

With regard to the sum of Rs. 2,72,946 which has been added to the surplus, the assessee is entitled to a deduction in respect of this item also under r. 3 (a) because this amount must be considered to have been reserved for and on behalf of the policy-holders. It stands on the same footing as the sum of Rs. 22,96,068 shown as surplus under the valuation report. The same applies to the sum of Rs. 1,00,000 also added to the surplus.

We would therefore answer questions referred to us as follows: No. 1 in the affirmative. No. 2 in the affirmative. We would re-frame the third question as follows:—

Whether the amounts paid to or reserved for or expended on behalf of the policy-holders within the meaning of r. 3 (a) of the schedule to the Income-tax Act include the expenses incurred by the company for payment of income-tax or provision for income-tax?

Having re-framed the question thus we would answer the third question in the negative.

No order for the costs of the reference.

Attorneys for applicant: *Manilal, Kher, Ambalal & Co.*

Attorney for respondent: *N. K. Petigara.*

*Answer accordingly.*

A. J. P.

---

### INCOME-TAX REFERENCE

---

*Before Mr. M. C. Chagla, Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Tendolkar.*

HIMATLAL MOTILAL APPLICANT (ASSESSEE) v. THE COMMISSIONER OF INCOME-TAX AND EXCESS PROFITS TAX BOMBAY NORTH, RESPONDENT.\*

1951  
April 12

*Indian Income-tax Act (XI of 1922), s. 25 (4)—Assessment in case of a discontinued business—Relief when there is succession of business—Relief only in respect of the business succeeded to by another person and not in respect of the total income from all sources of the assessee.*

The policy of the Legislature in enacting s. 25, sub-ss. (3) and (4) is to prevent double taxation and the relief which is intended to be given is to a particular business that has paid tax under the Act of 1918 and which has paid a further tax under the new Act. Having paid tax relief is intended to be given to that business when that business is succeeded to by another person. But no relief is intended to be given by the Legis-

---

\* Income Tax Ref. No. 41 of 1950.

1951  
THE  
BOMBAY  
MUTUAL  
LIFE  
ASSURANCE  
Co., LTD.  
v.  
THE  
COMMISSIONER OF  
INCOME-  
TAX,  
BOMBAY  
CITY

*Chagla C. J.*

1951

HIMATLAL  
MOTILAL  
v.THE  
COMMISSIONER OF  
INCOME-  
TAX AND  
EXCESS  
PROFITS  
TAX,  
BOMBAY  
NORTH

lature to a person who has paid tax on his property or on dividends received by him on shares and securities. The relief intended to be given is not to the assessee so much as to the particular business, profession or vocation.

The assessee, an undivided Hindu family, was assessed for the first time to tax for the assessment year 1921-22. On October 26, 1943 the joint family was disrupted. At that time the family was carrying on three separate businesses, one of money-lending, secondly, of running a ginning factory and lastly, a share business. Only the money-lending business had paid tax under the Income-tax Act of 1918.

As a result of the disruption, the three businesses were divided amongst the members of the family. The assessee claimed relief under s. 25 (4) of the Income-tax Act in respect of its income, profits and gains not only of the money-lending business but of the other two businesses for the period between the end of the previous year and the date of the succession of the money-lending business.

*Held*, that as the three businesses were distinct and separate businesses and as the money-lending business only had paid tax under the Act of 1918, the assessee was entitled to the benefit provided in s. 25 (4) in respect of his money-lending business only.

*Nopram Ramgopal v. Commissioner of Income-tax, Bihar and Orissa*<sup>(1)</sup> and *Gopi Mohan and Sons v. The Commissioner of Income-tax, C. P. and Berar*,<sup>(2)</sup> referred to.

The assessee was the Hindu undivided family of one Himatlal who became separate from his father Motilal Hirabhai some time in 1916-17. Himatlal was assessed separately for the first time in the status of a Hindu joint family in the assessment year 1921-22, in respect of the money-lending business carried on by his family. The joint family of Himatlal was partitioned on October 26, 1943 on which date there was succession to the money-lending business. The undivided Hindu family of Himatlal therefore claimed the benefit of s. 25 (4) of the Income-tax Act in respect of all the three businesses.

The Tribunal held that the family was entitled to claim the benefit in respect of the money-lending business only.

At the instance of the assessee, the Tribunal made a reference to the High Court and referred the following question of law for the opinion of the High Court.

“Whether on the facts of the case, the assessee is entitled to the benefits of s. 25 (4) of the Indian Income-tax Act in respect of income from money-lending business only or in respect of the three businesses carried on by the family at the time of the disruption.”

The reference was heard.

*Sir Jamshedji Kanga* with *R. J. Kolah* for the assessee.

<sup>(1)</sup> (1950) 19 I. T. R. 219.

<sup>(2)</sup> (1946) 15 I. T. R. 220.

C. K. Daphtary Advocate-General with G. N. Joshi for the respondent.

CHAGLA C. J. This reference has given an opportunity to Sir Jamshedji Kanga to advance before us a very interesting and ingenious argument based on the construction of s. 25 (4) of the Indian Income-tax Act. The facts are that the assessee before us who is an undivided Hindu family of one Himatlal was assessed for the first time to tax for the assessment year 1921-22. This joint family was disrupted on October 26, 1943. It has been found as a fact that at the time of disruption the joint family was carrying on three separate businesses, one of money-lending, secondly, of running a ginning factory and, lastly, a share business. It is also found as a fact that only the money-lending business had paid tax under the Income-tax Act of 1918. On these facts the assessee claims the concessions laid down in s. 25 (4) on the ground that his business had been succeeded to by others and therefore he was entitled to the benefits mentioned in that sub-section.

Now the contention of the Commissioner is that the concessions in s. 25 (4) are to be given to a particular business which was assessed to tax under the Act of 1918 and the relief to be granted should be in respect of that business only. That sub-section does not contemplate any relief in respect of any other sources of income of the assessee who was carrying on the business which was assessed to tax under the Act of 1918 and in respect of which there was a succession. The ingenious argument advanced by Sir Jamshedji is that when you look at the framework of s. 25 (4) it is clear that the Legislature intended to give relief not merely in respect of a particular business which was assessed to tax under the Act of 1918 and in respect of which there was a succession, but the relief contemplated was in respect of the total income of the assessee whose business was succeeded to. This argument is based on the language used in sub-s. (4) to the effect that "no tax shall be payable by the first mentioned person in respect of the income, profits and gains for the period between the end of the previous year and the date of such succession." It is pointed out that when you turn to s. 10 which deals with tax on business, profession or vocation, the language used by the Legislature is "Profits or gains of any business, profession or vocation." The expression "income from any business, profession or vocation" is not used in s. 10 at all. On the other hand, when you turn to sub-s. (4) the words "income, profits and gains" are used

1951

HIMATLAL  
MOTILAL  
v.THE  
COMMISSIONER OF  
INCOME-  
TAX AND  
EXCESS  
PROFITS  
TAX,  
BOMBAY  
NORTHChagla  
C. J.

1951

HIMATLAL  
MOTILAL  
v.  
THE  
COMMISSIONER OF  
INCOME-  
TAX AND  
EXCESS  
PROFITS  
TAX,  
BOMBAY  
NORTH

Chagla  
C. J.

in connection with an assessee who satisfies the conditions laid down in that sub-section and not merely a relief in respect of a particular business which was succeeded to by another person. Frankly the use of the expression "income, profits and gains" creates considerable difficulty in properly construing this sub-section. If we were to give the construction for which Sir Jamshedji contends, it would lead to most absurd conclusions and consequences. It is obvious that the policy of the Legislature in enacting s. 25 sub-ss. (3) and (4), was to prevent double taxation, and the relief which was intended to be given was to a particular business that had paid tax under the Act of 1918 and which had paid a further tax under the new Act. Having paid tax twice a relief was intended to be given to that business when that business was succeeded to by another person. It is also clear that no relief was intended to be given by the Legislature to a person who had paid tax on his property or on dividends received by him on shares and securities. If that was the policy of the Legislature it is difficult to understand why relief should be given to a person whose business is succeeded to in respect of not only that business but also in respect of all sources of income. Sir Jamshedji says that taxing statutes lead to many absurd results, but if we find that this is the only construction of s. 25 (4), we should not hesitate in giving effect to that construction. If we were satisfied that the Legislature intended to use the expression "income, profits and gains" not only for the purpose of indicating the profits and gains of the business as contemplated by s. 10 but also for the purpose of indicating the total income of the assessee, then no doubt we would have to come to that conclusion, however reluctantly; but fortunately there is a clear indication in this sub-section itself. What the Legislature intended by using the expression "income, profits and gains" was the profits and gains of the business or profession contemplated by s. 10 and not the total income of the assessee, because when we come to the proviso to s. 25, sub-s. (3) and (4), it provides as follows :

Provided that sub-ss. (3) and (4) shall not apply—

(a) to super-tax except where the income, profits and gains of the business, profession or vocation were assessed to super-tax for the first time either for the year beginning on the first day of April 1920, or for the year beginning on the 1st day of April 1921;"

Therefore, here we have the expression "income, profits and gains" used in juxtaposition with "business, profession and vocation" and there can be no doubt as far as this provision

is concerned that what the Legislature was providing for was the profits and gains of the business, profession or vocation contemplated by s. 10. It is true that the expression "income" is very loosely used. Had the Legislature been careful they would only have used the expression "profits and gains." But the very fact that in the proviso they have used "income, profits and gains" as indicating profits and gains of the business clearly shows that the expression "income, profits and gains" in sub-s. (4) has also been used with the same meaning and intent. Further when you look at sub-s. (4) as a whole, apart from the use of the expression "income, profits and gains" it is clear that the conditions required for obtaining of relief under this sub-section are, firstly, carrying on any business, profession or vocation; secondly, tax being charged on this business, profession or vocation under the Act of 1918; and, lastly, succession to any such business, profession or vocation in such capacity by another person. Therefore, such other person must not only succeed, he must also succeed in such capacity, which means, he must carry on the same business, profession or vocation which had been carried on by the assessee to whom relief is to be given. If these conditions are satisfied, then no tax is payable by the first mentioned person who is the person to whom relief is intended to be given in respect of the income, profits and gains of the period between the end of the previous year and the date of such succession. Therefore, the whole emphasis in sub-s. (4) is not upon the assessee so much as upon the particular business, profession or vocation which was carried on and which was subjected to tax under the Act of 1918. One might almost say that the relief contemplated to be given was not to the assessee so much as to the particular business, profession or vocation. No authority was really necessary in support of this construction, but we find that the High Court of Orissa has in the case of *Nopram Ramgopal v. Commr. of Inc. tax*<sup>(1)</sup> taken the view that it is the business which was in existence and which had been assessed to tax under the Act of 1918 and not the person who is entitled to this relief. Even the High Court of Allahabad has in the case of *Gopi Mohan and Sons v. Commr. of Inc. Tax, U. P. & C. P.*<sup>(2)</sup> in construing s. 25 (3) (where also the expression income, profits and gains occurs) has construed that sub-section as relating to that head of income, which had been dealt with in s. 10, and as quite distinct from income from property which was mentioned in s. 9. Sir Jamshedji, relying on the judgment of the

<sup>(1)</sup> (1951) 19 I. T. R. 219.

<sup>(2)</sup> (1947) 15 I. T. R. 220.

1951

HIMATLAL  
MOTILAL  
v.  
THE  
COMMISSIONER OF  
INCOME-  
TAX AND  
EXCESS  
PROFITS  
TAX,  
BOMBAY  
NORTH

Chagla C. J.

Orissa High Court, wanted to argue that the two other businesses, viz. the running of ginning factory and the share business really formed part of the money-lending business and, therefore, all the three businesses should obtain the relief under s. 25 (4). What the Orissa High Court held was that if the new business has arisen from the old business, then it may be stated that the new business and the old business constituted only one business and the two businesses were not distinct and separate, and, therefore, both the businesses as one business may be entitled to the relief under s. 25 (4). But before us we have a clear and categorical finding that the three businesses of the assessee were distinct businesses and, therefore, it cannot be stated that the relief which was intended for the money-lending business which was carried on by the assessee and which was subjected to tax under the Act of 1918 should be extended to the business of running the ginning factory and the share business which was not in existence and which was not subjected to tax under the Act of 1918. The answer, therefore, to the question put to us will be that the assessee is entitled to the benefit mentioned in s. 25 (4) only in respect of his money-lending business. The assessee to pay the costs of the reference.

Attorneys for applicants: Zaiwalla & Co.

Attorney for respondent: N. K. Petigara.

*Answer accordingly.*

A. J. P.

---

ORIGINAL CIVIL

---

*Before Mr. M. C. Chagla, Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Tendolkar.*

ABDUL MAJID HAJI MAHOMED AND ANOTHER APPELLANTS (ORIGINAL PETITIONERS) v. P. R. NAYAK, RESPONDENT.\*

1951  
April 11

*Administration of Evacuee Property Ordinance (XXVII of 1949) ss. 2 (d), 7 (1), 10 (2), 26 (1), 28, 43 and 58—Administration of Evacuee Property Act (XXXI of 1950)—Government of India Act, 1935, Seventh Schedule, Concurrent List, Entry 31 (B)—Constitution of India, 1950, arts. 19 (1), (f), 31, 226—Effect of vesting of property in the Custodian—Jurisdiction of the High Court to issue writs and directions—Orders of the custodian in excess of jurisdiction—Validity of the Ordinance.*

---

\* Appeal No. 85 of 1950 Misc. Petition No. 149 of 1950.