

NEWSLETTER
APRIL-2026



R. C. JAIN & ASSOCIATES LLP

IT'S NOT ABOUT PERFECT. IT'S ABOUT EFFORT.”
-JILLIAN MICHAELS

C AND DANCE



Index

1. Direct Tax _____	3
2. Case Laws _____	4-7
3. GST _____	8-13
4. RBI _____	14-18
5. ROC _____	19

EDITORIAL TEAM

CHIEF EDITOR

CA R. C. Jain

EDITOR

CA Ekta Bhanushali

CA Shubham Singh

MEMBERS

Atharva Vaishampayan

Harsh Bhadra

Harsh Verma

Manali Majethia

Mrunali Bavkar

Omkar Pawar

Punam Ramgade

Sahil Bhatt

Shivani Shetty

SUPPORT TEAM

Ulhas Jain

CA Meera Joisher

Mangesh Kolekar

DIRECT TAX

Notification No. 56/2026 F. No. 500/22/2022-FT&TR-V

The Government of India and the Government of Japan signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) concerning Assistance in the Collection of Taxes, being the mode of application of Article 26A of the Convention between the Government of the Republic of India and the Government of Japan for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with respect to taxes on income. This MoU was signed in Tokyo on 30 June 2025 and in New Delhi on 8 July 2025.

As per the terms of the MoU, it will apply to any requests for tax collection made after both countries have signed it. Since India signed it later, the MoU became effective from 8 July 2025.

Therefore, the Central Government, using its powers under Section 90 of the Income-tax Act, 1961, has officially notified that this MoU will be applicable in India for all tax collection requests made after 8 July 2025.

F. No. ADG(S)-1/PAN/M/3699/2026-AD-DD SYSTEMS 1-5 DELHI

Order for specifying Forms and procedures in relation to furnishing Application for PAN Correction under Rule 158(12) of Income - tax Rules, 2026 read with Section 262(4) of Income-tax Act, 2025

In exercise of the powers conferred by Rule 158(12) of the Income-tax Rules, 2026, the Director General of Income-tax (Systems), specifies the following Application Forms in respect of correction of PAN along with related procedure and guidelines, as under: -

a) PAN holders are required to fill the following Forms for Changes or Correction in PAN Data

- (i) **PAN CR-01**: Request For Changes or Correction in PAN Data [For an **Individual**]
- (ii) **PAN CR-02**: Request For Changes or Correction in PAN Data [For **Non-Individual**]

b) The PDF format of the Forms for Changes or Correction in PAN Data, along with the related guidelines, is attached at Annexure-1.

c) The Forms can be submitted physically in the PAN Centres of M/s UTUTSL/ M/s Protean eGov or on line through their websites.

2. This order shall apply with effect from 01.04.2026

CASE LAWS

HIGH COURT OF CALCUTTA

Graphite India Ltd.

v.

Commissioner of Income-tax*

RAJARSHI BHARADWAJ AND UDAY KUMAR, JJ.

IT APPEAL NO. 266 OF 2008†

APRIL 21, 2026

[2026] 185 taxmann.com 746 (Calcutta High Court)

❖ Issues Involved

- Whether electricity duty should be included while valuing captive power for deduction under Section 80-IA.
- Whether deduction under Section 80-IA reduces profits eligible for deduction under Section 80HHC.
- Whether 100% or only 80% export profits should be excluded while computing book profit under Section 115JB.
- Whether sales tax remission received under State incentive scheme is capital or revenue receipt.
- Whether such subsidy should be excluded from MAT book profit under Section 115JB.

❖ Facts of the Case

- Assesse company was engaged in manufacturing graphite electrodes and related products.
- Company operated captive power plants due to inadequate electricity supply from State Electricity Board.
- Surplus electricity generated was supplied to Electricity Board under agreement.
- Deduction under Section 80-IA was claimed by adopting State Electricity Board tariff rates for captive power.
- Deduction under Section 80HHC was claimed on export profits.
- While computing MAT under Section 115JB, eligible export profits were excluded.
- Company received sales tax remission under West Bengal Incentive Scheme for expansion in backward area linked to fixed capital investment.
- Assessing Officer reduced deductions, adopted lower power rates, restricted MAT claim, and treated subsidy as taxable revenue receipt.

❖ **Held by High Court**

- Captive power should be valued at Electricity Board tariff charged to industrial consumers.
- Electricity duty forming part of tariff should also be included for Section 80-IA deduction.
- Lower rate at which surplus power was sold to Board cannot be adopted.
- Deduction under Section 80-IA cannot reduce profits eligible under Section 80HHC.
- Full eligible export profits (100%) are to be excluded while computing book profit under Section 115JB.
- Restriction of only 80% deduction was held incorrect.
- Sales tax remission linked to expansion and fixed capital investment is a capital receipt.
- Capital receipt is not chargeable to tax.
- Such subsidy should also be excluded while computing MAT book profit under Section 115JB.

❖ **Key Takeaway**

- Important relief for manufacturing and export companies.
- Confirms correct treatment of captive power deduction under Section 80-IA.
- Clarifies MAT computation under Section 115JB.
- Reaffirms that capital subsidies for expansion are non-taxable.

IN THE ITAT BANGALORE BENCH 'A'
Agricultural Produce Marketing Committee

v.

Income-tax Officer*

PRASHANT MAHARISHI, VICE PRESIDENT
AND SOUNADARARAJAN K., JUDICIAL MEMBER

1. Issues Involved:

- Whether delay of **84 days** in filing appeal before CIT(A) should be condoned.
- Whether exemption under **Section 10(26AAB)** can be denied merely because PAN status was wrongly reflecting as “**Trust**” instead of Agricultural Produce Marketing Committee / Local Authority.
- Whether reassessment and taxable income determination were valid when assessee's income was otherwise exempt.
- Whether wrong PAN classification can override actual legal status of assessee.

2. Facts of the Case:

- Assessee was an **Agricultural Produce Marketing Committee (APMC)** constituted under Karnataka law.
- It earned income mainly from **market fees and cess** collected from agricultural produce transactions.
- Such income was claimed as fully exempt under **Section 10(26AAB)**.
- Assessee did not file returns on bona fide belief that exempt income need not be reported.
- PAN was mistakenly allotted under status of **Trust**.
- Due to wrong PAN category, assessee could file only **ITR-7**, which did not permit proper claim of exemption u/s 10(26AAB).
- AO reopened assessment u/s 147 based on cash deposits in bank accounts.
- Assessment completed u/s 147 w.r.t. Section 144 treating assessee as Trust and taxable income was assessed.
- Appeal before CIT(A) was filed late by **84 days**. CIT(A) dismissed appeal without condoning delay.

3. Gist of Tribunal Decision:

A. Delay in Filing Appeal

- Tribunal held delay was due to genuine hardship and peculiar circumstances.
- Assessee faced practical difficulty because PAN status was incorrect.
- Time taken for obtaining professional advice was reasonable.
- CIT(A) adopted overly technical / pedantic approach in refusing condonation.
- Hence, delay of 84 days was condoned.

B. Eligibility of Exemption u/s 10(26AAB)

- All parties accepted that assessee was actually an **Agricultural Produce Marketing Committee**.
- Income of APMC is specifically exempt under Section 10(26AAB).
- Mere wrong PAN status as Trust cannot deny statutory exemption.
- Taxability depends on real legal character of assessee, not PAN master data error.
- Later PAN was corrected as Local Authority in 2022, supporting assessee's stand.

C. Reassessment Issue

- Since total income itself was exempt and determined at Nil, reopening grounds became academic.
- Tribunal therefore did not separately adjudicate reassessment legality in detail.

4. Conclusion:

- Appeals of assessee were **allowed**.
- Delay of 84 days was condoned.
- Assessment orders for all years were set aside.
- AO was directed to allow exemption under **Section 10(26AAB)** on entire income.
- Total income for all relevant years to be assessed at **Nil**.
- Stay petitions became infructuous.

5. Key Takeaway:

Wrong PAN status or procedural defects cannot defeat a substantive exemption available under the Income-tax Act when assessee's true legal status is undisputed.

GST

HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA

Bagga Vet Pharma

v.

State of Punjab*

DEEPAK SIBAL AND

MS. LAPITA BANERJI, JJ.

CWP NO. 7816 OF 2026 (O & M)

APRIL 17, 2026

• Facts of the Case:

The taxpayer, Bagga Vet Pharma, was engaged in the trading of veterinary and poultry feed supplements (Health Care Type) and dealt in both taxable and exempt supplies under GST. For FY 2020-21, the department issued a DRC-01A alleging short reversal of Input Tax Credit (ITC) on common inputs used for taxable as well as exempt supplies, proposing a demand of approximately Rs.2.30 crore.

The taxpayer submitted a detailed reply along with books of accounts and justifications, after which the department did not proceed further. However, for FY 2021-22, the department again raised the same issue during scrutiny proceedings (ASMT-10).

The taxpayer clarified that ITC had been claimed only on taxable supplies and submitted supporting documents, reconciliation statements, and reliance on relevant CBIC circulars.

Despite these submissions, the department issued a Show Cause Notice (DRC-01), termed the reply unsatisfactory, incorrectly stated that the matter was “sub-judice,” and passed an order confirming the demand without providing proper reasoning or addressing the taxpayer’s submissions.

• Grounds of Appeal:

The taxpayer challenged the order before the High Court on multiple grounds. It was argued that the order suffered from non-application of mind, as the authority failed to properly examine the replies and supporting evidence.

There was a clear violation of principles of natural justice since multiple submissions, documents, and reconciliations were ignored without due consideration. The taxpayer also contended that the department incorrectly labelled the matter as “sub-judice” despite there being no pending litigation.

Further, binding CBIC circulars dated 26.06.2024 and 12.09.2025, which supported the taxpayer’s position, were not considered. Additionally, the department had taken an inconsistent approach by dropping the same issue in FY 2020-21 but raising and confirming the demand for FY 2021-22 without any valid justification.

- **Ruling and Judgment:**

The Punjab & Haryana High Court held that the impugned order was passed without proper application of mind and lacked any cogent reasoning for rejecting the taxpayer's replies. The Court observed that the adjudicating authority failed to consider all submissions, did not examine the supporting documents, and completely ignored the CBIC circulars relied upon by the taxpayer.

It further noted that the claim of the matter being "sub-judice" was baseless and factually incorrect. Accordingly, the Court quashed and set aside the order. However, it allowed the department to proceed afresh in accordance with law, subject to the condition that all replies must be properly considered, a fair opportunity of hearing must be granted, and a reasoned order must be passed.

- **Legal Impact:**

This judgment reinforces the fundamental principle of natural justice in GST proceedings by emphasizing that authorities must pass reasoned and speaking orders after duly considering taxpayer submissions.

It strengthens taxpayer rights by confirming that arbitrary or unreasoned orders are liable to be quashed by courts. The case also highlights the importance of maintaining proper documentation and reconciliation, as these play a crucial role in defending ITC claims.

Further, it reiterates that CBIC circulars are binding on the department and cannot be ignored during adjudication. Lastly, the judgment underscores that the department must maintain consistency in its approach across different financial years and cannot take contradictory stands without valid justification.

HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY

Rollmet LLP

v.

Union of India

G.S. KULKARNI AND

AARTI SATHE, JJ.

WRIT PETITION NOS. 4894 OF 2024 & 1656–1659, 1878, 2021, 2608, 3352, 3755, 4002, 4279, 5271, 6359, 6902, 10267, 10274, 14606, 15750, 16077, 17159, 17765, 18618 OF 2025 & 246, 779, 1117–1122, 1495, 1698, 1847, 2017, 2031, 2127, 2140, 3388 OF 2026 WRIT PETITION (L) NOS. 11901, 12468, 13604, 14256, 20775, 36297 OF 2025
APRIL 17, 2026

• Facts of the Case

The case involved a batch of writ petitions filed by various assesses who were issued single, consolidated show-cause notices (SCNs) by the GST Department. These notices clubbed multiple financial years or tax periods together to allege the wrongful or fraudulent availment or utilization of Input Tax Credit (ITC). The petitioners challenged these notices at the "notice stage" itself, arguing that no determination orders had yet been passed under Section 73(9) or 74(9) of the CGST Act.

• Grounds of Appeal

The petitioners primarily argued that the issuance of a composite show-cause notice was without jurisdiction.

Their key arguments included:

Year-Wise Limitation: Sections 73(10) and 74(10) of the CGST Act prescribe specific limitation periods (three and five years from the due date of the annual return for the relevant financial year, respectively) for passing orders, which the petitioners claimed required year-wise assessments.

Statutory Scheme: The petitioners contended that the Act's definitions of "tax period" and "return" (Sections 2(106) and 2(97)) contemplate period-specific self-assessment and annual returns, making consolidated notices contrary to the law's intent.

Judicial Precedent: They relied heavily on a co-ordinate bench decision in *Milroc Good Earth Developers v. Union of India*, which held that the CGST Act does not provide for clubbing various tax periods in a single notice.

• Ruling and Judgment

The High Court of Bombay observed a significant "cleavage of opinion" among various High Courts on the issue. While the *Milroc* case and several others (from Kerala, Madras, and Karnataka) supported the petitioners, the Delhi and Allahabad High Courts had taken the opposite view, ruling that consolidated notices are permissible.

The Court noted that the Supreme Court had recently dismissed a Special Leave Petition (SLP) in the case of *Mathur Polymers* with a speaking order, which could be considered a declaration of law under Article 141 of the Constitution.

Consequently, the Court found that the decision in *Milroc* required reconsideration. It ruled that, prima facie, there appeared to be no embargo on issuing consolidated notices as long as the limitation for each year was strictly adhered to during adjudication.

However, given the conflicting precedents, the Court referred the matter to a Larger Bench to provide an authoritative decision on the questions of law.

• **Legal Impact**

The immediate impact of this judgment is the suspension of the precedent set by the *Milroc* case within the jurisdiction of the Bombay High Court until the Larger Bench decides the issue.

Key legal implications include:

Workability of Machinery Provisions: The Court emphasized that machinery provisions for tax recovery should be interpreted to make them "workable" and should not be restricted by "strict literalism" if it leads to absurdity.

Procedural Clarification: The Court noted that a consolidated notice is a procedural mechanism that does not necessarily extend the statutory limitation for any individual financial year.

Continuation of Interim Orders: In all matters where interim orders had already been passed, the Court directed that those orders would continue until the Larger Bench delivers its decision.

HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY

Golden Cryo (P.) Ltd.

v.

Union of India*

G. S. KULKARNI AND

AARTI SATHE, JJ.

WRIT PETITION NO. 1268 OF 2026

MARCH 12, 2026

• **Facts of the Case**

The petitioner, an exporter, filed a refund application on October 14, 2025, for Rs.23,67,56,258 representing accumulated Input Tax Credit (ITC) on the export of goods and services without payment of tax for the period of September 2025.

While the application was acknowledged on October 17, 2025, the Proper Officer subsequently issued a Show Cause Notice (SCN) in Form GST RFD-08 on December 12, 2025. The notice alleged that the petitioner's suppliers were involved in issuing fake invoices without actual supply.

Crucially, the notice directed the petitioner to reply within only seven days, failing which the refund would be disposed of as proposed. The petitioner emailed a preliminary reply on December 19, 2025, requesting a personal hearing. However, the very next day, the officer issued the impugned order in Form GST RFD-06, rejecting the entire refund claim without considering the email reply or granting a hearing.

• **Grounds of Appeal**

The petitioner challenged the rejection primarily on the basis that it violated the mandatory statutory procedure and the principles of natural justice. The core legal argument rested on Rule 92(3) of the CGST Rules, 2017, which stipulates that a taxpayer must be given fifteen days to reply to an SCN and must be granted an opportunity for a personal hearing before a refund can be rejected.

The petitioner argued that the officer's decision to curtail the reply period to seven days was illegal and that the "undue haste" in passing the order without verifying the email reply trail caused serious prejudice. Conversely, the Revenue contended that the petition should be dismissed because the petitioner failed to file the reply electronically through the common portal via Form GST RFD-09, leading the officer to presume no reply was intended.

• **Ruling and Judgment**

The High Court of Bombay ruled in favour of the assessee, quashing the rejection order dated December 20, 2025. The Court held that the mandate of Rule 92(3) is clear: the officer must provide fifteen days for a reply and a hearing is non-negotiable under the proviso to the rule. The Court found that the officer had no authority to side-line the law by substituting the statutory fifteen-day period with a seven-day deadline, rendering the notice itself illegal.

Furthermore, the Court criticized the officer's failure to verify the petitioner's email communications, labelling the approach as arbitrary and contrary to the norms of fairness. The matter was remanded to Respondent No. 2 with directions to issue a fresh notice and decide the case after providing a proper hearing.

• **Legal Impact**

This judgment reinforces the strict adherence required by tax authorities to procedural mandates under the GST regime.

It clarifies that administrative "haste" cannot override statutory timelines or the principles of natural justice. By citing precedents like *Haren Textiles (P.) Ltd. v. Dy. CST*, the Court emphasized that failure to follow Rule 92(3) will lead to the quashing of orders to prevent "multiplicity of litigations" and the waste of judicial time.

The ruling serves as a warning to Revenue officials that they must adhere to the regime of law and cannot unilaterally ignore procedural safeguards designed to protect the rights of taxpayers.

RBI

RBI/2026-27/02

A.P. (DIR Series) Circular No. 01

April 01, 2026

Reporting under Foreign Exchange Management Act, 1999 – Returns pertaining to Foreign Exchange Management (Guarantees) Regulations, 2026

The Reserve Bank of India has introduced revised reporting requirements for guarantees under the Foreign Exchange Management Act, 1999, effective immediately.

As per the updated framework, guarantees must now be reported using standardised forms. Form GRN (Goods Received Note) Issue is to be used for reporting issuance, Form GRN Modification for any changes such as amount revision, extension or closure, and Form GRN Invocation for cases where the guarantee is invoked.

Authorised dealer banks are required to submit these details to the Reserve Bank on a quarterly basis within thirty days from the end of the quarter through the Centralised Information Management System portal. Additionally, each guarantee will be assigned a Unique Guarantee Transaction Number for tracking purposes.

The circular also clarifies that late submission fees will apply for delays in reporting invocation based on the liability amount, while delays in reporting issuance or modification will not attract such calculation since there is no fund flow involved.

RBI/2026-27/07

A.P. (DIR Series) Circular No. 05

April 06, 2026

Limits for investment in debt and sale of Credit Default Swaps by Foreign Portfolio Investors (FPIs)

The Reserve Bank of India has issued an update on investment limits for Foreign Portfolio Investors for the financial year 2026 to 2027 under the Foreign Exchange Management Act, 1999 framework.

The overall investment limits for Foreign Portfolio Investors in debt markets remain unchanged in percentage terms. Investments in Government Securities continue at six

percent, State Government Securities at two percent, and corporate bonds at fifteen percent of the outstanding stock under the general route.

However, the Reserve Bank has increased the limits in absolute terms for the year in a phased manner. For the first half of the year, the total debt limit has been increased to approximately fifteen lakh fifty one thousand crore rupees, and further to around sixteen lakh thirty two thousand crore rupees for the second half.

The allocation approach also remains consistent. The incremental increase in Government Securities is equally split between general and long term categories, while the entire increase in State Government Securities is allocated to the general category. Investments in specified securities will continue under the fully accessible route. Additionally, all investments under the voluntary retention route will now align with the general route limits from April one, 2026.

In relation to credit default swaps, the aggregate limit for Foreign Portfolio Investors has been set at five percent of the outstanding corporate bond stock. Accordingly, an additional limit of over three lakh thirty thousand crore rupees has been provided for the current financial year.

This circular replaces the previous limits notified for the financial year 2025 to 2026. Clients and market participants should take note of the revised limits and ensure that their investment positions remain within the prescribed thresholds.

RBI/2026-27/08

CO.DPSS.ID.No.S20/06-08-017/2026-2027

April 09, 2026

Guidelines to facilitate faster cross-border inward payments

The Reserve Bank of India has issued guidelines to improve the speed and efficiency of cross border inward payments, in line with its Payments Vision 2025 and global efforts to make such transactions faster, more transparent and accessible.

The focus of the circular is on reducing delays at the beneficiary bank stage, where time is often lost between receipt of funds and credit to the customer's account.

Banks are now required to promptly inform customers as soon as a cross border payment message is received. If such messages are received after banking hours, customers must be informed at the beginning of the next working day.

To address delays caused by reliance on end of day reconciliation of nostro accounts, banks are advised to move towards more frequent reconciliation. Ideally, this should be done on a near real time basis, with intervals not exceeding one hour.

Banks are also expected to credit funds on the same business day if received during foreign exchange market hours, and on the next business day if received after market hours, subject to regulatory compliance. Additionally, they may implement automated processing systems for individual customers to enable faster credit.

Further, banks are encouraged to introduce digital interfaces that allow customers to submit documents, track transactions and manage foreign exchange processes more efficiently.

These guidelines will come into effect after six months from the date of the circular. Overall, the move is aimed at enhancing customer experience and bringing greater efficiency in cross border payment systems.

RBI/2026-27/10

A.P. (DIR Series) Circular No. 06

April 10, 2026

Master Direction - Reserve Bank of India (Non-resident Investment in Debt Instruments) Directions, 2025 – amendment

The Reserve Bank of India has issued an amendment to its Master Direction on non-resident investment in debt instruments under the Foreign Exchange Management Act, 1999 framework.

This update consolidates various instructions issued over time relating to investments in debt instruments by Non Resident Indians and the use of such instruments as collateral for transactions in exchange traded derivatives on recognised stock exchanges in India.

The objective of this amendment is to bring clarity and uniformity by integrating all relevant guidelines into a single, updated Master Direction, making compliance simpler for banks and investors.

Authorised dealer banks have been advised to inform their clients and stakeholders about these changes. Overall, this is a procedural update aimed at streamlining existing regulations rather than introducing any major new provisions.

RBI/2026-2027/11

DOR.RAUG.REC.No.3/23-27-013/2026-27

April 15, 2026

Reserve Bank of India (Non-Banking Financial Companies – Branch Authorisation) Amendment Directions, 2026

The Reserve Bank of India has issued amendments to the Branch Authorisation Directions for Non-Banking Financial Companies to provide greater operational flexibility while maintaining regulatory oversight.

Under the revised framework, most Non-Banking Financial Companies are now generally permitted to open branches across India without prior approval from the Reserve Bank, unless specifically restricted. This marks a significant move towards ease of doing business for the sector.

For deposit taking Non-Banking Financial Companies, branch expansion will depend on their net owned funds and credit rating. Entities with net owned funds up to fifty crore rupees or with a credit rating below AA can open branches only within the state where their registered office is located. Those with net owned funds above fifty crore rupees and a credit rating of AA or higher are allowed to expand across India. However, if such entities have a lower credit rating, they will still be restricted to operating within their home state.

The amendment also clarifies the applicability of these directions across different categories of Non-Banking Financial Companies, including investment companies, microfinance institutions, infrastructure finance companies and housing finance companies. Certain earlier provisions and sub sections have been removed to simplify the overall framework.

Overall, the update aims to streamline branch expansion norms, reduce regulatory burden and promote growth in the Non-Banking Financial Company sector, while ensuring that financial stability and depositor interests remain protected

RBI/DPSS/2026-27/396

RBI/CO.DPSS.POLC.No.S56/02.14.003/2026-27

April 21, 2026

Digital Payments – E-mandate Framework, 2026

The Reserve Bank of India has introduced a consolidated framework for digital payment mandates titled the E mandate Framework 2026, bringing together all previous guidelines on recurring transactions into a single, streamlined direction.

This framework applies to all payment system providers and participants handling recurring payments through cards, prepaid instruments and unified payments interface, covering both domestic and cross border transactions.

Customers opting for an e mandate will be required to complete a onetime registration with additional authentication. They will have full control to modify, pause or cancel the mandate at any time. The framework allows both fixed and variable recurring payments, with an option to set maximum limits in case of variable amounts.

To enhance transparency, customers must receive a prior notification at least twenty four hours before any debit, along with key transaction details and an option to opt out. A post transaction notification is also mandatory, ensuring complete visibility and access to grievance redressal mechanisms.

In terms of limits, recurring transactions up to fifteen thousand rupees can be processed without additional authentication, while higher amounts will require it. However, for specific categories such as insurance premiums, mutual fund subscriptions and credit card bill payments, the threshold has been increased to one lakh rupees.

The framework also mandates that no charges be levied on customers for using the e mandate facility and requires robust dispute resolution systems to protect customer interests.

With this move, the Reserve Bank has repealed earlier circulars on e mandates and established a unified, customer friendly structure aimed at improving security, convenience and efficiency in recurring digital payments.

ROC

DIR-3 KYC Fee Changes (April 2026)

Date: 21 April 2026

Issued by: Ministry of Corporate Affairs (MCA)

The Ministry of Corporate Affairs has notified the **Companies (Registration Offices and Fees) Amendment Rules, 2026**, introducing important changes to the fee structure for filing **Form DIR-3 KYC Web** under Rule 12A of the Companies (Appointment and Qualification of Directors) Rules, 2014.

Key Highlights

1. Effective Date

The amendment comes into force from the date of its publication in the Official Gazette.

2. Revised Fee Structure for DIR-3 KYC Web

Filing Scenario	Fee (INR)
Filing within the prescribed timeline	NIL
Filing after due date or for DIN reactivation	Rs.5,000
Filing again for updating details (as per Rule 12A(2))	Rs.500 per filing

What This Means

- **Timely compliance remains crucial:** No fee is charged if **DIR-3 KYC Web** is filed within the due date.
- **Delayed filings are costly:** A significant fee of Rs5,000 applies for late submissions or DIN reactivation.

Updates now chargeable: Any subsequent changes to KYC details will incur a fee of Rs.500 per filing.

R. C. Jain & Associates LLP

Chartered Accountants

Head Office:

Mumbai - 622-624, The Corporate Centre, Nirmal Lifestyle, L.B.S. Marg, Mulund (W),
Mumbai, Maharashtra - 400080.

Email: info@rcjainca.com

Tel.:022- 67081031/67700107.

Branch Offices:

Bhopal I - M-272, Near Arya Samaj Bhawan, Gautam Nagar, Bhopal,
Madhya Pradesh 462 023.

E-mail: hmjainca@rediffmail.com

Tel.: 0755-2600646.

Bhopal II - Plot No. 187, Near Milan Restaurant, MP Nagar, Zone-1, Bhopal,
Madhya Pradesh - 462 011.

E-mail: ajaygupta.agst@gmail.com

Tel.: 83195 56171

Aurangabad - Su-Shobha, Plot No. 7, Mitranagar, Behind Akashwani, Near Maratha
Darbar Hotel, Aurangabad, Maharashtra - 431001.

E-mail: sskasliwal@gmail.com

Tel.: 0240-2357556.

Guwahati – 3C, Gokuldharm, JP Agawala Path, Bye Lane-2, Sanitpur, Bharalumukh
Kamrup Metro, Guwahati, Assam - 781 009

E-mail: canavratn6725@gmail.com

Tel.: 8276887194

Website: www.rcjainca.com