

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD**

**SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 2349 of 2014**

**FOR APPROVAL AND SIGNATURE:**

**HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.R. SHAH- sd/-**

**and**

**HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.J.THAKER- sd/-**

1.	Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgment ?	<b>YES</b>
2.	To be referred to the Reporter or not ?	<b>YES</b>
3.	Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgment ?	<b>NO</b>
4.	Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the constitution of India, 1950 or any order made thereunder ?	<b>NO</b>
5.	Whether it is to be circulated to the civil judge ?	<b>NO</b>

SUMIT DEVENDRA RAJANI....Petitioner(s)

Versus

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER OF INCOME TAX -OSD- & 1....Respondent(s)

Appearance:

MR KETAN H SHAH, ADVOCATE for the Petitioner(s) No. 1

MRS MAUNA M BHATT, ADVOCATE for the Respondent(s) No. 1

NOTICE UNSERVED for the Respondent(s) No. 2

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.R. SHAH**

and

**HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.J.THAKER**

**Date : 23/06/2014**

**CAV JUDGMENT**

**(PER : HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.R. SHAH)**

1.0. Rule. Ms. Mauna Bhatt, learned advocate waives service notice of Rule on behalf of respondent. In the facts and circumstances of the case and with the consent of the learned advocates for the respective parties, the present Special Civil Application is taken up for final

hearing today.

2.0. By way of this petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, the petitioner has prayed for an appropriate writ, direction and order quashing and setting aside the recovery notice dated 06.01.2012 (Annexure D), by which, the petitioner – assessee has called upon to pay demand of Rs.6,82,148/- raised under Section 143(1) of the Income Tax Act, 1961 (hereinafter referred to as the “Act”) for the AY 2010-11.

3.0. The facts leading to the present petition in nutshell are as under:

3.1. That the petitioner is an individual and assessed to tax under the Act, therefore, for the AY 2010-11 the petitioner filed his return of income dated 30.12.2010 declaring net taxable income of Rs.29,54,982/-. In the return of income, the petitioner also claimed the credit of tax deducted at source of total Rs.5,86,606/-- TDS deducted by his employer M/s. Amar Remedies Limited. However, without giving credit of the TDS deducted by his employer M/s. Amar Remedies Limited on the salary income as well as on the amount received towards professional and technical fees received from the said M/s. Amar Remedies Limited, the department has raised the demand of Rs.6,82,148/- by impugned notice issued under Section 221(1) of the Act.

3.2. It is the case of the petitioner that the petitioner was received salary income of Rs.21,50,400/- from M/s. Amar Remedies Limited, Mumbai and out of the said salary income, TDS is deducted of Rs.5,86,606/- by the said M/s. Amar Remedies Limited. It is the case of the petitioner that the petitioner was also receiving the professional and

technical fees from the said M/s. Amar Remedies Limited of Rs.24,00,000/- and TDS deducted by the said M/s. Amar Remedies Limited is of Rs. 2,40,000/-. It is the case of the petitioner that the petitioner received both TDS certificate i.e. in respect of salary income in Form No.16 on 22.09.2010 and in respect of professional and technical fees in the form of 16A dated 22.08.2010 from his employer- M/s. Amar Remedies Limited mentioning PAN-AAACA3774G and TAN of the deductor as MUMA21298E. It is the case of the petitioner that Form No.16 dated 22.09.2010, it is found that they have furnished that they have furnished TDS statement also of various quarters i.e. quarter nos. I, II, III and IV as per the acknowledgment number mentioned therein. According to the petitioner, TDS was made on two occasions i.e. Rs.1,58,486/- and Rs.4,28,120/- vide cheque no. 0076, BSR Code No.0261632 of the Bank, which was deposited by the employer on 02.08.2010 and 02.09.2010 vide challans No.54601 and 83046 respectively. It is the case on behalf of the petitioner that as such the aforesaid Form No.16 dated 22.09.2010 regarding TDS under the head salaries was duly signed by one Srinivas D. Samudra, Accounts Manager of Amar Remedies Limited, Mumbai. It is also the case on behalf of the petitioners that petitioner has also received Form No.16 A dated 22.08.2010 under Section 194J for TDS of Rs.24,00,000/- in reference to professional charges of Rs.24,00,000/- from M/s. Amar Remedies Limited wherein the details regarding TDS return filed by the deductor and the PAN and TAN number were also mentioned by them. It is submitted that the said TDS of Rs.2,40,000/- was deposited by cheque no.776 on 24.07.2010 vide challan no.47008 and BSR Code No.261632 of the Bank.

3.3. It is the case on behalf of the petitioner that despite the above and without giving credit of the tax deducted at source at

Rs.5,86,606/-, demand of Rs.6,82,148/- has been raised.

3.4. It is the case on behalf of the petitioner that immediately on receipt of impugned notice under Section 221(1) of the Act, the petitioner addressed a letter dated 13.1.2012 drawing the attention of the authority submitting that so called demand raised may be pertaining to non giving of proper credit of TDS claimed from M/s. Amar Remedies Limited. It is the case on behalf of the petitioner that even the petitioner also submitted the application under Section 154 of the Act in reference to notice under Section 221(1) of the Act, which has not been disposed of. It is also the case on behalf of the petitioner that petitioner's advocate addressed letter dated 30.10.2013 enclosing therewith Form No.26AS also to respondent no.1 and requested to dispose of application dated 13.1.2012 and to serve so-called intimation under Section 143(1) of the Act. It is the case on behalf of the petitioner that thereafter and despite the above, respondent no.2 has issued intimation under Section 245 dated 22.11.2013 starting recovery of demand and adjusted the refund of AY 2013-14 of Rs.1290/- against the outstanding demand of AY 2010-11. Hence, petitioner has preferred the present Special Civil Application under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

4.0. Shri Ketan Shah, learned advocate for the petitioner has vehemently submitted that impugned demand / recovery notice of Rs.6,82,148/- subject to penalty under Section 221(1) of the Act without giving any credit of the tax deducted at source of total Rs.5,86,606/- is absolutely illegal and most arbitrary. It is submitted that as per Form No.16 and 16 A deductor- M/s. Amar Remedies Limited as such TDS of Rs. 5,86,606/-, particulars of which are given in Form no. 16 and 16A and as such petitioner -assessee has received the less amount i.e. amount after deducting TDS. It is submitted that even in the Form no. 26AS

there is mentioned that the amount of TDS deducted however in the Form No.26AS credit of Rs.2,40,000/- only has been given and as such no credit of Rs.5,86,606/- has been given. Relying upon Section 205 of the Act, it is submitted by Shri Shah, learned advocate for the petitioner that even in a case where deductor may not have deposited the amount of TDS, where tax is deductible at the source under Chapter XVII, assessee shall not be called upon to pay the tax himself to the extent to which tax has been deducted from that income. It is submitted that in such case the department is required to recover amount from the deductor and no such recovery can be made from assessee. It is submitted that, therefore, once the amount is deducted by the deductor, in the present case by the employer- M/s. Amar Remedies Limited and for which form under Section 16 and 16A has been issued by the deductor, the department bound to give the credit to the tax deducted at source of Rs.5,86,606/-. It is submitted that therefore, the impugned demand / recovery notice without giving credit of TDS of Rs.5,86,606/- is absolutely illegal and most arbitrary which deserves to be quashed and set aside.

4.1. Shri Shah, learned advocate for the petitioner has heavily relied upon the decision of the Gauhati High Court in the case of **ACIT vs. Om Prakas Gattani** reported in (2000) 242 ITR 638 and the decision of the Bombay High Court in the case of **Yashpal Sahni vs. ACIT** reported in (2007) 293 ITR 539. Shri Shah, learned advocate for the petitioner has also relied upon the another decision of the Bombay High Court in the case of **Director of Income Tax (International Taxation) vs. NGC Network Asia Lic** reported in (2009) 313 ITR 187(Bom) as well as decision of the Karnataka High Court in the case of **Smt. Anusuya Alva vs. Deputy Commissioner of Income Tax and Others** reported in (2005) 278 ITR 206 (Karn) as well as decision of the

Division Bench of this Court in the case of **Commissioner of Income Tax vs. Ranoli Investment P. Ltd. and others** reported in **1999 (235) ITR 433 (Guj)**, in support of his above submissions and in support of his prayer to allow the present Special Civil Application and to direct the department to give credit of TDS of total Rs.5,86,606/-.

4.2. Making above submissions and relying upon the above decisions, it is requested to allow present Special Civil Application and grant the relief as prayed for.

5.0. Ms. Mauna Bhatt, learned advocate has appeared on behalf of the respondent- revenue. An affidavit in reply is filed by the Assessing Officer. It was submitted that as such no TDS credit of Rs.5,86,606/- on account of Form No.16A by M/s. Amar Remedies Limited appeared on the ITD system of department and therefore, no credit of the TDS was given to the assessee. It was further submitted that even in 26AS statement of the assessee, no such TDS deduction of Rs.5,86,606/- was reflected. It is submitted that the only the amount of Rs.24,000/- deposited by Amar Remedies Limited against form No.16A and Rs.4333/- by Union Bank against form no.16A were reflected in the system, which were given credit to the assessee at the time of processing of return. It was further submitted that however as the credit of TDS of Rs.5,86,606/- was not given, as no such credit of TDS is available with the department.

5.1. Today, when the present petition was taken up for final hearing, Ms. Bhatt, learned advocate for the revenue has placed on record one communication dated 12.06.2014 by the Assistant Commissioner of Income Tax (OSD), Circle-10, Ahmedabad, by which, it is reported that aforesaid efforts were made from Mumbai office

(Income Tax Department) to gather the information from deducto i.e. Amar Remedies Limited vide letter dated 06.05.2014 and / or direct to supply the details of TDS deducted and deposited in the case of assessee for the AY 2010-11. It is submitted that in response, the deductor vide his letter dated 12.5.2014 has requested some time for verify all data and necessary documents and enclosed a copy of TDS challan and court order. It is submitted that on perusal of the aforesaid letter, it is found that the amount of Rs.5,77,333/- was deposited by the deductor on 14.7.2010, TDS amount allocated against Rs.2,40,000/- for F.Y 2009-10 and the balance amount of Rs.3,37,333/- allocated against Rs.5,86,606/-. It is submitted that however no evidence regarding claimed of Rs.3,37,333/- has been provided by the deductor till date. It is further stated in the said communication that after availability of ITD and BCP, deductee details in the case of ARL have been uploaded from ITD systems by the Mumbai office and found that in quarter 4 of 24Q Rs. 1,58,486/- and in quarter 4 of 26Q Rs.2,40,000/- deposited on 31.3.2010 in the name of Shri Devendra Rajani. It appears that assessee mentioned wrong PAN AAHPR3027C instead of PAN: AAHPR3027P for the quarter 4 of 24Q. It is stated that the deductor has been asked to submit the details in the case of assessee vide letter dated 22.5.2014 and 30.5.2014, however no reply has been received till date. It is further stated that in absence of details / evidence from the deductor side, the Department may give the credit of TDS amounting to Rs.2,40,000/- and further of Rs.1,58,486/- only as available with the ITD systems. It is further stated that in future if the details of so claimed TDS provided by the deductor the department may give the credit of the same after due verification. The said communication dated 12.06.2014 is directed to be taken on record. Considering the aforesaid factual background, present petition is required to be considered.

6.0. Heard Shri Ketan Shah, learned advocate for the petitioner- assessee and Ms. Mauna Bhatt, learned advocate for the Income Tax Department.

7.0. The grievance which is voiced in the present petition by the assessee is that though deductor -employer - Amar Remedies Limited had deducted TDS for total Rs.5,86,606/- and for which Form 16 A has been issued by it, department has not given credit of the said TDS to the petitioner- assessee -deductee and when the assessee has claimed the said deduction, the same has not been granted and demand is raised by issuing notice at Annexure D. Therefore, short question which is posed for consideration of this Court is whether in case the deductor had deducted the TDS and for the same Form no.16 A has been issued by deductor, the credit of the same can be denied to the assessee and deductee solely on the ground that such credit does not appear on ITD system of the department and / or same does not match with the ITD system of the department ?

8.0. At the outset, it is required to be noted that under Chapter XVII, more particularly, Section 204 of the Act the liability to deduct the tax at source would be upon the employer / payer / deductor- in the present case Amar Remedies Limited. As per Section 205 of the Act whether tax is deductible at source under Chapter XVII, the assessee shall not be called upon to pay tax himself to the extent to which tax has been deducted from that income. That the deductor is required to issue Form no.16 A providing particulars with respect to the amount of tax deducted at source in the relevant assessment year. In the present case, it is the case on behalf of the petitioner and / or as per the return of income filed the total sum of Rs.5,86,606/- has been deducted by the deductor- Amar Remedies Limited as TDA and for which M/s. Amar

Remedies Limited- deductor has issued Form no. 16 A. It is also the case on behalf of the petitioner that out of total salary of Rs.21,60,000/- to be received from M/s. Amar Remedies Limited – deductor he has received salary after deducting the amount of tax at source by the deductor for which form no.16 A has been issued i.e. he has received Rs. 5,86,606/- and on account of said amount deducted at source by the M/s. Amar Remedies Limited. Under the circumstances and considering Sections 204 and 205 when the deductor who is liable to deduct the tax at source under Chapter XVII deducts the TDS and issued form no.16A the assessee – deductee shall be entitled to credit of the same. As stated above and as per Section 205 of the Act whether tax is deductible at the source under Chapter XVII, the assessee shall not be called upon to pay the tax himself to the extent of which tax has been deducted from that income. Meaning thereby, the assessee / deductee is entitled to credit of such amount of TDS. Assuming that in a given case the deductor after deducting the TDS may not have deposited with the department. However, in such situation, the department is to recover the said amount from the deductor and assessee- deductee cannot deny the credit of the same. Identical question came to be considered by the Bombay High Court in the case of **Yashpal Sahni (supra)** and considering Section 205 of the Act in para 15 of the Bombay High Court has observed as under:

*“15. Chapter XVII of the IT Act, 1961 provides for collection and recovery of tax by two modes. They are (one) directly from the assessee and (two) indirectly by deduction of tax at source. In the present case, we are concerned with the second mode of recovery, namely recovery of tax by deduction at source.”*

9.0. In the said decision, the Bombay High Court has considered and relied upon the decision of the **Om Prakas Gattani (supra)**. In the said decision the Gauhati High Court after considering the relevant provision under Chapter XVII has observed and held that so far as

assessee is concerned, he is not supposed to do anything in the whole transaction except that he is to accept the payment of the reduced amount which is deducted income tax at source. It is observed that on the amount being deducted the assessee only gets a certificate to that effect by the person responsible to deduct the tax. In the said decision Gauhati High Court has quashed and set aside the notice issued under Section 226(3) of the Act to the bankers of the assessee observing in para 7 as under:

*“7. So far the assessee is concerned, he is not supposed to do anything in the whole transaction except that he is to accept the payment of the reduced amount from which is deducted income-tax at source. The responsibility to deposit the amount deducted at source as tax is that of the person who is responsible to deduct the tax at source. On the amount being deducted the assessee only gets a certificate to that effect by the person responsible to deduct the tax. In a case where the amount has been deducted by the person responsible to deduct the amount under the statutory provisions, the assessee has no control over the matter. In case of default in making over the amount to the account of the Central Government, it is obviously the person responsible to deduct or the person who has made the deduction who is held responsible for the same. The responsibility of such person is to the extent that he has to be deemed to be an assessee in default in respect of the tax. He may be deemed to be an assessee in default not only in cases where after deduction he does not make over the amount to the Central Government but also in cases where there is failure on his part to deduct the amount at source. This responsibility has been fastened upon him under Section 201 of the Income-tax Act. It is, of course, without prejudice to any other consequences which he or it may incur. Presently we are not concerned with the case where the person responsible to make the deductions has not deducted the amount at all. It may or may not fall in a different category from one where the amount has been deducted and not made over to the Central Government. We are concerned with the latter category of cases. As indicated earlier, on the facts it is nobody's case that the amount was actually not deducted at source by Chandra Agencies. What seems to be in dispute is the deposit of the said amount in the account of the Central Government. The Income-tax Department seems to have made enquiries about the exact date of payment to the Central Government which Chandra*

*Agencies could not furnish on the ground that the papers were forwarded to the chairman of Vaibhavshali Bumper. In such a category of cases we feel that the amount of tax can be recovered by the Income-tax Department treating the person responsible to deduct tax at source as an assessee in default in respect of the tax. It would not be possible to proceed to recover the amount of tax from the assessee. The assessee cannot be doubly saddled with the tax liability. Deduction of tax at source is only one of the modes of recovery of tax.. Once this mode is adopted and by virtue of the statutory provisions the person responsible to deduct the tax at source deducts the amount, only that mode should be pursued for the purpose of recovery of tax liability and the assessee should not be subjected to other modes of recovery of tax by recovering the amount once again to satisfy the tax liability. It is, therefore, provided under Section 201 of the Income-tax Act that the person responsible to deduct the tax at source would be deemed to be an assessee in default in case he deducts the amount and fails to deposit it in the Government treasury. As observed earlier, the assessee has no control over such person who is responsible to deduct the income-tax at source, but fails to deposit the same in the Government treasury. In this light of the matter, in our view, the notices issued under Section 226(3) of the Income-tax Act to the bankers of the petitioner-respondent to satisfy the tax liability from the bank account of the petitioner-respondent are illegal. It is not that the Income-tax Department was helpless in the matter. The person responsible to deduct the tax at source would move into the shoes of the assessee and he would be deemed to be an assessee in default. Whatever process or coercive measures are permissible under the law would only be taken against such person and not the assessee.”*

10. We are in complete agreement with the view taken by the Bombay High Court and Gauhati High Court. Applying the aforesaid two decisions of the Bombay High Court as well as Gauhati High Court, the facts of the case on hand and even considering Section 205 of the Act action of the respondent in not giving the credit of the tax deducted at source for which form no.16 A have been produced by the assessee – deductee and consequently impugned demand notice issued under Section 221(1) of the Act cannot be sustained. Concerned respondent therefore, is required to be directed to give credit of tax deducted at

source to the assessee- deductee of the amount for which form no.16 A have been produced.

11. In view of the above and for the reasons stated petition succeeds. It is held that the petitioner-assessee -deductee is entitled to credit of the tax deducted at source with respect to amount of TDS for which Form No.16A issued by the employer -deductor – M/s. Amar Remedies Limited has been produced and consequently department is directed to give credit of tax deducted at source to the petitioner- assessee – deductee to the extent form no.16 A issued by the deductor have been issued. Consequently, the impugned demand notice dated 6.1.2012 (Annexure D) is quashed and set aside. However, it is clarified and observed that if the department is of the opinion deductor has not deposited the said amount of tax deducted at source, it will always been open for the department to recover the same from the deductor. Rule is made absolutely to the aforesaid extent. In the facts and circumstances of the case, there shall be no order as to costs.

sd/-  
(M.R.SHAH, J.)

sd/-  
(K.J.THAKER, J)

Kaushik