Dilbagh Industries v. Income Tax Officer, Ward I, Phagwara

ITA 346/2007

ITA 346/2007 | 2007-11-26

Survey-stock valuation addition sustained where the appeal raised no substantial question of law.

260A | 133A

High Court of Punjab and Haryana | Division Bench | Justice M.M. Kumar | Justice Rajesh Bindal

Assessment years: 2000-01

Scope of this order

The challenged addition remained in place on this record.

01 FACTS OF THE CASE

Dilbagh Industries challenged a Rs.1,07,930 trading-account addition for AY 2000-01 following a 29 March 2000 survey. The dispute involved stock valuation and use of a 16% estimated gross-profit rate compared with 15.16% in the trading account.

Source: PDF p. 2

02 DISCUSSION BY THE HON'BLE COURT

CIT(A) and the Tribunal sustained the addition. The High Court treated their conclusions as concurrent findings of fact and declined to substitute its estimate in a section 260 A appeal.

Source: PDF p. 2

03 JUDICIAL DECISION

No substantial question of law arose; the appeal was dismissed.

Source: PDF p. 3

04 OUTCOME / IN WHOSE FAVOUR

The challenged addition remained in place on this record.

Source: PDF p. 3

05 EXPERT COMMENTS

The appellate threshold controls the result — The Court did not independently derive a new valuation method. Its holding concerns the absence of a substantial legal question in this particular estimation dispute.

Do not silently reconcile inconsistent arithmetic — The source states stock figures of Rs.4,44,308 and Rs.5,57,933 alongside an addition of Rs.1,07,930; those figures do not arithmetically reconcile by simple subtraction. The note reports the challenged addition without inventing a correction.

A survey reference is not a general evidentiary rule — Section 133 A appears in the proposed question and history. No universal rule about conclusiveness of survey admissions or agreed additions was pronounced.

Source: PDF p. 1

SOURCE & VERIFICATION

Primary High Court order - verified local repository copy

Complete source PDF reviewed: 3 physical pages.

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

Open cited source rendition

All 3 physical source pages read and visually inspected. SHA-256: b3c3d0b9a00cfdb1d3d60dbb129f7c5e3cfb762c4fe5e8b088eeb56ba3a01244.

STATUTORY SCOPE

Sections and disposition are recorded only to the extent stated in this source order.

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.