



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 11.11.2021

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE R.MAHADEVAN
AND

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE MOHAMMED SHAFFIQ

TAX CASE NOS.25 TO 32 OF 2021

Tvl. Shriram Transport Finance Company Ltd.,
SRI Towers, 14-A, South Phase,
Industrial Estate, Guindy,
Chennai 600 032.

...Appellant in all Cases/
Petitioner

-vs-

State of Tamil Nadu represented by
The Joint Commissioner (CT),
Chennai (East) Division,
Chennai.

...Respondent in all Cases/
Respondent

Tax Case (Revision) Petitions filed under Section 60(1) of the Tamil Nadu Value Added Tax Act, 2006 to set aside the common order dated 05.02.2021 passed by the Tamil Nadu Sales Tax Appellate Tribunal (Main Bench), Chennai-104, in T.A. Nos.14,15,12,16,17,18,11 & 13 of 2016 made against Proceedings of the Appellate Deputy Commissioner (CT), Chennai (East), Chennai - 06 dated 26.06.2015 vide AP.Nos.210/2015 (Assessment Year 2009-10), 211/2015 (Assessment Year 2010-11), 208/2015 (Assessment Year 2007-08), 212/2015 (Assessment Year 2011-12), 213/2015 (Assessment Year 2012-13), 214/2015 (Assessment Year 2013-14), 207/2015 (Assessment Year 2006-07) 209/2015 (Assessment Year 2007-08), respectively, made against the Proceedings of the Assistant Commissioner (CT), Alwarpet Assessment Circle, Chennai - 28 dated 27.03.2015 vide TIN/332908203359/2009-10, TIN/332908203359/2010-11, TIN/332908203359/2007-08, TIN/332908203359/2011-12, TIN/332908203359/2012-13, TIN/332908203359/2013-14, TIN/332908203359/2006-07 and TIN/332908203359/2008-09 respectively.



WEB COPY

For Appellant : Mr.R.Sivaraman (in all cases)

For Respondent : Mr.K.Venkateswaran (in all cases)
Government Advocate (Taxes)

COMMON JUDGMENT

(Judgment was delivered by R. MAHADEVAN, J.)

These tax cases have been filed by the petitioner, raising the following substantial questions of law:-

- (1) Whether, on the facts and in the circumstances of the case, the Hon'ble Appellate Tribunal was right in law in stating that the Petitioner/Appellant would fall within the ambit of 'dealer' as per section 2(15) of the TNVAT Act, 2006?
- (2) Whether, on the facts and in the circumstances of the case, the Hon'ble Appellate Tribunal was right in law in stating that sale of repossessed vehicle on behalf of the defaulter by the Petitioner/Appellant would be liable to pay taxes under VAT Act on the sale of the Hypothecated Motor Vehicles?
- (3) Whether, on the facts and in the circumstances of the case, the Hon'ble Appellate Tribunal was right in law in stating that the Petitioner/Appellant is a dealer even though the contractual agreements specifically states the Petitioner/Appellant as not the owner of the Vehicle?
- (4) Whether, on the facts and in the circumstances of the case, the Hon'ble Appellate Tribunal was right in law in stating that Resale of Plant and Machinery, Furniture and Fittings and Fixed Asset by the Petitioner/Appellant which is used for the purpose of own business would fall within the meaning of sale and subject to VAT as per the TNVAT ACT, 2006?
- (5) Whether on the facts and in the circumstances of the case the Hon'ble Appellate Tribunal was right in law in not treating the sale of Plant & Machinery, fixture, furniture, air conditioners etc., as scrap?



2. When the matters were taken up for consideration, the learned counsel appearing for both sides in unison submitted that the identical questions of law were already decided against the assessee by a Division Bench of this Court, in Tax Case (Revision) Nos.2 to 9 of 2019 on 25.09.2019 in the case of Cholamandalam Investment v. The State of Tamil Nadu. The relevant paragraphs of the said order are usefully extracted below:

"22. We have heard the elaborate arguments put forth by Mr.N.Sriprakash, followed by the submissions made by the learned Special Government Pleader on several dates. In our view the learned Special Government Pleader has rightly crystallized the arguments made on either side and has framed questions/issues, which are required to be answered by us in these revision petitions. The four questions/issues, which required our consideration are hereunder:

(i)Whether the assessee is a dealer as defined under Section 2(15) of the TNVAT Act and liable to pay sales tax on the sale of the repossessed vehicles?

(ii)Whether the decision in HDFC Bank Ltd., would apply to the case of the assessee?

(iii)Whether the assessee when acts as an agent of the borrower is liable to pay sales tax?

(iv)Whether the liability of the agents is not co-extensive with that of the Principal?

23.When we heard the case at the first instance, the learned Special Government Pleader appearing for the respondent submitted that the issues raised in these revision petitions are clearly covered by the decision in HDFC Bank Ltd., Mr.N.Sriprakash submitted that the Tribunal erred in applying the decision in HDFC Bank Ltd., to the case of the assessee, who is the non-banking finance company. Therefore, we are to test the applicability or otherwise of the decision in HDFC Bank Ltd., For such reason, we propose to test question No.(ii) at the first instance and the necessity to answer the other three questions will be subject to the decision we take on question No.(ii).

24.In HDFC Bank Ltd., the revision petition was filed before this Court questioning the correctness of the order of the Sales Tax Appellate Tribunal, which held that the Bank is liable to pay sales tax. The assessment under the TNVAT Act was revised by the Assessing Officer on the ground that the bank had not



WEB COPY

Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 for appointment of an Advocate Commissioner to seize and repossess the vehicle and also seeking permission for sale of the vehicle. These applications are being allowed by orders of this Court and this has been the consistent practice, though in certain cases the Court appointed one of the Officers of the financial institutions to carry out the process of repossession and sale at their cost. Considering the modus adopted by the assessee if they are acting on behalf of the borrower as its agent, it presupposes that there is valid consent of the borrower, which is never the case, at least in the case which are subject matter of the impugned assessments. If the assessee is the agent of the borrower effect repossession and consequent sale, there would never arise a need to approach the Court to obtain orders to effect repossession and seizure of the vehicle and put it for sale. That apart, when the vehicle is put up for sale through auction, invariably it is by negotiation with the prospective purchaser either directly or through dealers. Undoubtedly, it is done without involving the owner of the vehicle. In many cases, along with main agreement and other documents the borrower's signature is obtained in statutory forms prescribed under Motor Vehicles Act to enable the lender to transfer the certificate of registration in favour of the purchaser without bringing the borrower in the scene. In the event, there is a resistance by the borrower, the situation is taken care by appropriate amendments to Motor Vehicles Act, which empowers the lender to approach the appropriate authority and execute the transfer of ownership without consent of the borrower. Therefore, the right exercisable by the assessee is under a contract.

28.This issue was also considered by the Division Bench in HDFC, wherein a distinction was sought to be drawn to the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Federal Bank and the distinction was not accepted and the Court pointed out that the exercise of statutory right of sale and exercise of contractual right to bring hypothecated property to sale, both, could not be excluded and would be covered in Explanation III as the explanation is widely couched.

29.While on this issue, we wish to refer to an identical situation, which was considered in Cholamandalam Investment & Finance Co., Ltd., Coimbatore v. The Chief Secretary to Govt. and others



WEB COPY

[2014-4-L.W. 240] and while considering an identical type of transaction as done by the assessee, it was pointed out that in an agreement of hire purchase, the purchaser remains merely a trustee/bailee on behalf of the financier/financial institution. To this effect, reliance was placed on the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Anup Sharmah vs. Bhola Nath Sharma & Ors. [(2013) 1 SCC 400]. In the said case (Cholamandalam), the NBFC sought for a direction to quash a Government Order and to return the vehicle. The NBFC, who had financed the vehicle, had a valid hypothecation. However, the vehicle was confiscated by the Government under the provisions of Tamil Nadu Protection of Interest of Depositors (in Financial Establishment) Act, 1997. The NBFC moved the Special Court praying that they should be granted interim custody of the vehicles. The petitions were dismissed, against which Criminal Revision was filed before the High Court. The Writ Petition, challenging the Government Order of confiscation and the Criminal Revision Case, challenging the order of the Special Court rejecting the prayer for interim custody were clubbed together and heard by this Court. This Court by interpretation of hire purchase agreement and taking note of the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, it was held that the respondent in the said case viz., the borrower was only hirer of the vehicle and in the light of the valid deed of hypothecation executed in favour of NBFC, they retained the ownership and the same remains with them till the hypothecation is revoked. With this reasoning the Special Court was directed to consider the case of NBFC.

30. In Indian Oil Corporation v. NEPC India Ltd., and Others [(2006) 6 SCC 736], it was pointed out that the deed of hypothecation created a charge over the hypothecated asset with right to take possession in the event of default. Thus, on a conjoint reading of the above decisions and the modus operandi of the assessee, which in our considered view, is no different from that of the modus operandi adopted in the case of HDFC. Therefore, we are necessarily conclude that the decision in HDFC, would squarely apply to the case of the assessee.

31. Mr. N. SriPrakash took strenuous efforts to distinguish HDFC. It was pointed out that the registration certificate stands in the name of the borrower, this being a vital feature, the ownership of



WEB COPY

the vehicle vests with the borrower. We are to note that though the hire purchaser was branded as owner, nothing falls out of the same as the Hire Purchase Act continuous to remain a legislation on paper as it has not been notified. Conscious of the increase in the number of financial agreements by NBFCs and Banks for purchase of vehicles, the provisions of the Motor Vehicles Act were suitably amended. Therefore, we are required to examine in the instant case what is the nature of the contract between the assessee and the borrower.

32.The decision in the case of Federal Bank (supra) was distinguished by contending that it was case of pledge not a hypothecation and in the case of a bank, power under the Banking Regulations Act, 1949 is invoked. We do not accept the said submissions for the reason that nature of the activity done by the Bank and the NBFC like the assessee are identical. It may be true that the banks are covered by the Banking Regulations Act, 1949. Nevertheless, the test to be applied is as to whether assessee is liable to payment of sales tax and is to be done by examining the nature of transaction and not by taking note of the statute under which their business is regulated. If this exercise is done, the nature of transactions being identical, hardly makes a difference as to whether the assessee is a NBFC or a Bank.

33.The contention that the assessee takes the role of agent of the borrower, when he brings the property for sale cannot be fully right because on facts it has been found that the assessee was entitled to act independently without the express consent by the borrower to effect sale of the hypothecated vehicle. This aspect was noted in HDFC. Therefore, we respectfully agree with the observations/findings in HDFC that the sales are in the nature of compulsory sales for realization of debts due to the financial institutions and to say that the assessee sold the hypothecated goods only as agents of the owner is not completely true.

34.Various statutory provisions, which were referred to by Mr.Sriprakash, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner have been set out by us in the preceding paragraphs and in addition there to, we need to refer to a few more provisions which will bring better clarity as to whether the agent would be also



WEB COPY

liable. Section 2(41) of the Act defines turnover to mean aggregate amount for which goods are brought or sold, or delivered or supplied or otherwise disposed of in any of the ways referred to in clause (33), by a dealer either directly or through another, on his own account or on account of others whether for cash or for deferred payment. Therefore, this provision clearly indicates that turnover will include aggregate amount of net sales effected by the seller on his account or on account of others. Therefore, assuming the contentions raised by the Mr.Sriprakash is acceptable and that the assessee is acting as an agent of the borrower is wholly true, yet the turnover assessee should include the aggregate amount of the goods sold on his account or on account of others.

35.Next, we turn on to the definition of dealer as defined under Section 2(15) of the TNVAT Act. The definition is exhaustive and would encompass agent to bring him within the tax umbrella. If we look at the definition of sale as defined under Section 2(3), it is a very wide definition.

36.The arguments of Mr.N.Sriprakash, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner is that Explanation III to Section 2(33) will not be attracted to the assessee because the assessee is not a person or body referred to in Explanation III to clause 15 of Section 2. In the earlier paragraph of our order we have held that the assessee would be liable to sales tax, by examining the nature of the transaction. Even assuming that the assessee would not fall within Explanation III to Section 2(33), nevertheless Explanation IV to Section 2(33) would stand attracted.

37.Mr.N.Sriprakash, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner referred to the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Indian Oil Corporation v. NEFC India Ltd. & Ors (SC) [(2006) 6 SCC 736], to explain as to whether there is entrustment in the hypothecation. In our considered view, we need not go into this aspect to examine the correctness of the impugned order passed by the Tribunal. We have taken note of all the decisions, which have interpreted identical agreements and are of the firm view that the assessee is liable for payment of sales tax.



WEB COPY

38.The decision Syed Abdul Khader v. Rami Reddi & Ors. (SC) [(1972) 2 SCC 601] was pressed into service to explain as to who is the agent. We have examined the facts of the assessee and also the scheme of the Act and held that considering the nature of contract entered into between the assessee and borrower, the assessee will continue to be liable for sales tax even if its claim of agent is accepted. The agent is also liable to pay tax as held by us supra.

39.The decision in the case of Seth Loon Sethiya v. Ivan E. John and Others [AIR 1969 SC 73] would have no application to the case for the reason that the question which arose for consideration there was whether the power of attorney is a power coupled with interest; if it is so, whether the same is revocable? No dispute of that nature arises in the instant case and the transaction between the assessee and the borrower is quite distinct and different from what was examined by the Supreme Court in the said case.

40.The decision of the Delhi High Court in Citi Bank v. Commissioner of Sales Tax (Del.) [88 VST 246] was relied by Mr.N.Sriprakash, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner to support his case that the assessee was acting on behalf of the borrower and therefore, the liability, if at all should be fastened on the borrower which also shall not be done because borrower is not a dealer as defined under the Act. This decision also refers to the decision HDFC and Federal bank, which were noted by this Court and we have already held that even accepting the case of the assessee to be that of a agent, the assessee exercises the right under the contract and bringing for sale the vehicle without the express consent of the borrower would make them fully liable for payment of sales tax.

41.We may take a slightly different view point, while interpreting the terms and conditions of the Loan Agreement. Clause 8 of the loan agreement deals with Security and Clause 8 (c) deals with the Certificate of Registration issued under the Motor Vehicles Act and shall contain the endorsement of hypothecated with the assessee company and in terms of clause (d) as long as the asset is hypothecated with the assessee, the borrower shall not sell or create any other



WEB COPY

hypothecation, charge, mortgage, pledge, lien or encumbrance over the Asset without prior approval of the assessee. The borrower has executed a demand promissory note in favour of the assessee, for the security as required in clause 8(f). In terms of clause 8 (g) the hypothecation shall remain until the assessee issues a certificate discharging the security created. Any change in status of the borrower will not affect the hypothecation in terms of 8(h). In terms of 8(j) the assessee is entitled to direct the borrower to furnish additional security including guarantees from any third parties. Clause 11 of the agreement deals with possession, termination and company's other rights.

42.We, may also refer to a few more clauses. A reading of clause 11(c)(ii) makes abundantly clear that the sale by the assessee of the hypothecated asset is without the consent of the borrower. The borrower has no right to question the value at which the asset was sold and sale will be done by the assessee without accountability to the borrower and the guarantor and the assessee will not be liable for loss or damage or diminution in value of asset/ security on account of exercise or non exercise of rights by the assessee and the borrower/guarantor will not be entitled to raise any claim against the assessee on the ground that a large sum of amount might have been received or dispute their liability for the remaining dues under this agreement. Clause 11(c)(iii) empowers the assessee to initiate legal proceedings against the borrower and entitled to appoint third parties to carryout its functions rights and powers. Clause 13 of the agreement deals with Covenants and representations of the borrowers and the guarantors. Clause 13(b) empowers the assessee to sell, assign or transfer the assessee's right and obligations under the agreement to any person. There are many such clauses in the agreement, which clearly elucidate that theory as propounded by the assessee that the sale is effected by them as an agent of the borrower has to necessarily fall. For all the above reasons, no ground is made for interference of the order of the Tribunal.

43.Accordingly, the Tax Cases (Revision) are dismissed and the substantial questions of law framed for consideration are decided against the assessee. No costs."



WEB COPY

3. Thus, following the above decision, these Tax Cases are dismissed. No costs.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(CS-VII)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

av

To

1. The Joint Commissioner (CT),
Chennai (East) Division, Chennai.
2. The Presiding Officer,
Tamil Nadu Sales Tax Appellate Tribunal (Main Bench),
Chennai - 104.
3. The Appellate Deputy Commissioner(CT),
Chennai (East), Chennai - 06.
4. The Assistant Commissioner(CT),
Alwarpet Assessment Circle, Chennai - 28.

+1cc to the Special Government Pleader(Taxes), S.R.No.58488

Tax Case Nos.25 to 32 of 2021

AK-II(CO)

RLP(11/02/2022)