

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Dated: 13.07.2016

C O R A M

The Honourable Mr. Justice S. MANIKUMAR
and
The Honourable Mr. Justice D. KRISHNAKUMAR

Tax Case Appeal No. 448 of 2016

Principal Commissioner of Income Tax I
No. 63, Race Course Road,
Coimbatore. Appellant

Vs

M/s. Vetal Textiles and Electronics P. Ltd.,
No. 1, Industrial Estate Civil Aerodrome Post,
Coimbatore 641 014 Respondent

Prayer : Appeal filed against the order of the Income Tax Appellate Tribunal, Madras 'A' Bench, Chennai dated 09.12.2015 in ITA No. 1694/Mds/2015 (Assessment Year 2011-12) against the order of the Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeals)-I, Coimbatore dated 7.5.2015 in Appeal No. 29/14-15 for the Assessment Year 2011-12 and against the order of the Assistant Commissioner of Income Tax, Company Circle-I(1), Coimbatore, dated 26.2.2014.

For appellant : Mrs. R. Hemalatha
Jr. Standing Counsel for Income Tax.

J U D G M E N T

(Judgment of the Court was made by S. Manikumar, J)

Challenge in this Tax Appeal, is to an order passed by the Income Tax Appellate Tribunal in ITA No. 1694/Mds/2015, dated 09.12.2015, by which, the Tribunal dismissed the appeal preferred by the revenue, against the order of the Commissioner of Income-Tax (Appeals) dated 07.05.2015 for the Assessment Year 2011-12.

2. Revenue has come up with the above appeal, raising the following substantial questions of law:-

"1. Whether on the facts and circumstance of the case the Appellate Tribunal was right in

law in holding that the assessee is entitled to deduction under section 80 IA of the Income Tax Act?

2. Whether under the facts and circumstances of the case, the Income Tax Appellate Tribunal was right in holding that unabsorbed depreciation of the earlier years before the first year or claim, which was already been absorbed, should not be notionally carried forward and taken into consideration for computation of deduction u/s.80 IA of the Income Tax Act?"

3. As regards substantial questions of law, are concerned, it is the fair representation of the learned Senior Standing Counsel for Income Tax Department that this Court has been consistently following the decision in M/s.Velayudhaswamy Spinning Mills (P) Ltd., v. Assistant Commissioner of Income-Tax reported in 340 ITR 477. She also submitted that challenge to the same, is pending before the Hon'ble Apex Court in SLP No.1136 of 2011.

4. Similar to the facts and circumstances of the case, while advertng to the substantial questions of law raised and after considering the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in Liberty India vs. CIT reported in (2009) 225 CTR (SC) 233 : (2009) 28 DTR (SC) 73 : (2009) 317 ITR 218 (SC) and the judgment of the Rajasthan High Court in CIT vs. Mewar Oil & General Mills Ltd. reported in (2004) 186 CTR (Raj) 141 : (2004) 271 ITR 311 (Raj), a Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court in Velayudhaswamy Spinning Mills Pvt. Ltd.,'s case (stated supra), held that once the losses and other deductions are set off against the income of the assessee in the previous year, it should not be re-opened again, for the purpose of computation of current year income, under Section 80-I and 80-IA of the Act.

5. Velayudhaswamy Spinning Mills Pvt. Ltd.,'s case (stated supra), has been followed in CIT v. R.Yuvaraj reported in [2015] 57 TAXMANN.COM 252 (Madras), wherein, it is held that though it is contended that SLP filed against the above reported judgment, is pending on the file of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, the effect of the same, would not amount to reversal or erase the dictum.

6. Material on record discloses that while confirming the order of the Commissioner of Income-Tax (Appeal), the Income-Tax Appellate Tribunal, at paragraph No.2 has held as follows:

"6. We heard the ld. DR and also perused the material available on record. The CIT(A) allowed the claim of the assessee for deduction u/s 80IA by following the binding judgment of

the Madras High Court in Velayudhaswamy Spinning Mills (P) Ltd. (supra). This Tribunal is of the considered opinion that mere pendency of SLP before the Apex Court cannot be a reason for not following the judgment of the jurisdictional High Court. In other words, the judgment of the jurisdictional High Court is binding on all authorities in the States of Tamilnadu and Pondicherry. The CIT(A) has rightly allowed the claim of the assessee by following the judgment of the Madras High Court in Velayudhaswamy Spinning Mills P. Ltd. (supra). Therefore, this Tribunal do not find any infirmity in the order of the CIT(A) and accordingly the same is confirmed."

7. Going through the material on record, we are of the view that there are no valid grounds to reverse the abovesaid orders. Questions of law raised are answered against the revenue and in favour of the assessee and the instant appeal deserves to be dismissed.

8. In the result, the Tax Case Appeal is dismissed at the stage of admission itself. No costs.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar(CS VI)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

To

- 1.The Income Tax Appellate Tribunal,
Madras A Bench, Chennai.
- 2.The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeals)-I,
Coimbatore.
- 3.The Assistant Commissioner of Income Tax,
Company Circle -I(1),
Coimbatore.

+1cc to M/S.T.R.Senthilkumar, Advocate Sr.39755

Tax Case Appeal No.448 of 2016

mp[co]
srg 23/07/2016