

The Hon'ble Supreme Court in a recent ruling¹ held that penalty under section 271C(1)(a) of the Income-tax Act, 1961 ('the Act') applies to failure to deduct taxes at source. No penalty under section 271C of the Act can be levied for delay in remittance of withheld taxes.

Background and facts of the case

- The taxpayer deducted taxes at source ('TDS') in respect of salary, contractual payments, etc. for the Assessment Year 2003-04¹ and Assessment Year 2010-11 to 2012-13². The TDS amount was deposited with the Government after the payment due date.
- In addition to penal interest payable under section 201(1A) of the Act, the Revenue levied penalty under section 271C for

- belated payment of withheld taxes which was affirmed by the Kerala High Court.
- Aggrieved by the High Court order, the taxpayers preferred appeal before the Supreme Court.

Contention of the Taxpayer

- As per cardinal principle of law, penal provisions should be construed literally and strictly.
- Penalty under section 271C(1)(a) applies only on failure to deduct taxes at source.

¹ M/s. US Technologies International Pvt. Ltd. v. CIT (Civil Appeal No. 7934 of 2011)

² Eurotech Maritime Academy Pvt. Ltd v. CIT (TDS) (Civil Appeal No. 1258-1260/2019)



- Penalty under section 271C(1)(a) cannot be imposed for late payment of taxes after deduction.
- Penalty under section 271C(1)(b) is applicable only in case of non-payment of dividend distribution taxes under section 115-O or in case of non-payment of taxes for in-kind winnings from lottery or crossword puzzle under proviso to section 194B.
- Prior to 1 April 1989, section 276B provided for prosecution for failure to deduct taxes at source or after deducting failure to pay withholding taxes. The section was amended³ to take away power to prosecute for failure to deduct taxes at source. Simultaneously, section 271C was introduced to levy penalty for failure to deduct TDS, whereas failure to pay, after deduction, continued to attract prosecution under section 276B.⁴
- Unlike section 276B, the words 'fails to pay' are absent in the language employed in section 271C(1)(a). Section 271C and Section 276B have different and distinct operation. Section 276B applies in case of failure to pay taxes after deduction, whereas section 271C applies in case of failure to deduct taxes at source.
- If the penalty under section 271C is upheld for belated remittance of TDS, it would tantamount to adding something more than which is provided in the section.

- The Kerala High Court order passed against the taxpayer has been overruled by the Full Bench of Kerala HC⁵.
- When the Parliament thought it fit to levy the penal interest on late remittance of the TDS for the belated period, there shall not be levy of the penalty under section 271C for belated remittance of TDS.

Contention of the Revenue

- The old provisions of the Act provided for prosecution for failure to deduct tax at source or after deducting failure to remit the same to the Government. Section 271C was inserted to provide for levy of penalty for failure to deduct tax at source.
- In a case where though the taxpayer has deducted the taxes at source but does not remit the same to the Government and/or belatedly remits the TDS after deducting, such a taxpayer is liable to pay the penalty under Section 271C of the Act.
- The object and purpose of insertion of section 271C seems to be that over and above the prosecution, the person who has deducted the tax but not remitted the same to the government shall also be liable to pay penalty. Restricting penalty to the cases covering only non-deduction of taxes, would frustrate the legislative intent.

Observation of the Supreme Court

 The words used in section 271C(1)(a) are clear and relevant words used are 'fails to

³ Vide Direct Tax Laws (Amendment) Act, 1987

⁴ CBDT Circular no. 551 of 1990 dated 23 January 1990

Lakshadweep Development Corporation Ltd. (2019)
111 ITR 213 (FB)



- deduct' which does not speak about delayed payment of TDS.
- Section 276B provides for prosecution in case of failure to 'pay' TDS to the credit of central government, whereas the word 'pay' is missing in language of the section 271C(1)(a).
- As per cardinal principle of interpretation of statute and more particularly that of a penal provision, they should be interpreted as they are. It is not for the Court to read something more into it, contrary to the intent and legislative wisdom.
- Plain reading of section 271C suggests that there shall not be penalty leviable on belated remittance of TDS.
- Provisions of section 271C are categoric and its scope and extent of application can be discerned from its text in unambiguous terms.
- While failure to deduct taxes at source invite penalty under section may 271C(1)(a) of the Act, failure to pay tax invite penalty under section may 271C(1)(b) of the Act only in limited instances specified in the section namely failure to pay dividend distribution tax as required under section 115-O(2) of the Act and failure to pay tax as required under proviso to section 194B of the Act which covers a situation where winnings from lottery, puzzle or game are wholly or partly in kind and cash component is not sufficient to meet the requirement of TDS, the person responsible for paying need to ensure that tax has been paid in respect of winnings before winnings are released.

- Wherever the Parliament wanted to have the consequences of non-payment and/or belated remittance/payment of the TDS, the Parliament has provided the same in section 201(1A) and section 276B.
- The Supreme Court observed that the CBDT Circular (*supra*) relied upon by revenue actually favours case of the assessee. The Supreme Court observed that if there is delay in remitting TDS, it will involve prosecution proceedings under section 276B of the Act and if there is omission to deduct tax at source, tax liability is shifted to the person who failed to effect deduction, by incorporating provision of penalty as remedial action to safeguard revenue's interest.
- The words 'fails to deduct' as occurring in section 271C(1)(a) cannot be read as 'failure to deposit/pay the tax deducted'.
- The Supreme Court held that there shall be no penalty leviable under section 271C(of the Act for mere delay in remittance of the TDS after deduction.

Dhruva comments

It is a welcome decision as the Hon'ble Supreme Court has unequivocally held that penalty under section 271C(1)(a) of the Act cannot be levied for belated payment of TDS.

The Supreme Court ruling can be relied upon to defend penalty exposure in the pending matters related to non-payment/late payment of TDS.

Liability to deduct TDS is vicarious obligation and non-fulfilment of it attracts multiple adverse consequences and penalty under section 271C of the Act is just one of it. If



there is delay in remittance of TDS, taxpayer may be liable not only for interest under section 201(1A) of the Act, but also for prosecution under section 276B of the Act. If there is non-payment of TDS, the taxpayer can be held as assessee-in-default under section 201(1) of the Act and penalty under section 221 of the Act can also be levied.

Contributors

Sandeep Bhalla (Partner)

Pratik Vora (Principal)

Anuj A Shah (Senior Associate)

For any queries in relation to this tax alert, please feel free to reach out.

Follow us on:







ADDRESSES

Mumbai

1101, One World Center, 11th floor, Tower 2B, 841 Senapati Bapat Marg, Elphinstone Road (West), Mumbai 400 013 Tel: +91 22 6108 1000 / 1900

Tel. +91 22 6106 1000 / 1900

Ahmedabad

B3, 3rd Floor, Safal Profitaire, Near Auda Garden, Prahladnagar, Corporate Road, Ahmedabad 380015 Tel: +91-79-6134 3434

Bengaluru

Prestige Terraces, 2nd Floor Union Street, Infantry Road, Bengaluru 560001 Tel: +91-80-4660 2500

Delhi / NCR

101 & 102, 1st Floor, Tower 4B DLF Corporate Park M G Road, Gurgaon Haryana 122002 Tel: +91-124-668 7000

Pune

305, Pride Gateway, Near D-Mart, Baner, Pune 411 045 Tel: +91-20-6730 1000

Kolkata

4th Floor, Unit No 403, Camac Square, 24 Camac Street, Kolkata West Bengal 700016 Tel: +91-33-66371000

Singapore

Dhruva Advisors (Singapore) Pte. Ltd. 20 Collyer Quay, #11-05 Singapore 049319 Tel: +65 9105 3645

Dubai

WTS Dhruva Consultants Emaar Square Building 4, 2nd Floor, Office 207, Downtown, P.O. Box 127165 Dubai, UAE

Tel: +971 4 240 8477

KEY CONTACTS

Dinesh Kanabar

Chief Executive Officer dinesh.kanabar@dhruvaadvisors.com

Punit Shah(Mumbai)

punit.shah@dhruvaadvisors.com

Mehul Bheda (Ahmedabad)

mehul.bheda@dhruvaadvisors.com

Sandeep Bhalla (Bengaluru)

sandeep.bhalla@dhruvaadvisors.com

Vaibhav Gupta (Delhi/NCR)

vaibhav.gupta@dhruvaadvisors.com

K. Venkatachalam (Pune)

k.venkatachalam@dhruvaadvisors.com

Aditya Hans (Kolkata)

aditya.hans@dhruvaadvisors.com

Mahip Gupta (Singapore)

mahip.gupta@dhruvaadvisors.com

Nimish Goel (Dubai)

nimish.goel@dhruvaadvisors.com

Dhruva Advisors has been consistently recognised as the "India Tax Firm of the Year" at the ITR Asia Tax Awards in 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020 and 2021.

Dhruva Advisors has also been recognised as the "India Disputes and Litigation Firm of the Year" at the ITR Asia Tax Awards 2018 and 2020.

WTS Dhruva Consultants has been recognised as the "Best Newcomer Firm of the Year" at the ITR European Tax Awards 2020.

Dhruva Advisors has been recognised as the "Best Newcomer Firm of the Year" at the ITR Asia Tax Awards 2016.

Dhruva Advisors has been consistently recognised as a **Tier 1 Firm in India for General Corporate Tax** by the International Tax Review's in its World Tax Guide.

Dhruva Advisors has also been consistently recognised as a Tier 1 Firm in India for its Transfer Pricing practice ranking table in ITR's World Transfer Pricing guide

Dhruva Advisors has been consistently recognised as a **Tier 1 Firm in India for Indirect Taxes** in International Tax Review's Indirect Tax Guide.

Disclaimer

This information contained herein is in summary form and is therefore intended for general guidance only. This publication is not intended to address the circumstances of any particular individual or entity. No one should act on such information without appropriate professional advice after a thorough examination of the particular situation. This publication is not a substitute for detailed research and opinion. Before acting on any matters contained herein, reference should be made to subject matter experts and professional judgment needs to be exercised. Dhruva Advisors LLP cannot accept any responsibility for loss occasioned to any person acting or refraining from action as a result of any material in this publication