

# Pr. Commissioner of Income Tax-1, Chandigarh v M/s V-Con Integrated Solutions Pvt. Ltd.

SLP(C) Diary No.13205/2025

Official reasoned order dated 2025-04-04; no neutral citation printed | 2025-04-04

## Section 263: actual inquiry, erroneous conclusions and the limits of a remand.

Income-tax Act, 1961: section 263

Three-judge bench | Chief Justice (named by office in primary) | Sanjay Kumar | K.V. Viswanathan

### Qualified procedural result

Reasoned SLP dismissal; no grant of leave or fresh assessment merits adjudication. The order permits remand where a superficial inquiry and the required error and prejudice are established.

## 01 FACTS OF THE CASE

Revenue challenged the Punjab and Haryana High Court order of 12 September 2024 in ITA 88/2024 upholding the Tribunal. The assessing officer had made inquiries but no additions. Revenue's objection concerned the conclusion reached, rather than a complete failure to investigate. The short order does not identify the assessment year or underlying proposed additions.

Source: [Official order: PDF page 1, caption and first substantive paragraph](#)

## 02 DISCUSSION BY THE HON'BLE COURT

The Hon'ble Court distinguished absence of investigation from an erroneous decision after inquiry. An assessee does not control the assessing officer's drafting. Where inquiry occurred, section 263 remains available to correct an erroneous conclusion on merits by an addition or disallowance; a remand cannot simply be justified by saying there was no investigation. A superficial and random inquiry may justify remand, but the Commissioner must record the failure and lapse establishing both error and prejudice to Revenue.

Source: [Official order: PDF page 2, first four substantive paragraphs](#)

## 03 JUDICIAL DECISION

Delay was condoned. The Court held the High Court's order correct on the facts and law and dismissed Revenue's special leave petition with reasons. Pending applications were disposed of.

Source: [Official order: PDF pages 1-2, opening and concluding directions](#)

## 04 OUTCOME / IN WHOSE FAVOUR

In favour of the assessee: Revenue's challenge failed. This is not a blanket prohibition on section 263 remands or an adjudication of the unidentified underlying additions.

Source: [Official order: PDF page 2, qualification and dismissal](#)

**05 AKHB REVIEW POINT**

Compare the actual inquiry record with the precise revision ground. Distinguish a wrong conclusion after investigation from absence or demonstrably superficial inquiry. A proposed remand should identify the recorded failures and establish both statutory requirements. Do not read this short order as immunising every assessment that contains some inquiry.

Source: [Official order: Editorial analysis based on PDF pages 1-2](#)

**SOURCE & VERIFICATION**

[Hon'ble Supreme Court official reasoned order](#)

Both pages of the official record of proceedings and unnumbered reasoned order fully read.

[Open cited source rendition](#)

No neutral citation or numbered paragraphs appear. The stated hearing date is used, not the later digital-signature date.

**STATUTORY SCOPE**

Apply the statutory version governing the underlying proceedings. No automatic mapping to the Income-tax Act, 2025.

**LATER TREATMENT**

Source checked 2026-10-18. Subsequent treatment and current-law applicability have not been comprehensively checked.

**AI DISCLOSURE**

This AKHB research note was prepared with AI assistance from an identified primary report. Independent human review is not represented.

**PROFESSIONAL DISCLAIMER**

General legal and tax research only; not legal or tax advice. Verify the complete judgment, applicable statutory version and subsequent treatment before reliance. The AKHB REVIEW POINT is editorial analysis, not the Court's holding. No current-law clearance is claimed.