
The Commissioner of Income Tax, Delhi-VI, New Delhi Vs R.L. Bhargava

Income Tax R. No. 86 of 1981

Court: Delhi High Court

Date of Decision: Dec. 21, 2001

Acts Referred:

Income Tax Act, 1961 " Section 256(1)

Citation: (2002) 96 DLT 322 : (2002) 256 ITR 42 : (2002) 122 TAXMAN 486

Hon'ble Judges: S.B. Sinha, C.J; A.K. Sikri, J

Bench: Division Bench

Advocate: Sanjeev Khanna and Prem Lata Bansal, for the Appellant; Nemo, for the Respondent

Judgement

S.B. Sinha, C.J.

The following questions have been referred to this court for its opinion by the Income Tax Appellate Tribunal in terms of

Section 256(1) of the Income Tax Act, 1961:

1. Whether on the facts and in the circumstances of the case, the Tribunal is correct in law in holding that the sum of Rs. 2.50 lakhs is not taxable

in the assessed"s hands being a capital receipt?

2. Whether on the facts and circumstances of the case ,a part of the sum of Rs.2.50 lakhs is in any case taxable as revenue receipt?

2. The facts of the matter lies in a very narrow compass.

FACTS

3. The assessed is a well-known paper technologist. During this year, he entered into an agreement with Regal Papers Ltd., for transfer of

complete technology which included technical know-how process and secret formulate for manufacture of high gloss cast-coated papers and

boards. For this, he received a sum of Rs. 2,50,000/- from M/s. Regal Papers ltd. The assessed contended that the amount was not taxable as

being Capital Expenditure .The Income Tax Officer, however, treated it as Revenue Expenditure and charged it to tax. The Appellate Assistant

Commissioner in appeal upheld that as the assessment condition, the assessed had agreed to transfer complete technology including technical

know-how processes and secret formulae for the manufacture of high gloss cast-coated papers and boards to M/s. Regal Papers Ltd. and to

assist them to establish the plant for efficient production of the products for a period of five years where for the company agreed to pay the

assessed an amount of Rs. 2,50,000/-, and thus, the amount received, namely ,Rs. 2,50,000/- was in the nature of capital receipt. The department

went in appeal before the Tribunal. The Tribunal upheld the view taken by the Appellate Asst. Commissioner. It is appropriate to quote from the

Tribunal"s order:-

3. The Learned Departmental Representative submitted before us that the decision in the case of HINDUSTAN FORESTS CO. LTD. Vs.

COMMISSIONER OF Income Tax, PUNJAB., was directly applicable but the learned counsel for the assessed, however, stated that it had no

application .We are inclined to agree with the learned counsel for the assessed. The matter before us was in substance parting by the assessed with

part of his property for a purchase price. The method adopted by the assessed was not a method of trading by which the assessed acquired

particular sum of money as part of the profits and gains of the trade. The assessed was a well-known paper technologist and he had agreed to

transfer the complete technology to the company with which he had entered into an agreement. The cases cited by the assessed and referred to by

the Appellate Assistant Commissioner fully support the assessed"s case. For the reasons recorded by the Appellate Assistant Commissioner, and

with which we are inclined to agree, we hold that the amount of Rs. 2,50,000/- has to be treated as capital receipt and we accordingly uphold the

Appellate Assistant Commissioner"s action and reject the Department"s appeal.

4. For the purpose of disposal of the matter, the terms and conditions, embodied in the Articles of Agreement dated 14th December 1972 entered

into by the and between the company and the assessed are required to be noticed. The assessed was possessed of complete technology for

making high gloss cast-coated papers and boards including technical know how, processes and secret formula for the manufacture thereof. The

company had obtained a license to establish a plant for manufacture of high gloss cast-coated papers with a capacity of 1500 tonnes per annum.

As it was desirous of setting up a plant thereof, it had approached the assessed for transfer of complete technology including the technical know

how, process of secret formula in relation thereto. In the said Agreement, it was stipulated:

5. ""The Company shall be entitled to utilize technology including the technical know-how, processes and secret formulas to be imported, supplied

and rendered by the Consultant for establishing a plant for the manufacture of the said products in India, provided however that nothing herein

contained shall prevent or restrict the company from exporting or selling in foreign countries the said products manufactured by it in India.

6. The Consultant shall not, during the continuance of this agreement himself manufacture or supply the technology to any other person, firm,

company or corporate body in India including technical know-how processes and secret formulas for the manufacture of the said products.

7. The Company shall not communicate, code grant, disclose ,dispose after give away the technology including technical know-how, processes,

secret formula or specifications, formulations, critical conditions and other knowledge, information or data which have been transferred by way

of technology supplied or furnished by the Consultant to the Company under or by virtue of these presents to any person or persons whosoever

,without the prior consent in writing of the Consultant .This obligation shall survive the expiration or other sooner determination of this agreement.

8. In consideration of the Consultant agreeing for THE Transfer of complete technology including the technical know how, processes and secret

formulas to be Company to enable it to establish a plant for the manufacture of the said products and of the Consultant agreeing during the

continuance of this agreement not to himself manufacture nor impart, supply or render to any one also the technology ,including supply of technical

know how, processes or secret formula for undertaking manufacture in India of the said products, the Company shall pay to the Consultant a sum

of Rs. 2,50,000/- (Rupees two laks fifty thousand only) in the following manners:-

25% on the signing of the agreement

25% by 30th April, 1973 and balance

50% by 31st July, 1973

9. This agreement shall become operative from the date of execution hereof and shall remain operational for a period of 5 years there from. The

parties hereto shall bear liberty to extend the operation of this agreement on such terms and conditions as they may mutually agree upon

5. Mr. Sanjiv Khanna, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the Revenue would contend that the amounts received by the assessed in terms of

the said agreement cannot be treated as capital receipt, but must be treated as a revenue receipt.

6. Learned counsel for the Revenue would further contend that transfer of professional knowledge for a period of five years by way of know-how,

cannot be said to be an absolute transfer, particular in view of the fact that the said agreement was entered into by and between the parties only for

a period of five years. Mr. Khanna would urge that by reason of the said agreement, the assessed has not given up his right but thereby only his

services were hired by the assessed for a period of five years. He would urge that there had been no parting off or gifting away of the right to use

the said technology for all times to come in favor of the company by the assessed and as such, the receipt must be held to be a revenue receipt and

not a capital one. Even it is not a case where a right in relation to right for transfer of a goodwill has taken place. In support of the said contention,

strong reliance has been placed on Commissioner of Income Tax, Bombay City-I Vs. Ralliwolf Ltd., , Commissioner of Income Tax, Bombay Vs.

Ciba of India Ltd., and Commissioner of Income Tax, U.P., Lucknow Vs. British India Corporation Ltd., Kanpur,

7. Learned counsel would contend that the matter would have been different had, in consideration of the afore-mentioned transfer of technical

know-how, the assessed would have acquired equity shares in a new company. In Commissioner of Income Tax, Bombay City-I v. Ciba of India

Ltd. (supra), what is know-how, has been considered by the apex court in the following terms:

Counsel for the Commissioner strongly pressed for acceptance of what he called the principle of the speeches of Viscount Simonds and Lords

Tucker and Denning in Evansmedical Supplies Ltd. v. Moriarty, (1957) 37 Tax Cas. 540. Counsel said that it was ruled in that case by the majority

of the House that money received by a tax payer for making available to another person a right to technical ""know-how"" is liable to be treated as a

capital receipt. it must in the first instance be noted that the House of Lords was dealing with the true character of a receipt by a taxpayer who had

made technical ""know how"" available to another in consideration of a certain payment. The nature of a receipt as capital or revenue is not always

determinative of the nature of the outgoing in the hands of the person who pays it. Again the view expressed by the majority of the House does not

lay down any principle which may be of value of deciding this case.

8. The apex court, upon consideration of Jeffrey v. Rolls Royce Ltd., (1962) 40Tax Cas. 443, Musker v. English Electric Co. Ltd., (1964) 41

Tax Cas. 556 and EvansMedical Supplies Ltd. (supra), held as under:

In the case in hand it cannot be said that the Swiss Company had wholly parted with its Indian business. There was also no attempt to part with

the technical knowledge absolutely in favor of the assessed.

The following facts which emerge from the agreement clearly show that the secret processes were not sold by the Swiss company to the assessed:

(a) the license was for a period of five years, liable to be terminated in certain eventualities even before the expiry of the period; (b) the object of

the agreement was to obtain the benefit of the technical assistance for running the business; (c) the license was granted to the assessed subject to

rights actually granted or which maybe granted after the date of the agreement to other persons; (d) the assessed was expressly prohibited from

divulging confidential information to third parties without the consent of the Swiss company ;(e) there was o transfer of the fruits of research once

for all: the Swiss company which was continuously carrying on research had agreed to make it available to the assessed; and (f)the stipulated

payment was recurrent dependent upon the sales, and only for the period of the agreement. We agree with the High Court that the first question

was rightly answered in favor of the assessed.

9. The said decision was considered in some details by a Division Bench of the Bombay High Court in Commissioner of Income Tax, Bombay

City-I v. Ralliwolf Ltd. (supra). Therein also, shares had been given in return for the drawings etc and confidential technical information for the

establishment of the factory and production of selected tools for manufacturing in India. Upon consideration of various decisions, the court noticed

the test laid down by British Dyestuffs Corporation (Blackley) Ltd. v. IRC, (1924) 12 TC 586 wherein it was stated as under:

In ascertaining whether the value of the shares in Ralliwolf acquired by the assessed-company should be treated as receipt on revenue account or

on capital account, we must apply the well-known and oft-repeated test laid down by Bankes L.J., in British Dyestuffs Corporation (Blackley)

Ltd. v. IRC, (1924) 12 TC 586 , it was observed thus:

The real question is, looking at this matter, is the transaction in substance a parting by the company with part of its property for a purchase price,

or is it a method of trading by which it acquires this particular sum of money as part of the profits and gains of that trade? For that purpose one has

to look at the nature and substance of the transaction and the agreement as a whole.

10. A question was posed by the Division Bench as to whether know-how can be properly described as a capital asset and upon consideration as

to what know-how means, it was held:

The other point is that "know-how", though very naturally looked upon as part of the capital equipment of a trade ,is a fixed asset only by analogy

and, as it were, by metaphor. The nature of receipts from it depends essentially, I think ,upon the transaction out of which they arise and the

context in which they are received.

11. It was further held:

The legal position on these authorities, Therefore, is that know-how is not strictly a fixed asset and the nature of receipts from the know-how would

essentially depend upon the transactions out of which the receipts arise and the context in which the receipts are received. If the imparting of know

how is really in the nature of services rendered without anything more ,the receipt must be treated as a revenue receipt. But when consideration

received for imparting know-how in association with the disposal of a capital asset, then the receipt will have to be treated as a capital receipt. The

position, in our view ,is admirably summed up by Walton J. in John & E. Sturge Ltd. v. Hessel [1975] 51 TC 183 , in the following words:

According, there is no ground for treating it (know-how) in any way different from the rendering of any other service by the trader who imparts it:

if imparted for consideration, the receipt is a trading receipt. However, the disposal is capable of wearing an entirely different aspect if it is found,

not as a disclosure of "know-how" on its own, but combined with some other transaction of which it is a part, albeit an important part, which

nevertheless does represent the disposal of some capital asset of the trader concerned. Thus, if "know-how" is imparted as part and parcel of the

disposal of a branch of the trader's business, as in *Evans Medical Supplies Ltd. v. Moriarty* [1957] 37 TC 540; [1959] 35 ITR 707 or *Wolf*

Electric Tools Ltd. v. Wilson [1968] 45 TC 326, to which I have already referred, then, as Lord Radcliffe said, the moneys paid for the "know

how" may properly rank as a capital receipt. Per contra, if the disposal is not accompanied by the disposal of a branch of the trader's business or

some capital asset to which it can properly be regarded as incident, then it appears to me, as it did to my brother Goulding J. in *Coalite and*

Chemical Products Ltd. v. Tree [1971] 48 TC 171, that the consideration paid must be a receipt of the trader's trade. That is not to say that

there may not be other sets of circumstances in which the disposal of "know-how" forms but one part which may yet amount when viewed in the

round to the disposal of a capital asset, but so far there is none to be found in the books and nobody has suggested any convincing illustrations of

any such other transactions.

12. The Division Bench came to the conclusion that the value of 3625 shares in the Indian Company, *Ralliwolf Ltd.*, of Rs. 100/- each issued to

the non-resident assessed company in consideration of supplying the drawings and information, is of capital nature and not of revenue nature.

13. Yet again, in *Commissioner of Income Tax, UP v. British India Corporation Ltd.* (supra), the apex court relied upon its earlier decision in

Commissioner of Income Tax, Bombay City-I v. Ciba of India Ltd. (supra) and other decisions and held:

Having regard to the nature of the agreement and having regard to the facts that the organizational set up under the distributorship agreement was

to endure for seven years and upon the expiry of the period, the assessed had no relationship with the organization and that the period of

agreement between the assessed and distributors was contemporaneous with the agreement between the assessed and Charles Walker under

which the assessed became entitled to use the registered trademarks, it must be considered to be revenue expenditure.

14. The question again came up for consideration as to whether a business expenditure would be a capital or revenue expenditure in *Jonas*

Woodhead and Sons (India) Ltd. Vs. Commissioner of Income Tax, wherein, upon consideration of *Empire Jute Co. Ltd. Vs. Commissioner of*

Income Tax, and *Commissioner of Income Tax, Bombay City-I v. Ciba of India Ltd.* (supra), it was held:

It would thus appear that the courts have applied different tests like starting of a new business on the basis of technical know-how received from

the foreign firm, the exclusive right of the company to use the patent of trademark which it receives from the foreign firm, the payment made by the

company to the foreign firm whether a definite one or dependent upon certain contingencies, the right to use the technical know-how of production

or the activity even after the completion of the agreement, obtaining enduring benefit for a considerable part on account of the technical information

received from a foreign firm, payment whether made "once for all" or in different installments co-relatable to the percentage of gross turnover of

the product to ultimately find out whether the expenditure or payment thus made makes an accretion to the capital asset and after the court comes

to the conclusion that it does so, then it has to be held to be a capital expenditure. As has been held by this court and already indicated in *Alembic*

Chemical Works" case : [1989]177ITR377(SC) no single definitive criterion by itself could be determinative and, Therefore, bearing in mind the

changing economic realities of business and the varieties of situational diversities the various clauses of the agreement are to be examined. But in the

case in hand the High Court having considered the different clause of the agreement and having come to the conclusion that under the agreement

with the foreign firm what was set up by the assessed was a new business and the foreign firm had not only furnished information and the technical

know-how but rendered valuable services in setting up of the factory itself and even after the expiry of the agreement there is no embargo on the

assessed to continue to manufacture the product in question, it is difficult to hold that the entire payment made is revenue expenditure merely

because the payment is required to be made at a certain percentage of the rates of the gross turnover of the products of the assessed as royalty. In

our considered opinion, in the facts and circumstances of the case the High Court was fully justified in answering the reference in favor of the

Revenue and against the assessed.

15. In the afore-mentioned backdrop, the question raised before this court has to be answered.

16. Frankfurter, J said "there is no surer way to misread a document than to read it literally" in *Massachusetts B. & Insurance Co. v. U.S.*, (1956)

352 US 128.

17. A contract or an agreement, as it is well known, must be construed having regard to the intention of the parties thereto. Such intention must be

gathered from the language used therein. From the said agreement dated 14th December 1972, it appears that possession of complete technology

for making high gloss cast coated papers and boards under the consultant was accepted. The assessed was approached by the company for

transfer of complete technology including the technical know-how, process and secret formula. Clause(1) of the said agreement categorically states

that the Consultant would transfer the technology. The said transfer of technology is not an absolute one as the Consultant could himself use or

transfer the same after a period of five years. In addition to such transfer, the assessed was to render services, which had been enumerated in para

2 thereof. The company of course had the absolute right to utilize technology including the technical know how, process and secret formula to be

supplied and rendered by the assessed, but such entitlement to utilize the technology is confined to five years only. Clause 6 provides for a negative

covenant in terms whereof the assessed was precluded from himself manufacturing or supplying the technology to any other person during

continuance of the said agreement only for a period of five years. It is important to note that the company was also not to transfer the said

technology to any other person without the prior consent in writing of the assessed. The entire amount of consideration was to be paid within a

period of seven months. It is, therefore, not difficult to infer that by reason of the said agreement, the services of the Consultant had also been hired

for a period of five years.

18. The agreement has to be read as a whole. So read, it is clear that there had been no absolute parting by the assessed's technical know-how to

the company. The assessed was also required to render various services to the company. Such services rendered shall also form part of the

consideration. In this case, consideration had been received for imparting know-how not in association with the disposal of a capital asset and thus,

the receipt in our opinion should be treated as a revenue receipt.

19. For the reasons afore-mentioned, we are of the opinion that the question sent to this court for its opinion by the Income Tax Appellate Tribunal

must be answered in the negative in favor of the Revenue and against the assessed.