covered by the decision of this Tribunal in the case of *Ram Refrigeration & Electronics Pvt. Ltd. Vs. ITO in ITA Nos. 884 to 887/PUN/2025 order dated 23.05.2025.*

5. On the other hand, ld. Departmental Representative supported the orders of ld.CIT(A).



ITA Nos.2637 and 2639/PUN/2025  
 Shri Shivaji College and  
 Yashwantrao Chavan Institute of  
 Polytechnic Beed

6. We have heard the rival contentions and perused the record placed before us. We observe that the assessee(s) have furnished the e-TDS return for the F.Y. 2012-13 and the same were processed on 26.12.2013 and CPC while processing the TDS return has levied fee u/s.234E of the Act at Rs.41,000/- and Rs.22,800/- respectively. Admittedly, the assessee(s) did not file the appeal against the original intimation but subsequently has made applications u/s.154 of the Act against which Intimation has been received providing the details of TDS return filing of the original processing dates. Both the TDS returns have been processed by the CPC prior to 01.06.2015. Now the issue that whether the CPC had jurisdiction to levy fee u/s.234E of the Act prior to amendment brought in by the Finance Act, 01.06.2025 has been subject matter in various appeals before this Tribunal. In one of the decision referred and relied on by ld. Counsel for the assessee in the case of *Ram Refrigeration & Electronics Pvt. Ltd. Vs. ITO*, the Tribunal has held as under :

*“5. We have heard rival contentions and gone through the material placed before us. We observe that the assessee which is a private limited company furnished quarterly returns for F.Y. 2012-13 and the same were processed prior to 01/06/2015 wherein CPC levied late fee u/s. 234E of the Act for delay in filing of the TDS quarterly returns. Admittedly, the assessee did not file any appeal against the original order u/s. 200A of the Act, but subsequently, filed rectification applications u/s. 154 of the Act stating that in view of settled judicial precedence CPC has wrongly levied the late fee u/s. 234E, but failed to get any relief. Thereafter, the assessee filed separate appeals against the respective orders u/s. 154 of the Act against levy of late fee u/s. 234E of the Act for belatedly filing quarterly TDS returns which are subject matter of the instant bunch of appeals. We observe that similar set of facts and circumstances, where the original order u/s. 200A of the Act was not appealed before the Ld.CIT(A) but after rejection of application u/s. 154 of the Act, the appeal was preferred before the Ld.CIT(A) and after dismissal of the said appeals, the assessee preferred appeals before this Tribunal raising similar issue of charging of late fee u/s. 234E*



ITA Nos.2637 and 2639/PUN/2025  
Shri Shivaji College and  
Yashwantrao Chavan Institute of  
Polytechnic Beed

of the Act in the case of Pancharatna Buildcon Pvt. Ltd (supra), this Tribunal after considering the judicial precedents, held in favour of the assessee observing as follows:-

"9. We have heard the rival arguments made by both the parties and perused the material available on record. It is an admitted fact that because of late filing of the quarterly TDS return in Form-26Q, for the period Q3 of F.Y. 2012-2013 the Dy. Director of Income Tax, Centralized Processing Cell-TDS, Vaishali, Ghaziabad has imposed late fee u/s 234E of the Act and thereby, computed interest u/s.220(2) of the Act. We find the Ld. CIT(A) upheld the action of the CPC on the ground that as per the statutory provisions inserted by the Finance Act, 2012 payment of late fee for filing TDS late is mandatory. Therefore, the demand raised for levy u/sec.234E for the period prior to 01.06.2015 is very well valid and the levy of late fee u/sec.234E of the Act cannot be assailed

9.1. We find under identical circumstances, the Coordinate Bench of the Tribunal in the case of Dhairyasheel Pralhad Pawar, Kolhapur vs. DCIT, TDS-CPC, Kolhapur ITA. Nos. 950 to 955/ PUN./2022 dated 14.02.2023, has held that no late fee u/sec.234E can be imposed for the periods prior to 01.06.2015. The relevant observations of the Tribunal in para nos. 5 and 6 are as under:

"5. We have heard the rival submissions and gone through the relevant material on record. It is seen that fee u/s.234E has been imposed by the AO for belated filing of the relevant statements. The assessment years involved in these 5 appeals are 2013-14 and 2014-15, which shows that the fee u/s.234E has been imposed for the delay in furnishing the statements for quarters prior to 01-06-2015.

6. Section 200A deals with processing of statements of tax deducted at source. Clause (c) of section 200A(1) was inserted by the Finance Act 2015 w.e.f. 01-06-2015 providing for the levy of fee u/s.234E of the Act. In that view of the matter, such fee u/s.234E can be levied only for the default committed after 01-06-2015 and not prior to that. The Hon'ble Kerala High Court in Olari Little Flower Kuries Pvt. Ltd. Vs. Union of India and others (2022) 440 ITR 26 (Kerala) has affirmed the non-imposition of fee for the period prior to 01-06-2015. Similar view has been taken in Jiji Varghese VS. ITO(TDS) & Ors. (2022) 443 ITR 267 (Ker) holding that no interest u/s 234E can be imposed for the periods of the respective A. Ys. prior to June 1, 2015."

9.2. We find the learned Coordinate Bench of the Tribunal in the case of Dadasaheb Vittalrao Urhe, Pune vs. ITO, TDS,



ITA Nos.2637 and 2639/PUN/2025  
Shri Shivaji College and  
Yashwantrao Chavan Institute of  
Polytechnic Beed

Pune IIA. No. 1286 to 1309/PUN./2023 dated 29.02.2024  
under identical circumstances observed as under:

"5. We have heard the common rival contentions of both the parties; and subject to the provisions of rule 18 of Income Tax Appellate Tribunal Rules, 1963 for short ITAT, Rules') perused the material placed on records and considered the facts in the light of settled position law.

6. In the context of levy of fees for default, it shall serve to state that, a person liable to deduct any sum under the provisions of chapter XVII of the Act, is under obligation to deliver or furnish a statement u/s 200(3) of the Act within the due date prescribed therein and in the event of default such person is exposed to section 234E of the Act. Although the levy of fees u/s 234E for delay in furnishing statement has been brought into statute w.e.f. 1 July, 2012, the enabling provision of section 200A(1)(c) authorising such levy came into force w.e.f. 1" June, 2015 by Finance Act, 2015, consequently the fees levied for any default prior thereto being sine auctoritate hence unsustainable in the eyes of law. This position finds fortified by the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka in Fatheraj Singhvi & Ors Vs UOI reported in 289 CTR 602 & Sree Ayyappa Educational Charitable Trust & Anr. Vs. DCIT (WP-618/2015). Followed by Hon'ble Kerala High Court in 'Olari Little Flower Kuries Pvt. Ltd. Vs UOI (WA600/2017), by co-ordinate benches in 'Medical Superintendent Rural Hospital Vs DCIT (2018) 173 ITD 575, KD Realities Put. Ltd. VS CIT (2019)SCC Online21609, 'Permanent Magnets Ltd. Vs CIT (2019)SCC Online 20844."

10. Since admittedly in the instant case, the Assessing Officer/CPC-TDS has levied late fee u/sec.234E for the period prior to 01.06.2015, therefore, respectfully following the decisions of the Coordinate Benches of the Tribunal (supra) and in absence of any contrary material brought to our notice by the Learned DR, we set aside the order of the Ld. CIT(A) and direct the Assessing Officer-CPC to delete the late fee u/sec.234E and the consequential interest u/sec.220(2) of the Act. The grounds raised by the assessee in it's "lead" appeal ITA. No. 2049/PUN./2024 are accordingly allowed.

11. In the result, ITA.No.2049/PUN./2024 filed by the assessee is allowed

12. Since facts in the remaining appeals are identical to the facts of the appeal in ITA. No.2049/PUN./2024, therefore, respectfully following our observations in the said appeal, these appeals ITA. Nos. 2050 to 2062/PUN./2024 of the assessee are allowed.



ITA Nos.2637 and 2639/PUN/2025  
Shri Shivaji College and  
Yashwantrao Chavan Institute of  
Polytechnic Beed

13. To sum-up, ITA. Nos. 2049 to 2062/PUN./2024 of the Assessee are allowed. A copy of this common order be placed in the respective case files."

6. From the perusal of the findings of this Tribunal and examining the facts of the instant case, we find that the decision of this Tribunal in the case of Pancharatna Buildcon Pvt. Ltd (supra) is squarely applicable on the facts of the instant case and the Ld.DR is unable to place any other binding precedent, we therefore, respectfully following the decision of this Tribunal in Pancharatna Buildcon Pvt. Ltd (supra) decide in favour of the assessee and accordingly, set aside the findings of Ld.CIT(A) and delete the impugned fee levied u/s. 234E of the Act in all the instant four appeals. Accordingly, all the grounds of appeal raised by the assessee in ITA Nos. 884 to 887/PUN/2025 are allowed."

7. Respectfully following the above decision and the same being squarely applicable on the issues raised in the instant appeals, we delete the impugned fee levied u/s.234E of the Act and allow the effective grounds of appeal raised by both the assessee(s).

8. In the result, both the appeals filed by the assessee(s) are allowed.

Order pronounced on this 06<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2026.

Sd/-  
**(VINAY BHAMORE)**  
**JUDICIAL MEMBER**

Sd/-  
**(MANISH BORAD)**  
**ACCOUNTANT MEMBER**

पुणे / Pune; दिनांक / Dated : 06<sup>th</sup> January, 2026.

Satish



ITA Nos.2637 and 2639/PUN/2025  
Shri Shivaji College and  
Yashwantrao Chavan Institute of  
Polytechnic Beed

**आदेश की प्रतिलिपि अग्रेषित / Copy of the Order forwarded to :**

1. अपीलार्थी / The Appellant.
2. प्रत्यर्थी / The Respondent.
3. The Pr. CIT concerned.
4. विभागीय प्रतिनिधि, आयकर अपीलीय अधिकरण, "B" बेंच,  
पुणे / DR, ITAT, "B" Bench, Pune.
5. गार्ड फ़ाइल / Guard File.

आदेशानुसार / BY ORDER,

// True Copy //

Assistant Registrar,  
आयकर अपीलीय अधिकरण, पुणे / ITAT, Pune.