HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA
AT HYDERABAD

RESERVED ON : 05.11.2026

PRONOUNCED ON : 16.11.2026

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE T. VINOD KUMAR
AND
THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR JUKANTI

I.T.T.A.Nos.245 OF 2025 & 219 OF 2026
(CNR Nos.HBHC010715762025 & HBHC010761712026)

I.T.T.A.No.245 OF 2025:

Between:

Principal Commissioner of Income Tax-4

… Appellant

AND

M/s. Eenadu Television Private Limited

… Respondent

COMMON JUDGMENT:*(per Hon'ble Sri Justice T.Vinod Kumar)*

1. Inasmuch as the issue involved and the parties to these appeals are one and same, both the appeals are being disposed of by this common judgment.

2. ITTA No.245 of 2025 is filed by the revenue challenging the order dated 16.05.2025 in I.T.A.No.654/Hyd/2023 of the Income Tax Appellate Tribunal, Hyderabad-A Bench, Hyderabad, for the assessment year 2017-18.

3. Similarly, ITTA No.219 of 2026 is filed by the revenue challenging the order dated 30.06.2026 in I.T.A.No.636/Hyd/2025 of the Income Tax Appellate Tribunal, Hyderabad-A Bench, Hyderabad, for the assessment year 2022-23.

4. I.T.T.A.No.245 of 2025 is taken as the lead matter for deciding the issue involved.

5. The respondent/assessee is a company *inter alia* engaged in the business of producing and telecasting entertainment/news/ information programs. It filed its return of income for the assessment year 2017-18 on 27.10.2017 declaring total income of Rs.42,31,26,430/-. The said return was initially processed under Section 143(1) of the Income Tax Act, 1961 (hereinafter referred to as “the Act”). Thereafter, the assessment was selected for scrutiny under Computer Aided Scrutiny Selection (CASS) and notice under

Section 143(2) of the Act dated 08.08.2018 was issued. The respondent/assessee furnished the requisite information to the notice dated 08.08.2018, claiming cost of production of TV Serials & Programs as 'Revenue Expenditure'. On receiving the same, the Assessing Officer completed the assessment by adding the cost of production of TV Serials &programs, and treating it as capital expenditure which was eligible for depreciation under Section 32 of the Act, and also disallowed depreciation of non-compete fee. Accordingly, the assessing authority passed assessment order dated 19.12.2019 under Section 143 of the Act, determining the total income of the assessee at Rs.162,26,41,349/- as against the returned income of Rs.42,31,26,430/-.

6. Assailing the said order of the assessing authority, the respondent/assessee filed appeal before the Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeals) [in short 'CIT (Appeals/Appellate Authority)'].

7. The CIT (Appeals)*vide* order dated 13.10.2023 partly allowed assessee's appeal, to the extent ofthe disallowance of cost of production of TV Serials & programs as Revenue Expenditure on

the ground that deduction of such expenditure was not covered under Rule 9(A) or Rule 9(B) of the Income Tax Rules (for short 'Rules').It further noted that the Tribunal in the appellant's own case for the assessment year 2011-12 in ITA No.760/Hyd/2015, dated 13.05.2016 had allowed the said issue in favour of the assessee by following an order passed by the Tribunal in the appellant's sister concern's case i.e., ***M/s. Prism TV Limited*** in ITA No.466 and 1249/Hyd/2015 dated 24.03.2016wherein such expenditure was considered as revenue expenditure. Accordingly, the CIT (Appeals) allowed the appeal of the respondent/assessee.

8. Aggrieved by the aforesaid order of the CIT (Appeals), the appellant/revenue carried the matter in appeal to the Tribunal, numbered as ITA No.654/Hyd/2023.

9. Before the Tribunal, the appellant/revenue contended that the CIT (Appeals) was not justified in allowing the claim of the assessee that expenditure incurred for production of TV Serials and programs was a revenue expenditure as against the depreciation granted by the assessing authority treating it as capital expenditure. It is contended by the revenue that incurring of such expenditure

resulted in creation of asset with enduring benefit because of its repeat telecast value.

10. The appellant/revenue also contended that the order of the CIT (Appeals) in allowing the claim of the assessee, by following the decision of the Tribunal in Appellant's sister concern's case for an earlier year, which in turn followed the decision of the Delhi High Court in ***Commissioner of Income Tax Vs. Television Eighteen India Ltd.***[1]**,** wherein it was held that future likelihood of 'News archives" being a possible source of revenue, cannot justify its inclusion in the capital stream. Thus, the said decision of the Delhi High Court is clearly distinguishable and has no application to the Respondent/Assessee's case.

11. The appellant/revenue also contended that expenses incurred for production of TV Serials, programs & film rights created an intangible asset,which has to be depreciated over its lifetime as per Accounting Standard (AS) 26. Thus, it was contended that the order of the Assessing Officer allowing depreciation at 25% by treating

[1] (2014) 364 ITR 597

the TV programs & Serials as intangible asset was correct and the order of the CIT (Appeals) setting aside the same is erroneous.

12. The Tribunal *vide* order dated 16.05.2025 passed a detailed order by considering the aforesaid pleasand dismissed the appeal of the appellant/revenue with regard to the challenge to the order of the CIT (Appeals) in allowing the deduction towards cost of production of TV Serials and programs as revenue expenditure.

13. In so far as the rate of depreciation on film software library, the Tribunal returned a finding that the rate of depreciation is to be 25% as such software cannot be equated to Plant & Machinery without which no production can go on and it is upto the assessee to use the software in a particular production or not.

14. Assailing the aforesaid order of the Tribunal, the present appeal is filed by the appellant/revenue on the following substantial questions of law.

> i) Whether, on the facts and in the circumstances of the case and in law, the Hon'ble ITAT is justified in allowing the cost of production of TV serials and programmes as revenue expenditure as against depreciation granted by AO treating it as capital expenditure?

ii) Whether, on the facts and in the circumstances of the case and in law, the Hon'ble ITAT is justified in allowing the claim of cost of production of TV serials and programmes as revenue expenditure, when incurring of such expenditure resulted in creation of an asset with enduring benefit owing to its repeat telecast value?

iii) Whether, on the facts and in the circumstances of the case and in law, the Hon'ble ITAT is justified in allowing the claim of the assessee by relying on the decision of the Delhi High Court in Television Eighteen India Ltd. (364 ITR 597), where in the subject matter was news content with no repeat telecast value, unlike TV serials and film rights which have repeated value?

iv) Whether, on the facts and in the circumstances of the case and in law, the Hon'ble ITAT is justified in not considering that the expenditure incurred towards TV serials and programmes and film rights results in creation of an intangible asset, which has to be depreciated over its useful life in accordance with accounting standard-26?

v) Whether, on the facts and in the circumstances of the case and in law, the Hon'ble ITAT is justified in allowing depreciation @25% on film software library by treating it as an intangible asset ignoring the finding of A.O that the said asset is an integral part of the tools used by the assessee to carry on its business and needs to be treated plant and machinery thereby making it eligible for depreciation @ 15% only?

15. ***Contentions of the Appellant/revenue:***

15.1 The appellant/revenue, contended that the expenditure incurred by the respondent/assessee for production of TV

Serials creates an enduring benefit in its favour for re-telecast. Thus, any expenditure incurred for production of such TV Serials conferring enduring benefit on the respondent/assessee would have to be treated as capital expenditure.

15.2 Since, the respondent/assessee is into production of TV Serials it is not covered under Rule 9(A) and 9(B) of the Rules which provides for allowing deduction of expenditure in respect of feature films. Thus, the cost of production of TV Serials claimed as revenue expenditure was rightly disallowed and considered as capital expenditure as production of TV Serials & programs resulted in creation of a capital asset on which depreciation is allowable under the provisions of Section 32 of the Act.

15.3 Since, TV Serials & programs produced by the respondent/ assessee confers a right on the assessee to generate revenue by re-telecast, the said TV Serials & programs would satisfy the test of enduring benefit for being considered as capital asset. Thus, it is contended that the CIT (Appeals) as well as

the Tribunal erred in allowing cost of production as revenue expenditure, while such cost is rightly to be classified as capital expenditure.

15.4 It was contended that reliance placed by the Tribunal on the decision of the Delhi High Court in the case of ***Television Eighteen India Limited (supra)*** is concerned, the production involved therein was in relation to the news items which do not have any re-telecast value for the expenditure incurred in relation to such production to be considered as capital expenditure, while the case of the respondent/assessee cannot be equated with that of the facts of the case considered by the Delhi High Court.It is contended that as in the present case the expenditure incurred for production of TV Serials and programs results in creation of a intangible asset meeting the criteria of enduring benefit by way of re-telecasting rights. Thus, the order of the Tribunal in allowing the cost of production as revenue expenditure suffers from perversity and error.

15.5 In support of the aforesaid contentions, reliance is placed on the decision of High Court of Bombay in ***Commissioner of Income-Tax, Bombay City-I v. Patel International Film Limited***[2].

15.6 Insofar as rate of depreciation on film software library is concerned, it is contended that without use of the software, the assessee production would not be complete and as such the film software library is to be considered as plant & machinery. If considered so, the applicable rate of depreciation would be 15% and not 25% as held by the Tribunal.

16. ***<u>Contentions of the Respondent /Assessee:</u>***

16.1 *Per contra*, Mr. C. V. Narasimham learned Counsel appearing for the respondent/assessee contends that the entire premise on the basis of which the appellant/revenue considered the case of the respondent/assessee is erroneous. It is contended that the respondent/assessee never based its claim for deduction of expenditure as being covered by Rule 9(A) and 9(B) of the

[2] [1976] 102 ITR 219 (Bom)

Rules.On the other hand it is contended that the assessee had claimed the expenditure incurred for production of TV Serials & programmes as allowable expenditure under Section 37 of the Act.

16.2 It is further contended that in order to see whether the expenditure claimed by it as a deduction is allowable under Section 37 of the Act or not, the same is to be considered on the basis of the scope of the provision under the Act and allowability of such deduction cannot be restricted by applying Rule 9(A) or 9(B) of the Rules, which has no application to the case of the respondent/assessee.

16.3 In response to the notice issued by the assessing authority, the respondent/assessee had specifically contended that the TV Serials & programs produced by it does not have any repeat value for the assessing authority to consider the cost incurred for production of TV Serials & programs as creating an intangible asset with enduring benefit by way of re-telecast in order to generate income for it; and that the assessing authority has summarily rejected the explanation submitted by the

petitioner without conducting any enquiry or placing on record any evidence to show that the TV Serials produced by it having repeat value resulting in earning of income, in order to consider the expenditure incurred in making such programmes as 'capital expenditure'.

16.4 It is further contended that the allowability of expenditure under Section 37 of the Act is general in nature and is circumscribed by two exclusions i.e., the expenditure which is incurred being capital expenditure and the other being personal expenditure.

16.5 It is further contended that the assessing authority while disallowing the claim made by the respondent/assessee under Section 37 of the Act, had wrongly referred to provisions of Rule 9(A) and 9(B) of the Rules to hold that the deduction of expenditure claimed by the respondent/assessee not being covered by the aforementioned rule, would have to be considered as capital expenditure thereby impliedly considering the cost of production of TV Serials as resulting in creation of an intangible asset and considering such intangible

asset as a capital asset eligible for depreciation under Section 32 of the Act; that the said approach is wholly an erroneous and pre-determined approach adopted by the Assessing Officer; and that the CIT (Appeals) as well as the Tribunal considering the nature of expenditure incurred being in relation to the cost of production of TV Serials & programs being relation to the business of the assessee and does not result in any enduring benefit, in order to earn income over a period of time, had rightly allowed the deduction as revenue expenditure under Section 37 of the Act.

16.6 It is also contended that the understanding of the assessing authority with regard to operation and applicability of Rule 9(A) and 9(B) is misplaced as the said rule does not deal with disallowance as sought to be projected in the order but deals with allocation of expenditure incurred for being allowed as a deduction in a particular assessment year. Thus, it is contended since, the assessing authority proceeded on the basis of Rule 9(A) and 9(B) not being applicable to the respondent/assessee and having not considered the expenditure incurred for

production of TV Serials is allowable under Section 37 of the Act, the basis for the appellant/revenue to contend that the cost of production of TV Serials & programs results in intangible asset as well as enduring benefit on account of right of repeat telecast, has no basis and is thus unfounded.

16.7 It is further contended that the scope of Rule 9(A) and 9(B) of the Rules has been considered by the High Court of Bombay in the case of the ***Commissioner of Income Tax vs. Dharma Productions Private Limited***[3], wherein it has been held that the said Rule only deals with allowing of the expenditure in relation to production of feature films in a particular assessment year or to be allowed in the subsequent assessment year or under Section 37 of the act and not for disallowing such expenditure.

16.8 It is contended that since, the respondent/assessee is in the business of producing and telecasting entertainment/news/ information programme, the production of TV serials is part of its business and, thus, the expenditure incurred for production

[3] 2017 SCC Online Bom 8661

of such programmes in order to carry on its business does not result in creation of any capital asset for it to be depreciated over a period of time. It is contended that incurring of expenditure for production of TV programs is for the purpose of carrying on the business and thus, the expenditure incurred for production of TV serials is to be considered as revenue expenditure.

16.9 It is also contended that by applying the practicality test as enunciated by the Hon'ble Apex Court in ***Empire Jute Co., Ltd., vs. Commissioner of Income Tax***[4]**,** it would be evident that production of TV serials/programmes by the respondent/assessee is an integral part of profit earning process andthe expenses incurred would have to be considered from a business angle. If considered so, the cost of production would berevenue expenditure and does not result in creation of a capital asset for the said expenses to be considered as capital in nature. It is also contended that such expenses incurred for production of the programs would not result in any enduring

[4] (1980) 4 SCC 25

benefit to the assessee to be utilized over a period for such expenses to be considered as capital in nature.

16.10 It is further contended that applying the test of enduring benefit to such expenses incurred would be improper, as incurring such expenditure by the assessee would not result in benefit much less enduring benefit, which can be utilized over a long period.

16.11 It is contended that as the assessing authority did not dispute of the assessee not incurring expenditure or some part of the expenditure is allowable or disallowable as the revenue expenditure and proceeded only on the basis of such expenses incurred, not being allowable under Rule 9(A) and Rule 9(B) of the Rules and did not consider allowability or otherwise of such expenses under Section 37 of the Act, the order of assessment was vitiated, which has been rightly interfered with by the appellate authority in appeal and confirmed by the Tribunal and, therefore, no question of law arises for consideration in the present appeal.

16.12 It is also contended that the Tribunal having allowed expenses incurred for production of TV programmes/ serials in the case of similarly placed assessee for earlier years and the said order having been accepted by the department, it cannot adopt a different yardstick/method to deny the cost of production of TV serials claimed as revenue expenditure in the hands of the respondent/assessee.

16.13 It is also contended by the respondent/assessee that the appellant/revenue in the assessee's case before the High Court of Delhi in the case of *Television Eighteen India Limited (surpa)* contended to the contrary and the Hon'ble Delhi High Court had answered the question of law framed in favour of the assessee and against the revenue and dismissed the appeal of the department. Thus, the expenses incurred/cost of programme was considered to be revenue expenditure. Therefore, the appellant/revenue cannot argue otherwise.

16.14 Contending as above, the respondent/assessee placed reliance on the following decisions:

1. ***Commissioner of Income Tax vs. Dharma Productions Private Limited (3 supra)***
2. ***Empire Jute Co., Ltd., vs. Commissioner of Income Tax (4 supra)***
3. ***Allembic Chemical Works Company Limited vs. Commissioner of Income Tax, Gujarat***[5]

16.15 The respondent/assessee contended that the appellant/ respondent cannot adopt hair splitting approach with regard to the decisions of the Delhi High Court without considering the principle of law deciding therein. It is also contended that the jurisdictional Tribunal, while allowing the appeal in the case of ***M/s. Prism TV (supra)*** having allowed the case of production of TV serial as Revenue expenditure, followed the decision of the Delhi High Court, the Revenue cannot contend that the TV programmes involved in the case before the Delhi High Court related to news programmes, without appreciating the nature of the business in connection with which such expenses are incurred. Contending as above, the respondent/assessee submits that no question of law arises for consideration from the order of the Tribunal by this Court.

[5] (1989) 3 SCC 329

16.16 On the issue of rate of depreciation on film software library is concerned, it is contended that software cannot be classified as plant & machinery for applying Section 32(1)(i) of the Act and therefore the rate of depreciation @15% is not applicable.

16.17 It is also contended that the film software library is not essential part of production, without which production cannot go on for it to be treated as plant & machinery depreciable @15%. On the other hand it is contended that intangible assets and any other business or commercial rights being specifically covered by sub-clause (ii) of clause (1) of Section 32 of the Act, the film software library would fall under the specific provision and is rightly depreciable @25%.

Consideration By Court:

17. We have taken note of the respective contentions urged.

18. Though the Senior Standing Counsel had initially submitted that the substantial question of law raised is being confined to consideration of cost of production as revenue expenditure or capital expenditure and the other issue relating to rate of depreciation is not being pressed and made an endorsement to the said effect on the

bundle, subsequently on instructions advanced arguments on the said issue also. Thus, we proceed to consider both the question of law raised.

19. While elaborate submissions were made on behalf of the appellant/Revenue as well as the assessee, the substantial question of law that arises for consideration of this Court is in a very narrow compass i.e., as to whether the cost of production of TV serials incurred by the assessee is a deduction allowable as a revenue expenditure under Section 37 of the Act or such expenses incurred is capital in nature requiring to be depreciated over the life cycle of the capital asset.

20. The other substantial question relates to rate of depreciation to be applied on film software library.

21. The appellant/revenue does not dispute the fact that the entertainment/news/information programme. There is also no dispute with regard to incurring of the expenditure by the assessee. Thus, the only issue is in relation to the treatment to be given to

such expenditure incurred i.e., whether it is to be considered as revenue expenditure or as capital expenditure.

22. The test for determining as to what expenses would be considered as revenue expenditure and capital expenditure had fallen for consideration before the Hon'ble Apex Court in ***Empire Jute Company Limited*** (4 supra). The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the aforesaid decision having regard to the earlier decisions of the Hon'ble Apex Court and also after referring to some of the English decisions had held that no single test would be paramount or conclusive. The Hon'ble Apex Court, by observing as above, held as under:

> "What is material to consider is the nature of the advantage in a commercial sense and it is only where the advantage is in the capital field that the expenditure would be disallowable on an application of this test. If the advantage consists merely in facilitating the assessee's trading operations or enabling the management and conduct of the assesse's business to be carried on more efficiently or more profitably while leaving the fixed capital untouched, the expenditure would be on revenue account, even though the advantage may endure for an indefinite future. The test of enduring benefit is therefore not a certain or conclusive test

> and it cannot be applied blindly and mechanically without regard to the particular facts and circumstances of a given case".

23. The aforesaid view of the Hon'ble Apex Court has been applied by the Hon'ble Supreme Court again in the case of ***Alembic Chemical Works Company Limited*** *(supra)* wherein it is observed as under:

> "There is also no single definitive criterion which, by itself, is determinative whether a particular outlay is capital or revenue. The 'once for all' payment test is also inconclusive. What is relevant is the purpose of the outlay and its intended object and effect, considered in a common- sense way having regard to the business realities. In a given case, the test of 'enduring benefit' might break-down. In CIT v. Associated Cement Co. Ltd., this Court said:
>
> " ..... As observed by the Supreme Court in the decision in Empire Jute Co. Ltd. v. Commissioner of Income-Tax, that there may be cases where expenditure, even if incurred for obtaining an advantage of enduring benefit, may, none the less, be on revenue account and the test of enduring benefit may break down. It is not every advantage of enduring nature acquired by an assessee that brings the case within the principles laid down in this test. What is material to consider is the nature of the advantage in a commercial sense and it is only where the advantage is in the capital field that the

> expenditure would be disallowable on an application of this test ..... "

24. If the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the aforesaid decision is applied to the facts of the present case, what is required to be seen is that by undertaking production of TV serials and incurring cost for such production, results in benefit to the assessee, which is of enduring nature. Though on behalf of the appellant/revenue it is contended that the production of a TV serial by the respondent/assessee would result in creating a right in favour of the respondent/assessee for its re-telecast and such re-telecast results in enduring benefit over a period of years, firstly, it is to be noted that the assessing authority has not placed on record any material/evidence to show that the respondent/ assessee has derived any income on account of such right being reserved. On the other hand, the respondent/assessee had categorically pleaded in his reply to the notice issued under Section 143(2) of the Act that the moment serial is telecast, the cost incurred for production of such episode is expensed out.

25. Further, it is also to be seen that if at all the appellant/revenue intended to consider the expenditure incurred by the assessee as capital in nature, it ought to have first determined as to creation of an asset by applying Section 145(3) of the Act,in order to allow depreciation on such an asset. Instead the revenue had resorted to creating an asset artificially and then allowing deduction thereon under Section 32 of the Act. It is to be noted that Section 32(5) of the Actwould only stand attracted only when an asset is created, be it tangible or intangible but not otherwise. The production of a TV programme/serial cannot be considered as resulting in creation of an asset, tangible or intangible in nature for the assessee to utilize the said asset over a period of time to derive income, by utilizing the same like plant and machinery, software, copyright or patents, etc., for the expenditure incurred in relation to such asset to be considered as capital in nature.

26. It is also to be noted that though the appellant/ revenue seeks to apply Accounting Standard-26 to depreciate the cost of production claiming such expenditure incurred resulting in

enduring benefit and such benefit is to be depreciated over the life cycle of the program. It is not specified any where nor the revenue has placed any material on record to show the life cycle/ span of such TV programs / serials to be specified period, for allowing depreciation on the cost incurred for production. This is for the reason that rate of Depreciation under Section 32 of the Act, is not uniform, but varies any where between 5 % to 40%, which is fixed having regard to life cycle / span of such asset.

27. Further, the issue having fallen for consideration before the Delhi High Court wherein the Court having held that expenditure incurred for production of TV programme to be revenue expenditure and the said decision having attained finality, it is not open for the appellant/revenue to adopt a hair splitting approach to contend that the production of the TV programme involved therein is relating to new archive and not being a production of a serial, without appreciating that the decision of Delhi High Court is on a principle of law and as

such the said principle would equally be applicable to the respondent/assessee's case.

28. Further, the appellant/revenue having accepted the decision of the jurisdictional Tribunal in case of similarly placed assessee *viz., Prism TV (supra),* and the said decision having attained finality, as the same was not appealed by the revenue, which decision has been followed by the Tribunal while rejecting the appeal of the Revenue, this Court is of the view that the appellant/revenuecannot be permitted to adopt a different approach assessee-wise.

29. The Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of ***Commissioner of Income Tax vs. Narender Doshi,***[6] held that since, the revenue has not challenged the correctness of the two decisions of the Gujarat High Court, they are bound by the principle laid down therein.

30. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Berger Paints India Ltd., vs. Commissioner of Income Tax, Calcutta***[7]**,** held

[6] (2004) 2 SCC 801.
[7] (2004) 12 SCC 42

that no ‘just cause’ would justify departure from the said principle in not following the principle of law laid down by the High Court on a particular aspect of law.

31. Also taking note of the fact that the appellant/revenue itself having accepted the view of the Tribunal on cost of production/expenditure incurred for production of TV serials to be revenue expenditure in a similarly placed assessee’s case, this Court is of the view that the respondent/assessee is required to be adhereto the‘principle of consistency’ and cannot be permitted to agitate the same issue in case of another assessee. Thus, we are in agreement with the view taken by the Delhi High Court and hold that the cost of production of TV serials would be revenue expenditure.

32. Insofar as the rate of depreciation on film software library is concerned, the film software library is a tool for processing of a program, after it is produced. Thus, it cannot be said that without the use of the software no program comes into existence like a TV camera or equipment, without which

no shooting can take place, for software to be considered as Plant & Machinery.

33. Further, it is trite law that in tax statutes or schedules, if an item falls under a general description as well as a specific description, the specific entry controls. This is by applying the legal principle *"generalia specialibus non derogrant"*.

34. The Apex Court in ***M/s. Santhosh Maize & Industries Limited vs. The State of Tamil Nadu & Anr***[8]**.,** dealing with applicability of general and specific entry in taxation classification held as under :

> "Law is well settled that if in any statutory rule or statutory notification two expressions are used - one in general words and the other in special terms - under the rules of interpretation, it has to be understood that the special terms were not meant to be included in the general expression; alternatively, it can be said that where a statute contains both a general provision as well as a specific provision, the latter must prevail. (emphasis supplied by this court)

35. In view of the above, we are of the considered opinion that in the instant case no error of law has been committed by

---

[8] (2023) 20 SCC 356

the Appellate Authority in holding that the cost of production of TV serials has to be considered as revenue expenditure and an allowable deduction under Section 37 of the Act.

36. Accordingly, we hold that there is no question of law, much less substantial question of law, arises from the facts of the case warranting interference of this Court in exercise of powers under Section 260A of the Act.

37. Therefore, the appeals are without merit and are accordingly, dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

Consequently, miscellaneous petitions pending, if any, shall stand closed.

T.VINOD KUMAR, J

ANIL KUMAR JUKANTI, J

16.11.2026
Lrkm