

Director General of Anti-Profiteering v. Ireo Pvt. Ltd. (City Central, Managed Service Apartment and Skyon)

Case number: NAPA/73/PB/2025

Citation: No neutral or reporter citation printed in the identified official order.

Decision date: 2025-10-28

Project-specific ITC-to-purchase comparisons: Skyon, City Central and Managed Service Apartment found to yield no incremental GST benefit

Court: Goods and Services Tax Appellate Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi, Anti-Profiteering Division

Bench: Anil Kumar Gupta, Member (Technical); Single Bench Court III

Decision stage: Final reasoned merits determination accepting a project-specific no-profiteering conclusion and dropping proceedings.

01 Facts of case and issues

Following a wider project investigation directed by NAA Order 14/2019 dated 21 October 2019, DGAP examined Skyon, Ireo City Central and Managed Service Apartment. Its initial report was dated 15 December 2021. A reinvestigation followed the Delhi High Court's 29 January 2024 Reckitt Benckiser decision, and a revised report dated 20 August 2025 was considered at the 9 October 2025 hearing. The comparison used April 2012–June 2017 and July 2017–March 2024 periods. The source records that the investigation was directed by CCI and that no direct complaint against these projects had been received.

Pinpoint: Paras 1–5 and 8; physical pp.2–8 and 16.

02 Discussion by Hon'ble Tribunal

For Skyon, the order compares pre-GST credit of ₹31,64,28,447 with net post-GST credit of ₹73,93,179 against purchase values of ₹5,13,87,58,946 and ₹1,14,00,46,423 respectively. The ratios fall from 6.16% to 0.65%. The post-GST net amount reflects reversals and transitional credit, rather than gross GST credit alone. The respondent submitted that construction had been completed before GST; the same paragraph records an occupation certificate dated 14 September 2017. Those statements should not be conflated into a finding that the certificate predated GST.

City Central and Managed Service Apartment were treated together because of the common commercial licence and contractor. Their pre-GST credit of ₹7,16,92,557 and net post-GST credit of ₹9,58,827 were compared with purchases of ₹1,17,59,37,173 and ₹26,08,84,580, producing 6.10% and 0.37%. The source expressly records that exact verification of project costs against audited accounts was not feasible and describes area-based apportionment.

The Tribunal accepted the project-specific ITC-to-construction-cost approach and the conclusion that there was no additional benefit to pass on. Its use of this method does not prescribe one universal formula for every real-estate project.

Pinpoint: Paras 6.1–6.9, 7.1–7.6 and 9; physical pp. 8–16.

03 Judicial decision and operative relief

The Tribunal concluded that no post-GST tax-rate or ITC benefit accrued in respect of Skyon, Ireo City Central and Managed Service Apartment. It held Section 171 inapplicable on these project facts and dropped the proceedings. No monetary award, interest or penalty is directed. The final order was signed, dated and pronounced on 28 October 2025.

Pinpoint: Paras 10–12, physical pp. 16–17; summary physical p. 2.

04 In favour of

Ireo Pvt. Ltd., confined to the three identified projects and the examined benefit comparisons.

Final reasoned no-profiteering determination; proceedings dropped after evaluation of the investigation, rather than a hearing adjournment or interim direction.

Pinpoint: Operative paras 10–12.

05 AKHB REVIEW POINT

AKHB analysis: Reconcile gross credit, reversals and transitional credit before comparing tax benefits. A fall in the properly adjusted ratio supports this order's no-benefit finding, but should not be applied to another project without its own evidence. Separate project periods, areas, completion status and accounting allocation.

The Skyon computation is ₹4,40,97,274 – ₹1,40,86,992 + ₹1,42,38,477 – ₹3,68,55,580 = ₹73,93,179. The combined City Central/MSA computation is ₹6,80,44,335 – ₹3,39,60,955 + ₹51,48,323 + ₹73,71,544 – ₹4,56,44,420 = ₹9,58,827. These reproduce the order's arithmetic; they are not an audit of the underlying books. The express project-cost verification limitation deserves attention when comparing the decision with cases supported by directly traceable project accounts.

Do not merge this order with NAPA 51/PB/2025, decided the same day for Gurgaon Hills and Grand Hyatt. Nor does the introductory reference to Ireo Grace Realtech establish that it is legally identical to the present captioned respondent.

Pinpoint: AKHB analysis of paras 6–10; physical pp.8–17.

Sources and limitations

Relevant provisions

CGST Act 2017: Section 171; CGST Rules 2017: Rules 129(6) and 133(5)(a); CGST Rules 2017: Rule 37

Statutory note

Historical source-based explanation of the law and notifications applied in this order; not a current statutory consolidation.

Treatment note

Bounded exact-case, party and appeal/recall searches on 17 October 2026 identified no later primary order affecting this decision. This is not exhaustive docket clearance or proof that no appeal exists.

Scope of source review

Complete 17-page official order, including administrative summary. Underlying project accounts, returns, credit reversals and DGAP working papers were not independently obtained.

Identity note

Caption: Ireo Pvt. Ltd.; NAPA 73/PB/2025. Para 1 refers to Ireo Grace Realtech in the antecedent investigation. This note preserves that distinction and does not assert identity between those companies.

Primary source

Complete official source read; identity, calculations and operative pages visually checked.

[Open original judgment](#)

Source pages: 17

Outcome type: final

Official NAA listing[Open cited source](#)**Disclosures and source rights**

AI disclosure: Prepared with AI assistance from the identified sources. No human legal review is claimed.

General disclaimer: For professional information only; not legal advice. Read the judgment and applicable law in full and obtain case-specific advice before reliance. Subsequent treatment and compliance are unverified except to the expressly stated source scope.

©AKHB & Associates. This copyright notice applies to the original AKHB research note, analysis and presentation. It does not assert ownership of the reproduced official judgment or other source materials.

Source checked: 2026-10-17