

Tax officer is required to accept the prescribed method adopted by the taxpayer for determining FMV of shares

May 14, 2018

In brief

In a recent ruling¹, the Mumbai bench of the Income-tax Appellate Tribunal (Tribunal) held that the taxpayer had the option to choose any of the prescribed methods under the law to determine the fair market value (FMV) of unquoted shares and it was beyond the jurisdiction of the tax authority to insist on a particular method.

In detail

Facts

	Chartered Accountant (valuer).	independent evaluation by the valuer.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The taxpayer was in the business of developing and cultivating land for agricultural purposes. It issued shares at a premium during the year under consideration. In accordance with the provisions of Rule 11UA(2) of the Income-tax Rules, 1962 (the Rules) read with section 56(2)(viib) of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (the Act) either discounted cash flow (DCF) method or the net asset value (NAV) method could be adopted for valuation of unquoted equity shares. The taxpayer had adopted DCF method based on a valuation report of a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In earlier years, the tax officer (TO) had accepted this approach and had not raised any objections. However, in the year under consideration, the TO rejected the valuation based on the following contentions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No business activity was carried out during the year; Share premium was disproportionate to business activities; Astronomical projections considered that the DCF method was limited to five years; Valuation report was not based on an 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thereafter, the TO computed the FMV of shares by adopting the NAV method. On appeal, the Commissioner of Income-tax (Appeals) decided the issue in favour of the taxpayer by holding that the TO was not justified in rejecting the method of valuation adopted by the taxpayer.

Issue before the Tribunal

Whether the TO was justified in rejecting the method of valuation adopted by the taxpayer and adopting a different method?

Taxpayer's contentions

- Section 56(2)(viib) of the Act read with Rule 11UA(2) of the Rules provides the

¹ ITA No. 4854/ Mumbai/ 2016

taxpayer with an option to adopt any of the two prescribed methods to determine the FMV of shares.

- The taxpayer had adopted one of the prescribed methods to determine the FMV of unquoted shares. Therefore, the TO could not deviate from the method adopted by the taxpayer and insist on selection of a different method to determine the same.
- In earlier years also, the DCF method of valuation was accepted by the TO without any objection.

Tribunal's ruling

- The Tribunal observed that Rule 11UA(2) of the Rules read with section 56(2)(viib) of the Act provides an option to the taxpayer to opt for a method for determining FMV of shares.

- The Tribunal held that the TO could not adopt a method of his choice, especially when the Act allows to choose one of the two methods.
- The Tribunal observed that it was beyond the jurisdiction of the TO to insist upon a particular method.
- The Tribunal also observed that the contention of the taxpayer that the TO should not have deviated from the earlier years' decisions without assigning any concrete and justifiable reasons was acceptable.
- The Tribunal opined that tax determination could not be left to whims and fancies of the TO. Assessment is a serious task and has to be accomplished in a disciplined manner. When a taxpayer had been allowed a certain

concession in earlier year/(s), the same could not be withdrawn in subsequent years, without giving any plausible reason.

The takeaways

This is a welcome ruling by the Tribunal as it confirms that Rule 11UA(2) of the Rules read with section 56(2)(viib) of the Act provides an option to taxpayers for choosing one of the prescribed methods of valuation of shares. This ruling also confirms that it is also not open to the tax authorities to decide on these methods of valuation, without providing any cogent reasons for rejecting the method adopted by the taxpayers.

Let's talk

For a deeper discussion of how this issue might affect your business, please contact your local PwC advisor

Our Offices

Ahmedabad

1701, 17th Floor, Shapath V,
Opp. Karnavati Club,
S G Highway,
Ahmedabad – 380051
Gujarat
+91-79 3091 7000

Hyderabad

Plot no. 77/A, 8-2-624/A/1, 4th
Floor, Road No. 10, Banjara Hills,
Hyderabad – 500034,
Telangana
+91-40 44246000

Gurgaon

Building No. 10, Tower - C
17th & 18th Floor,
DLF Cyber City,
Gurgaon – 122002
Haryana
+91-124 330 6000

Bengaluru

6th Floor
Millenia Tower 'D'
1 & 2, Murphy Road, Ulsoor,
Bengaluru – 560 008
Karnataka
+91-80 4079 7000

Kolkata

56 & 57, Block DN.
Ground Floor, A- Wing
Sector - V, Salt Lake
Kolkata – 700 091,
West Bengal
+91-033 2357 9101/
4400 1111

Pune

7th Floor, Tower A - Wing 1,
Business Bay, Airport Road,
Yerwada, Pune – 411 006
Maharashtra
+91-20 4100 4444

Chennai

8th Floor
Prestige Palladium Bayan
129-140 Greaves Road
Chennai – 600 006
Tamil Nadu
+91 44 4228 5000

Mumbai

PwC House
Plot No. 18A,
Guru Nanak Road (Station Road),
Bandra (West), Mumbai – 400 050
Maharashtra
+91-22 6689 1000

For more information

Contact us at
pwctrs.knowledgemanagement@in.pwc.com

About PwC

At PwC, our purpose is to build trust in society and solve important problems. We're a network of firms in 157 countries with more than 223,000 people who are committed to delivering quality in assurance, advisory and tax services. Find out more and tell us what matters to you by visiting us at www.pwc.com.

In India, PwC has offices in these cities: Ahmedabad, Bengaluru, Chennai, Delhi NCR (Gurgaon), Hyderabad, Kolkata, Mumbai and Pune. For more information about PwC India's service offerings, visit www.pwc.com/in

PwC refers to the PwC International network and/or one or more of its member firms, each of which is a separate, independent and distinct legal entity. Please see www.pwc.com/structure for further details.

©2018 PwC. All rights reserved

Follow us on:



For private circulation only

This publication has been prepared for general guidance on matters of interest only, and does not constitute professional advice. You should not act upon the information contained in this publication without obtaining specific professional advice. No representation or warranty (express or implied) is given as to the accuracy or completeness of the information contained in this publication, and, to the extent permitted by law, PwCPL, its members, employees and agents accept no liability, and disclaim all responsibility, for the consequences of you or anyone else acting, or refraining to act, in reliance on the information contained in this publication or for any decision based on it. Without prior permission of PwCPL, this publication may not be quoted in whole or in part or otherwise referred to in any documents.

© 2018 PricewaterhouseCoopers Private Limited. All rights reserved. In this document, "PwC" refers to PricewaterhouseCoopers Private Limited (a limited liability company in India having Corporate Identity Number or CIN : U74140WB1983PTC036093), which is a member firm of PricewaterhouseCoopers International Limited (PwCIL), each member firm of which is a separate legal entity.