

\$~100

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ ITA 552/2010

DIRECTOR OF INCOME TAX Appellant
Through: Mr. Asheesh Jain, Adv.

versus

VIRAGE LOGIC INTERNATIONAL Respondent
Through: Mr. Prakash Kumar, Mrs. Rashmi Singh
and Ms. Mehvish Khan, Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S. RAVINDRA BHAT

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAJMI WAZIRI

ORDER

% **16.11.2016**

1. The questions of law involved in this case are identical to those framed in ITA Nos. 1108/2007, 1249/2009 and 173/2016 i.e. as to whether the assessee was entitled to the benefit of Section 10A of the Income Tax Act, 1961. By a common order dated 09.11.2016 passed in the aforesaid appeals, this Court had answered the questions of law in favour of the assessee and against the Revenue and, consequently, rejected the appeals. The order, inter alia, concluded as follows:

“.....13. It is undoubtedly aphorism that a legal fiction ought to be taken to its logical conclusion and the mind should not be allowed to boggle. This merely implies that a fiction should logically take a direction; the train of thought however cannot divert elsewhere. The absence of a “deemed export” provision in Section 10A similar to the one in Section 80HHC does not logically undercut the amplitude of the expression “transfer of goods” under Section 80-IA(8) – which is

now part of Section 10A. Such an interpretation would defeat Section 10A(7) entirely.

14. For the above reasons, the Court is of the opinion that substantial questions of law framed are to be answered in favour of the assessee and against the Revenue. The ITA Nos. 1108/2007, 1249/2009 and 173/2016 are, accordingly, dismissed. It is clarified, however, that the AO is at liberty to give tax effect as a consequence of the interpretation adopted by this Court....”

2. In view of the above development, the questions of law in this case too are answered against the Revenue and in favour of the assessee. The appeal is, therefore, dismissed.

S. RAVINDRA BHAT, J

NAJMI WAZIRI, J

NOVEMBER 16, 2016/kk