

**Company:** Sol Infotech Pvt. Ltd. **Website:** www.courtkutchehry.com

**Printed For:** 

**Date:** 10/11/2025

## (1988) 10 BOM CK 0028

## **Bombay High Court**

Case No: Income-tax Application No. 1 of 1985

Kewalramani Bros. APPELLANT

Vs

Commissioner of RESPONDENT

Date of Decision: Oct. 4, 1988

Citation: (1991) 189 ITR 90

Hon'ble Judges: V.S. Kotwal, J; S.K. Desai, J

Bench: Division Bench

Advocate: T.U. Khatri, for the Appellant; V.R. Bhatia, for the Respondent

## Judgement

## S.K. Desai, J.

Although the answer to be given to the question seems to be concluded as far as this court is concerned by the decision in <a href="Metal Rolling Works Pvt. Ltd. Vs. Commissioner of Income Tax">Metal Rolling Works Pvt. Ltd. Vs. Commissioner of Income Tax</a>, it is pointed out by learned counsel for the applicant that the Bombay decision cites with approval and follows <a href="Commissioner of Income Tax Vs. Swadeshi">Commissioner of Income Tax Vs. Swadeshi</a> <a href="Cotton Mills Co. Ltd.">Cotton Mills Co. Ltd.</a>, It has been shown to us by reference to 1982 135 ITR 110, <a href="Swadeshi">Swadeshi</a> <a href="Cotton Mills Co. Ltd.">Cotton Mills Co. Ltd.</a>, V. CIT (S. L. P. (Civil) 10498 of 1980), that the said Allahabad decision is under appeal to the Supreme Court.

- 2. To protect the applicant we make the rule absolute.
- 3. Costs of the application to be costs in the cause.