

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED:03.12.2019

CORAM

**THE HON'BLE DR.JUSTICE VINEET KOTHARI**  
AND  
**THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE R.SURESH KUMAR**

Tax Case Appeal No.741 of 2010

Commissioner of Income Tax  
Chennai.

... Appellant

Vs.

M/s.Teledata Informatics Ltd.,  
2AB Gee Gee Emerald  
151, Village Road,  
Nungambakkam, Chennai - 600 034.

... Respondent

Tax Case Appeal filed under Section 260A of the Income Tax Act, 1961  
against the order of the Income Tax Appellate Tribunal, Madras 'B'  
Bench, Chennai, dated 18.12.2009 made in ITA No.1662/mds/2008  
for the assessment year 2004-05.

For Appellant : Mr.M.Swaminathan  
Senior Standing Counsel  
Assisted by  
Mrs.N.Pushpa  
Junior Standing Counsel

For Respondent : Mr.M.Vijayaraghavan  
For M/s.Subbaraya Aiyar  
and Mr.Padmanabhan

**J U D G M E N T**

(Delivered by DR.VINEET KOTHARI,J)

Both the learned Standing Counsel submit that the issue involved in the present case is squarely covered by the Division Bench Judgment of this Court delivered on 05.12.2018 in the case of Commissioner of Income Tax, Chennai V. M/s.Maars Software International Ltd., East Coast Chambers II Floor, 92, G.N.Chetty Road, T.Nagar, Chennai.

2.The relevant portion of the said Judgment is quoted for ready reference:

*"7. The following substantial question of law (reframed by us) is raised for resolution:*

*'Whether on the facts and circumstances of the case, the Tribunal was right in holding that unrealised sale proceeds in foreign exchange within the prescribed period amounting to Rs.2,89,96,894/- had to be included in the total turnover while computing the deduction under Section 10A of the I.T. Act?'*

*8. Section 10A of the Act is a special provision enacted to provide for a deduction in respect of income derived by an undertaking from the export of articles or things or computer software for a period of ten consecutive assessment years beginning with the assessment year relevant to the previous year in which the undertaking begins the eligible activity.*

9. In the present case, the eligibility of the assessee to this relief is not disputed. The mode of computation of the relief is set out in terms of subsection (4) of section 10A by way of a formula.

10. Sub-section (4) is extracted below:

(4) For the purposes of sub-sections (1) and (1A), the profits derived from export of articles or things or computer software shall be the amount which bears to the profits of the business of the undertaking, the same proportion as the export turnover in respect of such articles or things or computer software bears to the total turnover of the business carried on by the undertaking.

The resultant formula is thus: 
$$\frac{\text{export profits} \times \text{export turnover}}{\text{total turnover.}}$$

11. Sub-section (3) stipulates that the foreign exchange derived from eligible activity be brought into the country within a specified period, i.e., six (6) months from the end of the previous year or within such period as the competent authority may allow in this behalf. In the present case, admittedly, foreign exchange to the extent of Rs.2,89,96,894/- has not been received in India within the stipulated statutory period.

12. Mr. Karthik Ranganathan, learned Standing Counsel appearing for the Revenue would thus contend that the amount of Rs.2,89,96,894/-, admittedly not brought into the country within the prescribed time limit would automatically have to stand excluded from the numerator, i.e. export turnover. However, according to him, the amount constitutes turnover of the assessee and should be included in the denominator, 'total turnover'. He would argue that this treatment was in keeping with the scheme of the section that is intended to provide a benefit only for

*those engaged in the activity of export and gaining foreign exchange.*

*13. He points out that the very object of the section is to improve foreign exchange inflows into the Country and thus in a situation where an assessee is unable to bring into the Country foreign exchange by way of export turnover, such non-realisation should not only stand excluded from the numerator, but also be deemed to be part of turnover and included in the denominator, i.e. total turnover of the company.*

*14. He relies on two decisions of this Court in the case of Galaxy Granites (P) Ltd. V. Commissioner of Income-tax ((2012) 27 taxmann.com) 31 (Mad) which relates to computation of deduction under Section 80 HHC of the Act and Pentasoft Technologies Ltd. V. The Deputy Commissioner of Income Tax (T.C.(A)Nos.1135 and 1196 of 2008 dated 25.11.2013).*

*15. In the case of Galaxy Granites (supra) the Bench considers the following question:*

*'Whether the Appellate Tribunal is right in law in holding that unrealised export turnover should be included in the "Total Turnover" while it is not treated as "Export Turnover" for purposes of computing the allowable deduction under Section 80HHC?'*

*16. In answering the question, the Division Bench took into account the definitions of 'export turnover' as well as 'total turnover' under section 80 HHC of the Act. The definition of 'export turnover' in Section 80HHC was amended by Finance Act 1990 to provide that what would be included within its ambit would only be sale proceeds 'received' as against sales proceeds 'receivable' till the date of amendment. Thus, with effect from 01.04.1991, only sales proceeds actually 'received' would stand included in the ambit of 'export turnover'. However, the corresponding amendment was not made in the definition*

of 'total turnover'. In the aforesaid circumstances, the intention of the Legislature was clear to the effect that it would be only sale proceeds actually 'received' that would be included within the ambit of 'export turnover' in the numerator whereas, in addition to actual receipts, what was 'receivable' or 'not actually received' would also stand included within the ambit of denominator i.e, 'total turnover'.

17. This position hinges on the scheme of deduction under section 80HHC, which is specific to the provisions set out therein. The provisions of section 10B do not contain a definition of 'total turnover' and therefore the interpretation of the Court in the context of section 80HHC would not advance the case of the Revenue as far as the scheme of section 10A or 10B is concerned.

18. In the case of Pentasoft (supra), the Bench decided the claim for exclusion of unrealised sales proceeds against the assessee since no such claim had been made at the time of assessment, and the assessee therein had raised the claim only by way of additional ground at the stage of first appeal. Since there was no challenge to the exclusion of unrealised sale proceeds from 'export turnover' but inclusion of the same in 'total turnover' at the time of assessment, the Bench held that it was not open to the assessee to question the interpretation of the formula at a later stage.

19. The assessee therein had also raised alternate grounds by way of a claim towards bad debt/business loss that were negatived by the Division Bench. The facts in that case are distinguishable from the one on hand. Moreover, the claim in the present case has been made at the time of assessment itself and thus the decision in the case of Pentasoft (supra) is of no assistance to the revenue.

20. While the scheme of Section 10A does not provide for

*a definition of the term 'total turnover', Explanation 2(iv) defines 'export turnover' in the following terms:*

*'(iv) "export turnover" means the consideration in respect of export by the undertaking of articles or things or computer software received in, or brought into, India by the assessee in convertible foreign exchange in accordance with sub-section (3), but does not include freight, telecommunication charges or insurance attributable to the delivery of the articles or things or computer software outside India or expenses, if any, incurred in foreign exchange in providing the technical services outside India;*

*21. The issue of whether the items reduced from 'export turnover', such as freight, telecommunication charges or insurance as provided for in the definition would also stand reduced from 'total turnover' was the subject matter of consideration by the Supreme Court in the case of CIT V. HCL Technologies [2018] (404 ITR 719) and the issue was held in favour of the assessee. The conclusion of the Bench was to the effect that items excluded/reduced from the numerator would stand excluded/reduced from the denominator as well. Paragraphs 18 to 21 of the judgement are relevant and are extracted below:*

*'18) Accordingly, the formula for computation of the deduction under Section 10A of the Act would be as follows:*

*Export turnover as defined in  
Explanation 2*

*(IV) of Section 10A of IT Act*

*Export Profit = total Profit X -----  
of the Business*

*Export turnover as defined in  
Explanation 2(IV) of Section  
10A of the IT Act + domestic  
sale proceeds*

*19) In the instant case, if the deductions on freight, telecommunication and insurance attributable to the delivery of computer software under Section 10A of the IT*

*Act are allowed only in Export Turnover but not from the Total Turnover then, it would give rise to inadvertent, unlawful, meaningless and illogical result which would cause grave injustice to the 19 Respondent which could have never been the intention of the legislature.*

*20) Even in common parlance, when the object of the formula is to arrive at the profit from export business, expenses excluded from export turnover have to be excluded from total turnover also. Otherwise, any other interpretation makes the formula unworkable and absurd. Hence, we are satisfied that such deduction shall be allowed from the total turnover in same proportion as well.*

*21) On the issue of expenses on technical services provided outside, we have to follow the same principle of interpretation as followed in the case of expenses of freight, telecommunication etc., otherwise the formula of calculation would be futile. Hence, in the same way, expenses incurred in foreign exchange for providing the technical services outside shall be allowed to exclude from the total turnover.'*

*22. Learned Counsel for the Revenue seeks to distinguish the above judgment stating that the rationale thereof would be applicable only to the items of exclusion at issue before the Supreme Court and cannot be extended to the question of unrealised sale proceeds, which is the issue in the present case.*

*23. We see no valid distinction as sought to be pointed out before us. The components of the total turnover/denominator in the formula would be the quantum of export turnover/numerator plus proceeds from domestic sales. Thus what is 'export turnover' for the purpose of the numerator would have to be the 'export turnover' for the purpose of*

*denominator as well and 'export turnover' cannot assume two different characteristics for two parts of the same formula.*

*24. In the present case, the quantum of 'export turnover' has been taken to be the actual remittances of foreign exchange after excluding the unrealised foreign exchange. This then would be the same figure to be adopted so far as the denominator is concerned as well. In fine, 'total turnover' for purposes of the formula would be the actual sale receipts excluding unrealised foreign exchange as adopted for 'export turnover'. This conclusion is also supported by the reasoning that the provisions of Section 10A/10B are beneficial in nature and seek to encourage an assessee engaging in a prescribed activity."*

3. Accordingly, the present appeal is disposed of in same terms.

No costs.

(V.K.,J.) (R.S.K.,J.)  
03.12.2019

Index : Yes/No


Speaking Order : Yes/No

Sgl

WEB COPY

To


The Income Tax Appellate Tribunal,  
Madras 'B' Bench, Chennai



WEB COPY

**DR.VINEET KOTHARI, J.**  
and  
**R.SURESH KUMAR, J.**

Sgl



TCA No.741 of 2010

**WEB COPY** 03.12.2019.