Land Development, Agency and the Elusive 'Service': SC Draws the Final Line

FEBRUARY 11, 2026

By Ashwarya Sharma, Advocate

A. Introduction

CLASSIFICATION disputes under indirect tax laws have a peculiar way of returning in different avatars. What was once debated under service tax continues to echo under GST, often with the same factual complexities but a different statutory lens. The decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Commissioner of Service Tax v. M/s Elegant Developers (**2025-TIOL-83-SC-ST**)* is one such ruling which, though rendered in the service tax regime, carries enduring relevance for GST practitioners.

The controversy before the Court revolved around a deceptively simple question: When does land development and facilitation cross the line from a transaction in immovable property into a taxable service? Despite repeated litigation on this theme, clarity remained elusive, largely due to aggressive departmental interpretations that attempted to stretch the concept of *"service"* to cover virtually every commercial arrangement connected with land.

The present judgment assumes significance as the Supreme Court carefully dissects the anatomy of a land transaction, re-emphasises the centrality of service as a taxable event, and decisively rejects taxation founded on economic surplus or profit margins rather than on an identifiable service relationship.

B. Factual Matrix

The respondent-taxpayer is engaged in the business of purchasing, selling, developing and dealing in land and allied activities. It entered into three substantially identical Memoranda of Understanding with M/s Sahara India Commercial Corporation Ltd. (SICCL) for acquisition, development and management of land parcels for real estate projects at Sri Ganganagar (Rajasthan), Vadodara (Gujarat) and Kurukshetra (Haryana).

Under the MoUs, SICCL agreed to pay the respondent a fixed average rate per acre of land. This rate was comprehensive and included the cost of land as well as expenses incurred for development and facilitation. The respondent was required to identify land parcels, divide and demarcate them, verify and furnish title documents, obtain statutory permissions and facilitate negotiations and registration with landowners.

Importantly, the consideration payable to the respondent was not structured as commission or service charges. The respondent's gain or loss depended entirely on its ability to procure land from landowners at a price lower or higher than the fixed rate agreed with SICCL, thereby exposing it to full commercial risk.

Based on statements recorded during investigation, the Department concluded that the respondent functioned as a *"Real Estate Agent"* under Sections 65(88) and 65(89) of the Finance Act, 1994, had suppressed material facts, and was liable to service tax on the alleged consideration embedded in the fixed average rate.

C. Proceedings Before the Adjudicating Authority and the Tribunal

The Adjudicating Authority adopted an expansive interpretation of the expression *"Real Estate Agent"* and held that even facilitation or introduction of parties constituted a taxable service. It was further held that

the respondent's profit margin formed consideration for services rendered in relation to land procurement and registration, thereby attracting service tax under Section 65(105)(v).

On appeal, the Tribunal reversed these findings. It noted that the MoUs did not prescribe any commission or service fee, that both parties operated as principals, and that the respondent bore the entire risk of profit or loss. The Tribunal further held that extended period of limitation was not invocable, as all transactions were recorded in books and routed through banking channels.

Aggrieved, the Department carried the matter to the Supreme Court.

D. Issues Before the Supreme Court

The Supreme Court was called upon to determine whether the respondent rendered taxable services as a *"Real Estate Agent"* during the relevant period, and whether extended limitation under Section 73 of the Finance Act, 1994 was validly invoked.

E. Rival Submissions

The Department argued that title in the land never vested with the respondent, that it merely held powers of attorney, and that the excess over the fixed rate constituted commission. Reliance was placed on judicial precedent to contend that transactions structured with a pre-determined onward buyer could not be treated as simple sale and purchase of immovable property.

The respondent, on the other hand, contended that it acted as an intervening trader assuming complete commercial risk, that no service element existed, and that the economic substance of the transaction was that of trading in land, which stood expressly excluded from service tax. It was further argued that limitation was not extendable in the absence of any positive act of suppression.

F. Supreme Court's Analysis

The Court commenced its analysis by examining Sections 65(88) and 65(89) of the Finance Act, 1994, noting that both definitions are intrinsically service-centric. The existence of a service, advice or consultancy is the sine qua non for taxability.

The Court emphasised that a *"Real Estate Agent"* necessarily pre-supposes a contract of agency. Absent a principal-agent relationship and absent consideration in the nature of commission or service charges, the statutory definition cannot be triggered.

After examining the MoUs, the Court found no indicia of agency. The fixed rate mechanism, exposure to loss, and absence of service-linked remuneration decisively negated the Department's case. The respondent's gains arose from trading margins and not from rendering any service to SICCL.

The Court further held that transactions of sale and conveyance of immovable property fall squarely within the exclusion carved out under Section 65B(44)(a)(i) of the Finance Act, 1994. Facilitating such sale, when done as part of one's own trading activity and not as an agent, does not metamorphose into a taxable service.

On limitation, the Court categorically held that the Department failed to establish any wilful suppression. Mere non-registration or non-payment, absent intent to evade, cannot justify invocation of the extended period.

H. Conclusion

The judgment in *Elegant Developers* is a timely reaffirmation of first principles. It cautions against the tendency to tax economic outcomes instead of legally identifiable taxable events. By restoring primacy to the concepts of agency, consideration and service, the Supreme Court has ensured that taxation does not drift into the realm of assumption and inference.

More importantly, the ruling sends a clear signal that land transactions-howsoever complex-cannot be artificially vivisected to extract a service element unless the statute clearly so provides. In an era where

form is often sacrificed at the altar of perceived substance, this judgment restores much-needed doctrinal balance.

I. Key Takeaways

+ Taxability under service tax hinges on the existence of a service and not merely on commercial profit or facilitation.

+ A "Real Estate Agent" relationship necessarily requires a contract of agency and consideration in the nature of commission or service charges.

+ Trading in land, even when accompanied by development and facilitation activities, does not constitute a taxable service if undertaken on principal-to-principal basis.

+ Profit margin or price differential cannot be mechanically equated with consideration for services.

+ Extended limitation cannot be invoked in the absence of demonstrable intent to suppress material facts.

J. GST Perspective: Continuing Relevance

Though rendered under the Finance Act, 1994, the ruling has strong resonance under GST. Schedule III of the CGST **Act, 2017** expressly excludes sale of land from the scope of supply. The logic adopted by the Supreme Court-that ancillary activities embedded in a principal land transaction do not automatically become taxable-provides critical interpretative guidance under GST as well.

Attempts to vivisect land transactions and tax embedded margins or facilitation under the guise of *"composite supply" or "intermediary services"* must now be tested against the substance-over-assumption approach reaffirmed in this judgment.

For GST practitioners and taxpayers alike, *Elegant Developers (**2025-TIOL-83-SC-ST**)* serves as a powerful precedent to resist over-expansive interpretations and reinforces that exclusions carved out by the legislature cannot be diluted by administrative creativity.

[The author is a practicing Advocate and Co-Founder & Legal Head at RB LawCorp. The views expressed are strictly personal.]