

the conviction is well based on either of the two counts and is hereby affirmed.

(6) It was then contended by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner be granted probation under section 360, Criminal Procedure Code, and there were no reasons to deny him that benefit. He cited *Dilbag Singh v. State of Punjab* (2), in support of his prayer. That was a hurt case under section 324, Indian Penal Code, and would have no bearing to the Criminal conduct of the petitioner in the present case. For the maintenance of the prestigious role and high standards of judicial conduct, it is essential that not only the members of the judicial service are to stay clean and remain above suspicion; but that joyful burden be also shared by the Clerks, Readers, Ahlmads, Record-keepers and other functionaries of the Courts with equal zeal and discipline. The fountain of justice has to remain unpolluted. Even the slightest attempt to sully its clear and calm waters disturbs the judicial mind and the broomstick to sweep the dirt comes into action severely and swiftly. There cannot be any extenuating circumstance in favour of the petitioner merely because he at the time of the commission of the offence was 39 years of age, a family man and having children, as suggested. Previous conduct of the petitioner may have been noted as good but that can cast no reflection of innocence for the crime for which he has been found guilty. He has already been leniently dealt with. In the result, the revision petition fails and is hereby dismissed.

H.S.B.

Before B. S. Dhillion and G. C. Mital JJ.

COMMISSIONER OF INCOME-TAX, PATIALA,—Applicant.

versus

MR. JUSTICE S. C. MITAL, JUDGE, PUNJAB & HARYANA  
HIGH COURT, CHANDIGARH,—Respondent.

*Income Tax Reference Nos. 85 to 88 of 1979.*

November 21, 1979.

*Income Tax Act (XLIII of 1961)—Section 10(13A)—Income Tax Rules 1962—Rule 2-A—Assessee occupying his own house—Whether could be said to be incurring expenditure in terms of section 10(13A) Compensation by the employer by payment of special allowance as*

(2) AIR 1979 S.C. 680.

Commissioner of Income-tax, Patiala *v.* Mr. Justice S. C. Mital,  
Judge, Punjab & Haryana High Court, Chandigarh  
(B. S. Dhillon, J.)

*house rent—Such compensation—Whether liable to tax—Assessee living in a house belonging to himself and his brother—Payment of rent by assessee to his brother for occupation of latter's portion—Such payment—Whether an expenditure.*

*Held*, that the provisions of section 10(13A) of the Income-tax Act, 1961 have been enacted to compensate an assessee regarding the expenditure incurred on payment of rent in respect of the residential accommodation occupied by him. The main object for enacting this provision appears to be that in case an assessee actually suffers monetary loss by way of expenditure or otherwise in respect of residential accommodation occupied by him and if he is compensated by his employer in that case, subject to the limitations imposed under the Act and the Income-tax Rules, 1952, the allowance paid to him by the employer shall be exempt from the Income-tax. An assessee, who occupies his own house, has disentitled himself from the rent which he would have been entitled to if he had not occupied the same himself, and in that sense he suffered expenditure in that regard. In that sense, an assessee occupying his own house, if compensated by the employer by payment of a special allowance (house rent) subject to the restrictions as imposed under the Act and the rules, compensation paid to an assessee by his employer cannot be subject to tax. (Para 6).

*Held*, that where an assessee occupies a house belonging to himself and his brother and makes payment of rent to the brother for occupation of the latter's portion, he was incurred expenditure within the meaning of section 10(13A) of the Act. (Para 7).

*Reference under section 256(1) of the Income-tax Act, 1961 made by the Income-tax Appellate Tribunal (Chandigarh Bench) referring the following question of law to this Hon'ble Court for its opinion arising out of I.T.A. Nos. 47, 48, 294 & 295/77-78 (Assessment Years 1973-74, 1972-73, 1974-75 & 1975-76, respectively) and R.A. Nos. 90, 91, 92 & 96/Chd./78-79.*

*"Whether on the facts and in the circumstances of the case, the Tribunal erred in law in holding that the amount received by the assessee on account of house rent allowance was not liable to be included in his taxable income for each of the four years?"*

D. N. Awasthy, Advocate & B. K. Jhingan, Advocate, for the appellant.

G. C. Sharma, Sr. Advocate with D. V. Sehgal, S. S. Raikhy, and R. K. Aggarwal, Advocates, for respondent.

## JUDGMENT

*B. S. Dhillon, J.—*

(1) The following question of law arising out of the order of the Income-tax Appellate Tribunal, Chandigarh Branch, Chandigarh, (hereinafter referred to as the Tribunal), in respect of I.T.A. Nos. 47, 48, 294 and 295 of 1977-78, for the assessment years 1973-74, 1972-73, 1974-75 and 1975-76 respectively, has been referred to us by the Tribunal at the instance of the Revenue.

“Whether on the facts and in the circumstances of the case, the Tribunal erred in law in holding that the amount received by the assessee on account of house rent allowance was not liable to be included in his taxable income for each of the four years ?”

(2) The brief facts giving rise to these references may thus be stated. The assessee, Hon'ble Mr. Justice S. C. Mital, is a sitting Judge of the Punjab and Haryana High Court. He claimed exemption in respect of House Rent Allowance (hereinafter shortly referred to as the HRA), which he received at Rs. 3,150 in each of first two years, Rs. 3,293 for the third year and Rs. 3,554 for the last year. The house in question is jointly held by Mr. Justice S. C. Mital with his brother and Mr. Justice S. C. Mital was paying a rent of Rs. 300 per month to his brother for occupying his portion of the house. As is clear from the facts, the HRA was assessed and out of the assessed amount, Rs. 350 per month, i.e., 10 per cent of the pay of the Hon'ble Judge was being deducted by the Government and the assessed amount over and above the amount of Rs. 350 per month was paid to the Hon'ble Judge. The plea that the said amount was exempt in view of the provisions of section 10(13-A) of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (hereinafter referred to as the Act) read with Rule 2-A of the Income-tax Rules (hereinafter referred to as the Rules) did not find favour with the Income-tax Officer.

(3) It was contended before the Appellate Assistant Commissioner that the assessee's occupation of the entire house for his residence, half of which belonged to his brother, tantamounted to the assessee incurring expenditure. It was further contended that HRA was granted by the Government after the annual letting value

Commissioner of Income-tax, Patiala v. Mr. Justice S. C. Mittal,  
Judge, Punjab & Haryana High Court, Chandigarh  
(B. S. Dhillon, J.)

of the house in occupation of Mr. Justice S. C. Mittal was determined by the Public Works Department and only the excess amount over 10 per cent of the salary was allowed as HRA which was not taxable. The Appellate Assistant Commissioner accepted the appeal and deleted the additions for each of the four years.

(4) The appeal filed by the Revenue was dismissed by the Tribunal. At the instance of the Revenue, the question, reference to which has already been made in the earlier part of the order, has been referred to this Court for its opinion.

(5) With a view to appreciate the contentions raised by the learned counsel for the parties, the provisions of section 10(13A) of the Act and Rule 2A of the Rules may be reproduced as under:—

“8.10. *Incomes not included in total income* : In computing the total income of a previous year of any person, any income falling within any of the following clauses shall not be included—

\* \* \* \*

(13A) any special allowance specifically granted to an assessee by his employer to meet expenditure actually incurred on payment of rent (by whatever name called) in respect of residential accommodation occupied by the assessee, to such extent not exceeding three hundred rupees per month as may be prescribed having regard to the area or place in which such accommodation is situate and other relevant considerations.”

“R. 2A. Limits for the purposes of section 10(13A)—The amount which is not to be included in the total income of an assessee in respect of the special allowance referred to in clause (13A) of section 10 shall be:—

- (a) the actual amount of such allowance received by the assessee in respect of the relevant period; or
- (b) the amount by which the expenditure actually incurred by the assessee in payment of rent in respect of residential accommodation occupied by him exceeds one-tenth of the amount of salary due to the assessee in respect of the relevant period ; or

(c) an amount equal to:

(i) Where such residential accommodation is situate at Agra, Ahemdabad, Allahabad, Amritsar, Bangalore, Bombay, Calcutta, Cochin, Coimbatore, Delhi, Hyderabad, Indore, Jabalpur, Jaipur, Kanpur, Lucknow, Madras, Madurai, Nagpur, Patna, Poona, Sholapur, Srinagar, Surat, Trivandrum, Vededara (Baroda) or Varanasi (Benaras), one-fifth of the amount of salary due to the assessee in respect of the relevant period, and

(ii) where such residential accommodation is situate at any other place, one-tenth of the amount of salary due to the assessee in respect of the relevant period ; or

(d) a sum calculated at the rate of Rs. 400 per month in respect of the relevant period, whichever is the least.”

(6) After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the provisions of law, we are of the opinion that the question referred to us has to be answered in the negative, i.e., against the revenue and in favour of the assessee. The provisions of section 10(13A) of the Act have been enacted to compensate the assessee regarding the expenditure incurred on payment of rent in respect of residential accommodation occupied by him. The main object for enacting this provision appears to be that in case an assessee actually suffers monetary loss by way of expenditure or otherwise in respect of residential accommodation occupied by him and if he is compensated by his employer in that case, subject to the limitations imposed under the Act and the Rules, the allowance paid to him by the employer, shall be exempt from the Income-tax. An assessee, who occupies his own house, has disentitled himself from the rent which he would have been entitled to if he had not occupied the same himself, and in that sense he suffered expenditure in that regard. In that sense, an assessee occupying his own house, if compensated by the employer by payment of a special allowance (HRA), subject to the restrictions as imposed under the Act and the Rules, the compensation paid to the assessee by his employer, cannot be subjected to tax. The Tribunal accepted the interpretation of the relevant provisions of the Act and we do not find any reason to take a different view than the one taken by the Tribunal.

Ashok Kumar Bagga v. Prithvi Nath Kaul (R. N. Mittal, J.)

---

(7) Even otherwise, on the facts of the present case, it is clear that half of the house of Mr. Justice S. C. Mital, which he was occupying, is owned by him and the remaining half portion of the house is owned by his brother to whom he has been paying the rent at the rate of Rs. 300 per month. Thus it cannot be said that on the facts and circumstances of this case, Mr. Justice S. C. Mittal has not incurred any expenditure even though he having paid a rent of Rs. 300 per month to his brother within the meaning of section 10 (13A) of the Act.

(8) The matter can be looked at from another angle also. The provisions of section 10(13A) of the Act and Rule 2A of the Rules have to be given effect to. The Rules and the section are not in conflict with each other. Rather, the Rules are supplementary to the section. Even if the assessee's case is covered by the Rules, the assessee will be entitled to exemption. The Rules impose the maximum limit to the extent of Rs. 400 per month. Admittedly, the house rent allowance paid to Mr. Justice S. C. Mital during all the four relevant assessment years was below the maximum prescribed limit. It is equally well settled that even if two interpretations of a particular provision are possible, in that case, the Income Tax Act being a taxing statute, one favourable to the assessee would be preferred. The view taken by the Tribunal in this regard is unexceptional.

(9) For the reasons recorded above, we answer the question referred to us in the negative, i.e., against the Revenue and in favour of the assessee, with costs.

G. C. Mital, J.—I agree.

---

H.S.B.

*Before R. N. Mittal, J.*

ASHOK KUMAR BAGGA,—*Petitioner.*

*versus*

PRITHVI NATH KAUL,—*Respondent.*

*Civil Revision No. 1523 of 1977*

November 23, 1979.

*East Punjab Urban Rent Restriction Act (III of 1949)—Section 13(3) (a) (i)—Landlord occupying ground floor of the house—First*