

## TAX FLASH NEWS

### Disallowance of expenditure due to non-deduction of tax at source – Kerala High Court

#### Background

Recently, the Kerala High Court (High Court) in the case of Thomas George Muthoot<sup>1</sup> (the taxpayer) held that a statutory provision unless otherwise expressly stated to be retrospective or by intendment shown to be retrospective, is always prospective in operation. Thus the High Court, while dealing with the second proviso to Section 40(a)(ia) of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (the Act), inserted by the Finance Act 2012, which states that disallowance under this section need not be made if the taxpayer is not an assessee in default under the first proviso<sup>2</sup> to Section 201(1) of the Act, held that the said proviso is prospective in nature. The reading of the aforesaid second proviso does not show that it was meant or intended to be curative or remedial in nature and by virtue of this proviso, an additional benefit was conferred on the taxpayers.

Further, the High Court held that the language of Section 40(a)(ia) of the Act does not warrant an interpretation that the provisions would be attracted only on such amounts which remain payable on the last day of the financial year.

The High Court also held that the business income of the taxpayer exceeded the limit prescribed under Section 44AB of the Act. Therefore, the taxpayer even though an individual, was liable to deduct tax while paying interest to the firm under Section 194A(1) of the Act.

<sup>1</sup> Shri Thomas George Muthoot v. CIT (ITA No. 278 of 2014) (Kerala) – Taxsutra.com

<sup>2</sup> Any person, including the principal officer of a company, who fails to deduct the whole or any part of the tax in accordance with the provisions of this Chapter on the sum paid to a resident or on the sum credited to the account of a resident shall not be deemed to be an assessee in default in respect of such tax if such resident -

(i) has furnished his return of income under section 139 ;  
(ii) has taken into account such sum for computing income in such return of income ; and  
(iii) has paid the tax due on the income declared by him in such return of income, and the person furnishes a certificate to this effect from an accountant in such form as may be prescribed.

#### Facts of the case

- The taxpayer was a partner in a partnership firm. During the relevant assessment years, the taxpayer paid interest to the partnership firm without deducting tax at source (TDS) on the belief that Section 194A of the Act, relating to TDS on interest payments, was not applicable to individuals.
- The Assessing Officer (AO) disallowed the said interest expenditure under Section 40(a)(ia) of the Act for non-deduction of taxes under Section 194A of the Act. On an appeal, the order of the AO was upheld by the Commissioner of Income-tax (Appeals) [CIT(A)] and thereafter by the Income-tax Appellate Tribunal (the Tribunal).

#### High Court's ruling

#### ***Whether individuals are excluded from the liability to deduct tax under Section 194A(1) of the Act***

- The TDS provisions under Section 194A(1) of the Act applies to any person, not being an individual or a Hindu Undivided Family (HUF). Further, by virtue of the Finance Act 2002, the benefit of exclusion is restricted only to those individuals and HUF, whose total sales, gross receipts or turnover from business and profession do not exceed the monetary limit specified under Section 44AB of the Act during the financial year immediately preceding the financial year in which such interest is credited or paid.

- In the light of the proviso to Section 194A(1), if the taxpayers are claiming the exemption provided in the Section, the burden is on them to establish that they, being individuals, satisfied the conditions specified in the proviso to the Section.
- However, in the present case the taxpayer had not produced any material to contradict specific factual finding made by the Tribunal, wherein it was held that the business income of the taxpayer exceeded the limit prescribed under Section 44AB of the Act and that the taxpayer even though an individual, was liable to deduct tax while paying interest to the firm under Section 194A(1) of the Act.
- Accordingly, the High Court held that the contention of the taxpayer that under Section 194A of the Act, an individual is excluded from the liability to deduct tax and therefore disallowance is without jurisdiction cannot be accepted.

### ***Is the proviso to Section 40(a)(ia) of the Act retrospective in nature***

- The other contention raised by the taxpayer was that the second proviso to Section 40(a)(ia) of the Act, which was inserted by the Finance Act 2012, stating that disallowance under this section need not be made if the taxpayer is not an assessee in default under the first proviso to Section 201(1) of the Act, is a remedial and curative clarificatory proviso and hence applies retrospectively.
- The High Court held that, a statutory provision unless otherwise expressly stated to be retrospective or by intendment shown to be retrospective, is always prospective in operation. In addition, it stated that the reading of the second proviso does not show that it was meant or intended to be curative or remedial in nature and by virtue of this proviso, an additional benefit was conferred on the taxpayers; hence such a provision can only be prospective in nature<sup>3</sup>.
- Further, the taxpayer's reliance on the Supreme Court's judgement in the case of Hindustan Coca Cola<sup>4</sup> was distinguished on the basis that the said judgement was rendered in the context of Section 201(1) of the Act, the objective of which was compensatory in nature and therefore, the ratio of the said ruling cannot be applied to the provisions of Section 40(a)(ia) of the Act.

<sup>3</sup> Prudential Logistics And Transports v. ITO [2014] 364 ITR 689 (Ker)

<sup>4</sup> Hindustan Coca Cola Beverages Pvt. Ltd. v. CIT [2007] 293 ITR 226 (SC)

### ***Whether disallowance under Section 40(a)(ia) of the Act can be made only in respect of payments outstanding at the end of the year***

- The taxpayer, by placing reliance on the case of Vector Shipping Services<sup>5</sup>, contended that the provisions of Section 40(a)(ia) of the Act are applicable only in respect of the amount which remain payable on the last day of the financial year. Since the disputed interest amount in question was not outstanding as at the year end, the provisions of Section 40(a)(ia) of the Act are not attracted.
- The High Court held that the language of the Section 40(a)(ia) of the Act does not warrant an interpretation that it gets attracted only where the interest remains payable on the last day of the financial year. This view has been supported by the decisions of the Calcutta High Court in the case of Crescent Exports Syndicate and another<sup>6</sup> and the Gujarat High Court in the case of Sikandarkhan N Tunvar<sup>7</sup>.

In view of above, the High Court dismissed the appeal of the taxpayer.

### **Our comments**

The Kerala High Court in the present case held that a statutory provision, unless otherwise expressly stated to be retrospective or by intendment shown to be retrospective, is always prospective in operation. Therefore, the second proviso to Section 40(a)(ia) of the Act shall apply prospectively.

The High Court held that the consequences under Section 40(a)(ia) of the Act would operate on all payments made without deduction of tax during the year, whether or not the same are outstanding at the end of the year. The said decision is in line with the various High Court rulings<sup>8</sup>. However, the Allahabad High Court in the case of Vector Shipping Services (P) Ltd ) had taken a contrary view and held that for disallowance of expenditure on which tax has not been deducted, the amount should be outstanding at the end of the year.

Further it was held that the business income of the taxpayer exceeded the limit prescribed under Section 44AB of the Act. Therefore, the taxpayer even though an individual, was liable to deduct tax while paying interest to the firm under Section 194A(1) of the Act.

<sup>5</sup> CIT v. Vector Shipping Services (P) Ltd. (2013) 262 CTR 545 (Allahabad)

<sup>6</sup> CIT v. Crescent Exports Syndicate and another [2013] 216 Taxman 258 (Cal)

<sup>7</sup> CIT v. Sikandarkhan N. Tunvar [2013] 33 taxman.com 133 (Guj)

<sup>8</sup> CIT v. Crescent Exports Syndicate and another [2013] 216 Taxman 258 (Cal), CIT v. Sikandarkhan Tunvar [2013] 33 taxman.com 133 (Guj), P.M.S. Diesels v CIT [ITA No. No. 716 of 2009 (O&M), dated 29 April 2015] (P&H)

[www.kpmg.com/in](http://www.kpmg.com/in)

**Ahmedabad**

Commerce House V, 9th Floor,  
902 & 903, Near Vodafone House,  
Corporate Road,  
Prahlad Nagar,  
Ahmedabad – 380 051  
Tel: +91 79 4040 2200  
Fax: +91 79 4040 2244

**Bengaluru**

Maruthi Info-Tech Centre  
11-12/1, Inner Ring Road  
Koramangala, Bangalore 560 071  
Tel: +91 80 3980 6000  
Fax: +91 80 3980 6999

**Chandigarh**

SCO 22-23 (1st Floor)  
Sector 8C, Madhya Marg  
Chandigarh 160 009  
Tel: +91 172 393 5777/781  
Fax: +91 172 393 5780

**Chennai**

No.10, Mahatma Gandhi Road  
Nungambakkam  
Chennai 600 034  
Tel: +91 44 3914 5000  
Fax: +91 44 3914 5999

**Delhi**

Building No.10, 8th Floor  
DLF Cyber City, Phase II  
Gurgaon, Haryana 122 002  
Tel: +91 124 307 4000  
Fax: +91 124 254 9101

**Hyderabad**

8-2-618/2  
Reliance Humsafar, 4th Floor  
Road No.11, Banjara Hills  
Hyderabad 500 034  
Tel: +91 40 3046 5000  
Fax: +91 40 3046 5299

**Kochi**

Syama Business Center  
3rd Floor, NH By Pass Road,  
Vytilla, Kochi – 682019  
Tel: +91 484 302 7000  
Fax: +91 484 302 7001

**Kolkata**

Unit No. 603 – 604,  
6th Floor, Tower – 1,  
Godrej Waterside,  
Sector – V, Salt Lake,  
Kolkata 700 091  
Tel: +91 33 44034000  
Fax: +91 33 44034199

**Mumbai**

Lodha Excelus, Apollo Mills  
N. M. Joshi Marg  
Mahalaxmi, Mumbai 400 011  
Tel: +91 22 3989 6000  
Fax: +91 22 3983 6000

**Noida**

6th Floor, Tower A  
Advant Navis Business Park  
Plot No. 07, Sector 142  
Noida Express Way  
Noida 201 305  
Tel: +91 0120 386 8000  
Fax: +91 0120 386 8999

**Pune**

703, Godrej Castlemaine  
Bund Garden  
Pune 411 001  
Tel: +91 20 3050 4000  
Fax: +91 20 3050 4010

The information contained herein is of a general nature and is not intended to address the circumstances of any particular individual or entity. Although we endeavor to provide accurate and timely information, there can be no guarantee that such information is accurate as of the date it is received or that it will continue to be accurate in the future. No one should act on such information without appropriate professional advice after a thorough examination of the particular situation.

© 2015 KPMG, an Indian Registered Partnership and a member firm of the KPMG network of independent member firms affiliated with KPMG International Cooperative ("KPMG International"), a Swiss entity. All rights reserved.

The KPMG name, logo and "cutting through complexity" are registered trademarks or trademarks of KPMG International Cooperative ("KPMG International").

This document is meant for e-communications only.

© 2015 KPMG, an Indian Registered Partnership and a member firm of the KPMG network of independent member firms affiliated with KPMG International Cooperative ("KPMG International"), a Swiss entity. All rights reserved.