

**IN THE INCOME TAX APPELLATE TRIBUNAL  
DEHRADUN BENCH, DEHRADUN**  
**Before Sh. Satbeer Singh Godara, Judicial Member**  
**&**  
**Sh. Manish Agarwal, Accountant Member**

**ITA No. 55/DDN/2024 : Asstt. Year: 2017-18**

ACIT, Income Tax Office, 16-A, Cross Road, Dehradun-248001 (APPELLANT)	Vs	Regalia Jewels Pvt. Ltd., Shop No. 05, DLF Shopping Complex, Near Savitri Cinema, GK-2, New Delhi-110048 (RESPONDENT)
<b>PAN No. AACCR9572R</b>		

**Assessee by : Sh. Ajay Agarwal, CA**  
**Revenue by : Sh. Amar Pal Singh, Sr. DR**

<b>Date of Hearing: 15.01.2026</b>	<b>Date of Pronouncement: 15.01.2026</b>
------------------------------------	--

**ORDER**

**Per Satbeer Singh Godara, Judicial Member:**

This Revenue's appeal for Assessment Year 2017-18, arises against the CIT(A)-3, Noida's DIN & order No. ITBA/APL/M/250/2023-24/1061575148(1) dated 27.02.2024, in proceedings u/s 143(3) of the Income Tax Act, 1961.

2. Heard both the parties at length. Case file perused.
3. We notice during the course of hearing that the Revenue/appellant is aggrieved against the CIT(A)'s lower appellate discussion reversing assessment findings treating the assessee's alleged abnormal cash deposits/sales of Rs.3.41

crores as unexplained, added in assessment order dated 31.12.2019.

4. We have given our thoughtful consideration to the Revenue's and the assessee's respective vehement submissions against and in support of the CIT(A)'s impugned findings. We make it clear that although the assessee admittedly is engaged in jewellery business and he has placed on record all the documentary evidence to buttress the point that the impugned cash deposits form part of its business turnover in the relevant financial year, the same could not be pleaded and proved by way of cogent supportive evidence during the course of assessment. The fact however remains that such cash deposits in assessee's business activity of jewellery sales could not be altogether denied as well. We thus deem it appropriate in this factual backdrop that a lump sum addition of Rs.12,00,000/- only would be just and proper with a rider that the same shall not be treated as a precedent. Necessary computation shall follow as per law.

5. So far as assessee's assessment under Section 115BBE is concerned, we quote S.M.I.L.E Microfinance Limited Vs. The ACIT CC-1 in W.P.(MD) No.2078 of 2020 & W.M.P. (MD) No. 1742 of 2020 held that the said provision applied for

transactions done on or after 01.04.2017 only. The assessee is accordingly directed to be assessed under normal provisions only.

6. This Revenue's appeal is partly allowed.

Order Pronounced in the Open Court on 15/01/2026.

Sd/-

**(Manish Agarwal)**  
**Accountant Member**  
**Dated: 15/01/2026**

\*Subodh Kumar, Sr. PS\*

Copy forwarded to:

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

Sd/-

**(Satbeer Singh Godara)**  
**Judicial Member**

**ASSISTANT REGISTRAR**