Deputy Commissioner of Income Tax v. Chola Textiles Pvt. Ltd.

Tax Case No. 344 of 2004

TCA344/2004 (2007-10-03) | 2007-10-03

Section 80-I relief upheld without first subtracting section 80 HH deduction under the historical provisions considered.

80HH | 80-I | 260A

High Court of Judicature at Madras | Division Bench | Justice K. Raviraja Pandian | Justice Chitra Venkataraman

Assessment years: 1991-92

Scope of this order

The direction to compute section 80-I relief without subtracting section 80 HH deduction survived.

01 FACTS OF THE CASE

Chola Textiles claimed deductions under sections 80 HH and 80-I. The assessing officer reduced the computation base for section 80-I by the section 80 HH deduction. The appellate authorities directed computation without that reduction.

Source: PDF p. 2

02 DISCUSSION BY THE HON'BLE COURT

Both sides accepted that the issue was covered by the authorities discussed. The Court followed Mandideep Engineering, including its reasoning on the Department's acceptance of the same view in other cases.

Source: PDF p. 3

03 JUDICIAL DECISION

Revenue's appeal was dismissed without costs.

Source: PDF p. 3

04 OUTCOME / IN WHOSE FAVOUR

The direction to compute section 80-I relief without subtracting section 80 HH deduction survived.

Source: PDF p. 2

05 EXPERT COMMENTS

Preserve the direction despite the question's wording — The first reproduced question appears inconsistent with the second question and the narrative. The operative dismissal preserves computation without reducing section 80 HH relief; the anomaly should not reverse the reported result.

Independent provisions do not remove every other condition — The issue was the interaction of these two deductions. The Court did not waive eligibility requirements or all statutory limits on aggregate relief.

Report the precedent actually used — The judgment follows Mandideep Engineering and the accepted line of decisions. Its result should not be generalized into a rule that every dismissal of special leave decides the merits of every underlying issue.

Source: PDF p. 3

SOURCE & VERIFICATION

Primary High Court order - verified local repository copy

Complete 4-page court PDF read for this correction.

Complete source text and every original page visually reviewed; identity and SHA-256 checked. AI-assisted source analysis.

Open cited source rendition

All 4 physical source pages read and visually inspected. SHA-256: 73f50afdf5445df54cad4606fd25bd55f2fa22d8f5abe0699737345ec0fe5f5f.

STATUTORY SCOPE

This note describes the historical provisions and authorities addressed by the supplied judgment. Subsequent statutory changes and judicial treatment have not been independently verified.

LATER TREATMENT

Source checked 2026-10-21. Subsequent judicial treatment has 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.