PRINCIPAL COMMISSIONER OF INCOME TAX-10 DELHI v. PINNACLE CLOTHING COMPANY

ITA 117/2026

ITA 117/2026; order dated 2026-02-10 | 2026-02-10

Revenue appeal dismissed on low tax effect; underlying merits not adjudicated.

High Court of Delhi | 2-judge bench (Division Bench) | Justice Dinesh Mehta | Justice Vinod Kumar

Assessment years: Not specified in order text

01 FACTS OF THE CASE

Revenue appealed against Pinnacle Clothing Company in ITA 117/2026. The order records that the tax effect falls below the limits in CBDT Circular 5/2024 dated 15 March 2024 read with Circular 9/2024 dated 17 September 2024.

Source: PDF pp.1–2

02 DISCUSSION BY THE HON'BLE COURT

Before considering tax effect, the Court condoned 708 days in refiling. Revenue then reported that the appeal fell below the limits in the two specified CBDT circulars.

Source: PDF pp.1–2

03 JUDICIAL DECISION

The appeal was dismissed on the stated low-tax-effect ground. No underlying tax merits were adjudicated.

Source: PDF pp.1–2

04 OUTCOME / IN WHOSE FAVOUR

Revenue's appeal ended; all pending applications were disposed of.

Source: PDF pp.1–2

05 EXPERT COMMENTS

AKHB Expert Comments — editorial analysis, distinct from the Court's findings.

Identify the actual disposal: The Court expressly condones 708 days in refiling under CM 9211/2026. The filing-delay application CM 9210/2026 is disposed of with the appeal; the order does not separately say that filing delay was condoned. (PDF pp.1–2)

Separate appellate closure from tax merits: The result favours Pinnacle Clothing Company only in ending this Revenue challenge. The Court supplies no independent reasoning approving a deduction, deleting an addition or invalidating reassessment. For any substantive reliance, the underlying appellate decision and its facts would need to be examined separately. (PDF pp.1–2)

Apply the recorded policy with its evidential limits: The order identifies both circulars but does not reproduce their full conditions or decide any exception. It therefore supports the recorded disposal, not a universal monetary-limit rule for other appeals. The assessment year and substantive statutory provisions remain unstated; assigning them from a filename or a neighbouring case would create unsupported facts. (PDF pp.1–2)

Source: PDF pp.1–2

SOURCE & VERIFICATION

Original High Court judgment PDF — AKHB source repository

Complete 2-page original reviewed; source bytes verified.

Full original and all five panels re-reviewed on 21 October 2026.

Open cited source rendition

Complete original source and all five note panels checked; original docket identities preserved.

STATUTORY SCOPE

Current law and subsequent treatment not independently verified.

LATER TREATMENT

Source checked 2026-10-21. Subsequent proceedings and current judicial treatment have not been independently verified.

AI DISCLOSURE

AI-assisted research checked against the identified source. Extraction, interpretation or omission errors remain possible. Source review does not mean independent approval by a practising professional. Verify every material statement against the complete original judgment.

PROFESSIONAL DISCLAIMER

General research information only; not legal or tax advice, a certified judgment or a substitute for the full order. Applicability depends on facts, assessment year, statutory version and jurisdiction. Subsequent treatment is unverified unless identified sources are expressly stated. Downloading does not create a professional engagement. Obtain case-specific advice before reliance.