

The Pr. Commissioner of Income-Tax, Central & Anr. v. Global Tech Park Pvt. Ltd.

Income Tax Appeal No. 2 of 2026

2026:KHC:49258-DB | 2026-09-10

Section 153A search assessment: addition of Rs. 10 crore based solely on uncorroborated figures scribbled by CFO on loose sheets (explained as loan-eligibility calculations for property acquisition) deleted; loose sheets are not books of account under V.C. Shukla and Sunil Kumar Sharma.

Income-tax Act, 1961: sections 69, 69B, 132, 153A, 250 and 260A | Indian Evidence Act, 1872: section 34

High Court of Karnataka | 2-judge bench (Division Bench) | Vibhu Bakhru, CJ. | K. S. Hemalekha, J.

Assessment years: 2016-17

Separate Rs. 1,09,97,172 accrued-interest addition conceded by assessee before ITAT; appeal confined to Rs. 10 crore loose-sheet addition

As recorded in paragraph 5 (PDF pp. 3-4), the assessee had conceded the separate addition of Rs. 1,09,97,172 relating to interest accrued on loans and advances before the ITAT; the High Court's ruling pertains exclusively to the Rs. 10 crore addition based on uncorroborated loose sheets.

01 FACTS OF THE CASE

Following a search on 01.02.2018, assessment proceedings under section 153A were initiated against Global Tech Park Pvt. Ltd. for AY 2016-17. During the search, certain loose sheets containing figures scribbled by the assessee's Chief Financial Officer (Sri B.V. Vijendra) were found. When confronted, the CFO explained that the scribbles represented hypothetical loan calculations prepared to inflate the valuation of a property (acquired on 28.12.2015 for a registered consideration of Rs. 92 crores, funded by a Rs. 65 crore loan from M/s. Aditya Birla Finance Limited) so as to obtain a higher loan sanction. Although no corroborative material or evidence of cash payment beyond the registered sale deed was found, the AO added Rs. 10 crores on the basis of the loose sheets, which the CIT(A) confirmed on 30.09.2024. By order dated 31.07.2025, the ITAT Bengaluru deleted the Rs. 10 crore addition.

Source: [Paragraphs 1-11; PDF pp. 2-5](#)

02 DISCUSSION BY THE HON'BLE COURT

Affirming the Tribunal's decision, the Division Bench held that the figures scribbled on the seized loose sheets were completely uncorroborated by any independent evidence indicating that any consideration over and above the registered sale deed price of Rs. 92 crores had actually been paid. Loose sheets do not constitute 'books of account', and uncorroborated scribbles on loose sheets cannot form the sole basis for an assessment addition—a legal position settled by the Supreme Court in *Central Bureau of Investigation v. V.C. Shukla & Ors.*, AIR 1998 SC 1406 and the coordinate Division Bench decision in *Deputy Commissioner of Income-Tax v. Sunil Kumar Sharma*, [2024] 159 taxmann.com 179 (Karnataka).

Source: [Paragraphs 8-14; PDF pp. 4-6](#)

03 JUDICIAL DECISION

Holding that in view of the settled law no substantial question of law arose for consideration, the High Court dismissed Income Tax Appeal No. 2 of 2026 at the admission stage.

Source: [Paragraph 14; PDF p. 6](#)

04 OUTCOME / IN WHOSE FAVOUR

In favour of the assessee (Global Tech Park Pvt. Ltd.). The Revenue's appeal was dismissed, affirming the deletion of the Rs. 10 crore loose-sheet search addition for AY 2016-17.

Source: [Paragraphs 11-14; PDF pp. 5-6](#)

05 AKHB REVIEW POINT

AKHB analysis: even where the authorship or ownership of a seized loose sheet is admitted by a company officer (such as a CFO's working sheet for bank-loan financing) and the cheque component matches the registered deed, an addition for alleged on-money cannot survive under V.C. Shukla and Sunil Kumar Sharma unless the Revenue adduces independent corroborative evidence of actual cash payment or receipt.

Source: [AKHB analysis based on paragraphs 3, 6-14 / PDF pp. 3-6](#)

SOURCE & VERIFICATION

[High Court of Karnataka official digital judgment PDF - AKHB Cloud Repository](#)

Six-page official High Court of Karnataka judgment PDF (2026:KHC:49258-DB); paragraphs 1-14 span PDF pages 1-6.

Supplied source-reviewed note retained; original bytes and identity validation checked in this release. Substantive re-review is not claimed for this record.

Open cited source rendition

Full 6-page official High Court of Karnataka PDF read and verified. Original bytes match SHA-256 80632a75a7782cd9e75814de897e13563a0f32733527498977aa3e060eed2d7b.

STATUTORY SCOPE

Applies sections 132, 153A and 260A of the Income-tax Act, 1961 for AY 2016-17. Income-tax Act, 2025 equivalence is not verified.

LATER TREATMENT

Source checked 2026-10-17. Full judgment checked. Follows Central Bureau of Investigation v. V.C. Shukla & Ors., AIR 1998 SC 1406 and Deputy Commissioner of Income-Tax v. Sunil Kumar Sharma, [2024] 159 taxmann.com 179 (Karnataka). Comprehensive subsequent judicial treatment has not been 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.