$~39

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

\+ ITA 55/2018

STEEL AUTHORITY OF INDIA LTD. ..... Appellant

Through Ms. Monika Garg, Adv.

versus

DCIT ..... Respondent

Through Mr. Zoheb Hossain, Sr. Standing counsel with Mr. Deepak Anand, Jr. Standing Counsel.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S. RAVINDRA BHAT
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A. K. CHAWLA

<u>O R D E R</u>

% **17.01.2018**

Two questions of law urged by the assessee in its appeal under Section 260A of the Income Tax Act, 1961 ('the Act') relate to the expenditure disallowed with respect to the amounts brought to tax under explanation 10 to Section 43(1) of the Act. The Income Tax Appellate Tribunal (ITAT) and the adjudicating authorities below were of the opinion that the amounts of loan waiver constitute subsidy. On this aspect, for previous years, this Court had ruled against the same assessee/appellant in *Steel Authority of India vs. Commissioner of Income Tax,* (2012) IV AD (Delhi) 262. For the same reason, no question of law arises.

So far as the other question of law urged is concerned, it relates to the sum of Rs.2,00,000/- brought to tax by the Revenue, with respect to freight expenditure. We notice that the AO had disallowed the expenditure claimed; the CIT(A), no doubt, granted the relief to the assessee. However, the ITAT, upon an overall appreciation, allowed the Revenue's appeal on this aspect. Since these are issues of facts decided purely on appreciation of documents, no question of law arises.

For the above reasons, the appeal has no merit and is therefore, dismissed.

S. RAVINDRA BHAT, J

A. K. CHAWLA, J

JANUARY 17, 2018

rc