

IN THE INCOME TAX APPELLATE TRIBUNAL PUNE
"B" BENCH PUNE
BEFORE SHRI MANISH BORAD, ACCOUNTANT MEMBER &
SHRI PAVAN KUMAR GADALE JUDICIALMEMBER
I T A. No.403/PUN/2026
(A.Y.2020-21)

Shree GaneshPlazaII CHS Ltd. Plot No.2/3/4, Sector 1, Panvel, Raigarh -410206, Maharashtra.	Vs	I.T.O. Ward- 4, Trifred Tower, Opp:Khanda Colony, Panvel-410206, Maharashtra.
PAN.No.ABHAS2779P		
(अपीलार्थी/Appellant)		(प्रत्यर्थी/Respondent)

Assesseeby	Shri.Suresh Kumar Gundher& Shri.Rajesh B Jage.AR
Revenue by	Shri.Ganesh B. Budruk.Addl.CIT- DR

सुनवाई की तारीख/Date of Hearing	08.04.2026
घोषणा की तारीख/Date of Pronouncement	17.04.2026

ORDER

PER PAVAN KUMAR GADALE, JM:

The appeal is filed by the assessee against the order of National Faceless Appeal Centre (NFAC) Delhi / CIT(A) passed u/sec144 and U/sec 250 of the Act. The assessee has raised the grounds of appeal challenging the ex parte order of the CIT(A) in not condoning the delay in filing the appeal and sustaining the disallowance of deduction u/sec80P of the Act made by the Assessing Officer.

2. At the time of hearing, the Ld.AR submitted that there is a delay of 88 days in filing the appeal before the Hon'ble Tribunal and the delay is not intentional and filed an affidavit of the assessee. On considering the facts and information mentioned in the affidavit there is a reasonable cause explained and the Ld. DR has no specific objections. Accordingly, the delay is condoned and the appeal is admitted.

3. The brief facts of the case are that, the assessee is a co-operative society and is engaged in providing credit facilities to its members. The assessee has filed the return of income for the A.Y 2020-21 on 14.02.2021 disclosing a total income of Rs. Nil after claiming deduction u/sec 80P of the Act. Subsequently the case was selected for scrutiny under the CASS and notice u/sec 143(2) and U/sec142(1) of the Act are issued. Whereas the Assessing Officer found that in spite of issuing show cause notice and notice u/sec 142(1) of the Act there was non-compliance. Therefore, the Assessing Officer considering the information available on record invoked the provisions u/sec. 144 of the Act disallowed the claim and assessed the total income of Rs.64,61,730/- and passed the order u/Sec. 144 r.w.s.144B of the Act dt.12.09.2022.

4. Aggrieved by the order, the assessee has filed an appeal before the CIT(A), whereas the CIT(A) has issued notice and there was no proper compliance by the assessee and there was delay of 763 days in filling the appeal and the

assessee has filed the sufficient reasons for the delay dealt at Page 2 Para 3 of the order. Whereas the CIT(A) has not condoned the delay and dismissed the assessee appeal in limine. Aggrieved by the CIT(A) order, the assessee has filed an appeal before the Hon'ble Tribunal.

5. At the time of hearing, the Ld. AR submitted that the CIT(A) has not considered the facts that the assessee has the knowledge of CIT(A) ex parte order only upon the initiation of recovery proceedings and immediately the assessee has filed the appeal against the assessment order dated 13.11.2024 before the CIT(A) and the delay was neither deliberate nor a wanton act. Further the Ld. AR emphasized that the assessee has good case on merits and prayed for an opportunity to substantiate with the material evidences before the lower authorities. Per Contra, the Ld. DR supported the order of the CIT(A).

6. We heard the rival submissions and perused the material on record. Prima-facie, the CIT(A) has passed the order considering the fact that there is no proper compliance by the assessee in spite of providing adequate opportunity of hearing and the delay in filing the appeal was not explained with the reasonable cause. Whereas the assessee has raised grounds of appeal challenging the denial of claim of deduction u/sec80P of the Act by the Assessing Officer and there could be various reasons for no proper compliance. Whereas the assessee in Form.No.35

made a request for condonation of delay in filing the appeal and dealt at Page 2 of the order. Therefore considering the facts, provisions and the condonation of delay request as dealt by the CIT(A) there is a reasonable cause explained and there is no benefit is derived in causing delay in filing appeal before the CIT(A). Whereas the Hon'ble Supreme Court in case of B. Madhuri Goud v. B. Damodar Reddy (2012) 12 SCC 693, has held that the following principles must be kept in mind while considering the application for condonation of delay;

(i) There should be a liberal, pragmatic, justice oriented, non-pedantic approach while dealing with an application for condonation of delay, for the courts are not supposed to legalise injustice but are obliged to remove injustice.

(ii) The terms "sufficient cause" should be understood in their proper spirit, philosophy and purpose regard being had to the fact that these terms are basically elastic and are to be applied in proper perspective to the obtaining fact-situation.

(iii) Substantial justice being paramount and pivotal the technical considerations should not be given undue and uncalled for emphasis.

(iv) No presumption can be attached to deliberate cause of delay but, gross negligence on the part of the counsel or litigant is to be taken note of.

(v) Lack of bona fides imputable to a party seeking condonation of delay is a significant and relevant fact.

(vi) It is to be kept in mind that adherence to strict proof should not affect public justice and cause public mischief because the courts are required to be vigilant so that in the ultimate eventuate there is no real failure of justice.

(vii) The concept of liberal approach has to encapsulate the conception of reasonableness and it cannot be allowed a totally unfettered free play.

(viii) There is a distinction between inordinate delay and a delay of short duration or few days, for to the former doctrine of prejudice is attracted whereas to the latter it may not be attracted. That apart, the first one warrants strict approach whereas the second calls for a liberal delineation.

(ix) The conduct, behaviour and attitude of a party relating to its inaction or negligence are relevant factors to be taken into consideration. It is so as the fundamental principle is that the courts are required to weigh the scale of balance of justice in respect of both parties and the said principle cannot be given a total go by in the name of liberal approach.

(x) If the explanation offered is concocted or the grounds urged in the application are fanciful, the courts should be vigilant not to expose the other side unnecessarily to face such litigation.

(xi) It is to be borne in mind that no one gets away with fraud, is representation or interpolation by taking recourse to the technicalities of law of limitation.

(xii) The entire gamut of facts are to be carefully scrutinized and the approach should be based on the paradigm of judicial discretion which is founded on objective reasoning and not on individual perception.

(xiii) The State or a public body or an entity representing a collective cause should be given some acceptable latitude.”

7. The Hon'ble supreme court in the case of Collector, Land Acquisition Vs. MST Katiji & others (167 ITR 471) (SC) has observed as under :

“ The legislature has conferred the power to condone delay by enacting s. 5 of the Limitation Act of 1963 in order to enable the Courts to do substantial justice to parties by disposing of matters on "merits". The expression "sufficient cause" employed by the legislature is adequately elastic to enable the Courts to

apply the law in a meaningful manner which subserves the ends of justice—that being the life-purpose of the existence of the institution of Courts. The doctrine of equality before law demands that all litigants, including the State as a litigant, are accorded the same treatment and the law is administered in an even-handed manner. There is no warrant for according a step-motherly treatment when the "State" is the applicant praying for condonation of delay. In fact, experience shows that on account of an impersonal machinery (no one in charge of the matter is directly hit or hurt by the judgment sought to be subjected to appeal) and the inherent bureaucratic methodology imbued with the note-making, file- pushing, and passing-on-the-buck ethos, delay on its part is less difficult to understand though more difficult to approve. In any event, the State which represents the collective cause of the community does not deserve a litigant non grata status. The Courts, therefore, have to be informed of the spirit and philosophy of the provision in the course of the interpretation of the expression "sufficient cause". So also the same approach has to be evidenced in its application to matters at hand with the end in view to do even-handed justice on merits in preference to the approach which scuttles a decision on merits."

8. We respectfully follow the observations and ratio of the decisions of Hon'ble Supreme Court and find that the delay in filing the appeal before the CIT (Appeals) by the assessee is supported with sufficient cause and pragmatic approach should be considered for condonation of delay and accordingly the delay is condoned. Further considering the principles of natural justice, the assessee shall be provided with one more opportunity of hearing to substantiate the case along with the evidences. Accordingly, we set aside the order of the CIT(A) and remit the entire disputed issues to the file of the Assessing Officer to adjudicate afresh on merits and

the assessee should be provided adequate opportunity of hearing and shall cooperate in submitting the information . And the grounds of appeal of the assessee are allowed for statistical purposes.

9. In the result, the appeal filed by the assessee is allowed for statistical purposes.

Order pronounced in the open court on 17.04.2026.

Sd/-
(MANISH BORAD)
ACCOUNTANT MEMBER
Pune Dated: 17/04/2026

Sd/-
(PAVAN KUMAR GADALE)
JUDICIAL MEMBER

Ashwini

Copy of the Order forwarded to:

1. The Appellant,
2. The Respondent
3. The CIT(A)-
4. CIT
5. DR, ITAT, "B" Bench
6. Guard file.

//True Copy//

BY ORDER,
(Asstt.Registrar)ITAT,
Pune

		Date	<u>Initial</u>	
1.	Draft dictated on	10/04/2026		PS
2.	Draft placed before author	16/04/2026		PS
3.	Draft proposed & placed before the second member			PS
4.	Draft discussed/approved by Second Member.			PS
5.	Approved Draft comes to the Sr.PS/PS			PS
6.	Kept for pronouncement on			
7.	File sent to the Bench Clerk			
8.	Date on which file goes to the AR			
9.	Date on which file goes to the Head Clerk.			
10.	Date of dispatch of Order.			
11.	Dictation Pad is enclosed			