IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

ITA No. 620 of 2009 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 11.04.2016

Commissioner of Income Tax, Faridabad ....Appellant

Versus

Mr. Lalit Lamba ......Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BINDAL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARINDER SINGH SIDHU

Present: Mr. Rajesh Katoch, Advocate for
Mr. Tajender K. Joshi, Advocate
for the appellant.

Mr. Akshay Bhan, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Alok Mittal, Advocate
for the respondent.

RAJESH BINDAL,J.

This appeal has been filed under Section 260 A of the Income Tax Act, 1961 (for short 'the Act'), against the order dated 20.2.2009 passed by the Income Tax Appellate Tribunal, Delhi Bench 'D' New Delhi, in ITA No. 2905/Del/2008, for the assessment year 2005-06, raising the following substantial questions of law:

> Whether, on the facts and in the circumstances of the case, the ld. ITAT was right in law in holding that the 3/4th share in the property had become the property of the assessee under a gift made by assessee's mother and two sisters, and thus, cost of acquisition of 3/4th share in the property shall be deemed to be the cost for which the previous owner of the property acquired it, in disregard of the fact that the 3/4th share of the property was reqlinquished

by the mother and two sisters in favour of the assessee in the Financial Year 1997-98 and as such the cost of inflation index of 1997-98 will be applicable for computing the indexed cost of acquisition as per explanation (iii) of section 48 of the Income Tax Act, 1961?

Learned counsel for the appellant-revenue submitted that in view of circular No.21/2015 dated 10.12.2015 read with circular No.279/Misc/M-142/2007-ITJ (Part) dated 8.3.2016, issued by Central Board of Direct Taxes, he does not wish to press the present appeal, as the tax effect involved is less than ₹ 20 lacs. However, he prays that liberty be granted to the revenue to file an application for revival of the appeal in case something survives therein.

Dismissed as not pressed with liberty as prayed for. It is however, clarified that withdrawal of the appeal by the revenue shall not be taken as affirmation of order of the Tribunal on merits. The legal issue as claimed by the revenue is left open to be adjudicated in an appropriate case.

(RAJESH BINDAL)
JUDGE

(HARINDER SINGH SIDHU)
JUDGE

11.04.2016
reema