

CENTRAL EXCISE

BASIC CONCEPTS

1. Does the process of washing of iron ore for removal of foreign materials from such ore amount to manufacture?

Commissioner v. Steel Authority of India Ltd. 2012 (283) E.L.T. A112 (S.C.)

Facts of the Case: The Steel Authority of India Ltd. (SAIL) was mining iron ore from mines.

The Department submitted that Steel Authority of India Ltd. (SAIL) was mining iron ore from mines and subjecting the same to crushing, grinding, screening and washing with an aim to concentrate the ores.

The Department contended that in the case of the respondents, their mining activity was done by fully mechanized system; that they were mining iron ores from mines and then ores were subjected to process of crushing, grinding and screening and washing with a view to remove foreign materials and to concentrate such ores; that at each stage of washing water is added to improve the flowability of material by removing the sticky particles and the processes undertaken by them involved removal of parts of foreign material from the ores and increase the "Fe" content (i.e. iron content); thus goods so obtained by such process would qualify as concentrate.

The SAIL submitted that the washing of iron ore by itself could never convert it into concentrates and that washing by itself did not amount to manufacture. The assessee also contended that the concentrates were manufactured by increasing the concentration of Fe content of the mineral by removing and separating different impurities; that concentrates were manufactured by enriching the material in terms of its Fe content; that under this process, raw iron ore of low Fe content was ground to very fine consistency and passed through various processes for making concentrates; that in the present matters neither they undertook any such process nor there was any variation in the Fe content of iron ore extracted from its mines and the Fe content of seized iron ore.

Point of Dispute: Department contended that any ore which after being subjected to physical or physico chemical process viz., crushing, screening, etc., has had part or whole of its extraneous, foreign matter removed, would be termed as "concentrate"; and thus the product obtained after the processes carried out by the Respondents was "iron ore concentrate" only and not iron ore.

Decision of the Case: The Supreme Court held that removal of foreign materials from iron ore, i.e., mining iron ore from mines and then subjecting to process of crushing, grinding,

screening and washing with a view to remove foreign materials to concentrate such ores do not result in manufacture of different commercial commodity. No Central excise duty is leviable on iron ore concentrate.

2. Whether the addition and mixing of polymers and additives to base bitumen results in the manufacture of a new marketable commodity and as such exigible to excise duty?

CCE v. Osnar Chemical Pvt. Ltd. 2012 (276) E.L.T. 162 (S.C.)

Facts of the Case: Osnar Chemical Pvt. Ltd. (Osnar) was engaged in the supply of Polymer Modified Bitumen (for short "PMB"). The assessee additionally supplied Crumbled Rubber Modified Bitumen (CRMB). It entered into a contract with M/s. Afcons Infrastructure Ltd. (Afcons) for supply of PMB at their work site. As per the agreement, the base bitumen and certain additives were to be supplied by Afcons to Osnar directly at the site, where Osnar, in its mobile polymer modification plant, was required to heat the bitumen at a temperature of 160°C with the help of burners. To this hot bitumen, 1% polymer and 0.2% additives were added under constant agitation, for improving its quality by increasing its softening point and penetration. The process of agitation was to be continued for a period of 12 to 18 hours till the mixture becomes homogenous and the required properties were met. The said bitumen in its hot agitated condition was mixed with stone aggregates which were then used for road construction. The Osnar paid duty on PMB processed at their factory in Mumbai but had not paid the same for the conversion done at their work site.

Point of Dispute: Revenue contended that the aforesaid process carried out by the assessee (Osnar) amounted to manufacture of PMB in terms of section 2(f) of the Central Excise Act, 1944.

Revenue further, submitted that the end products, viz. PMB and (CRMB) were different from bitumen, in as much as polymers and additives were the raw materials consumed in the process of manufacture of the said final products and were therefore, covered by the definition of the term "manufacture" in section 2(f) of the Act. The Revenue added that PMB and CRMB were exigible to excise duty, as bitumen is classifiable under Chapter sub heading 27132000, and polymer is classifiable under Chapter sub heading 39019000, while the finished products, PMB and CRMB were classifiable under Chapter sub heading 27150090. Further, PMB and CRMB were commercially known in the market for being bought and sold and therefore, satisfied the test of marketability which is one of the essential conditions for the purpose of levy of excise duty.

Decision of the Case: The Supreme Court was of the view that "manufacture" could be said to have taken place only when there was transformation of raw materials into a new and different article having a different identity, characteristic and use. It was a well settled principle that mere improvement in quality did not amount to manufacture. It was only when the change or a series of changes take the commodity to a point where commercially it could no longer be regarded as the original commodity but was instead recognized as a new and distinct article that manufacture could be said to have taken place.

The Court held that in order to bring a process within the ambit of section 2(f)(ii) of the Act, the same must be recognised by the legislature as manufacture in relation to the goods in the section notes or chapter notes of first schedule of the Central Excise Tariff Act. However, in the Schedule to the Central Excise Tariff Act, no such process or processes have been specified in the Section notes or Chapter notes in respect of Petroleum Bitumen falling under Tariff Item 27132000 or even in respect of bituminous mixtures falling under Tariff Item 27150090 to indicate that the said process amounts to manufacture. The Supreme Court thus concluded that the process of mixing polymers and additives with bitumen did not amount to manufacture.

3. Whether the metal scrap or waste generated during the repair of his worn out machineries/parts of cement manufacturing plant by a cement manufacturer amounts to manufacture?

Grasim Industries Ltd. v. UOI 2011 (273) E.L.T. 10 (S.C.)

Facts of the case: The assessee was the manufacturer of the white cement. He repaired his worn out machineries/parts of the cement manufacturing plant at its workshop such as damaged roller, shafts and coupling with the help of welding electrodes, mild steel, cutting tools, M.S. Angles, M.S. Channels, M.S. Beams, etc. In this process of repair, M.S. scrap and Iron scrap were generated. The assessee cleared this metal scrap and waste without paying any excise duty. The Department issued a show cause notice demanding duty on the said waste contending that the process of generation of scrap and waste amounted to the manufacture in terms of section 2(f) of the Central Excise Act.

Decision of the case: The Apex Court observed that manufacture in terms of section 2(f) includes any process incidental or ancillary to the completion of the manufactured product. This 'any process' can be a process in manufacture or process in relation to manufacture of the end product, which involves bringing some kind of change to the raw material at various stages by different operations. The process in relation to manufacture means a process which is so integrally connected to the manufacturing of the end product without which, the manufacture of the end product would be impossible or commercially inexpedient.

However, in the present case, it is clear that the process of repair and maintenance of the machinery of the cement manufacturing plant, in which M.S. scrap and Iron scrap arise, has no contribution or effect on the process of manufacturing of the cement, (the end product). The repairing activity in any possible manner cannot be called as a part of manufacturing activity in relation to production of end product. Therefore, the M.S. scrap and Iron scrap cannot be said to be a by-product of the final product. At the best, it is the by-product of the repairing process.

Hence, it held that the generation of metal scrap or waste during the repair of the worn out machineries/parts of cement manufacturing plant does not amount to manufacture.

4. Are the physician samples excisable goods in view of the fact that they are statutorily prohibited from being sold?

Medley Pharmaceuticals Ltd. v. CCE & C., Daman 2011 (263) E.L.T. 641 (S.C.)

The question which arose for consideration was whether physician samples of patent and proprietary medicines intended for distribution to medical practitioner as free samples, satisfied the test of marketability. The appellant contended that since the sale of the physician samples was prohibited under the Drugs and Cosmetics Act, 1940 and the rules made thereunder, the same could not be considered to be marketable.

Supreme Court observed that merely because a product was statutorily prohibited from being sold, would not mean that the product was not capable of being sold. Physician sample was capable of being sold in open market.

Moreover, the Drugs and Cosmetics Act, 1940 (Drugs Act) and the Central Excise Act, 1944 operated in different fields. The restrictions imposed under Drugs Act could not lead to non-levy of excise duty under the Central Excise Act thereby causing revenue loss. Prohibition on sale of physician samples under the Drugs Act did not have any bearing or effect on levy of excise duty.

Therefore, the Court inferred that the physician samples were excisable goods and were liable to excise duty.

Note: This case was affirmed in case of Medley Pharmaceuticals Ltd. v. Commissioner - 2011 (269) E.L.T. A20 (S.C.).

5. Whether assembling of the testing equipments for testing the final product in the factory amounts to manufacture?

Usha Rectifier Corpn. (I) Ltd. v. CCEx., New Delhi 2011 (263) E.L.T. 655 (S.C.)

Facts of the case: The appellant was a manufacturer of electronic transformers, semiconductor devices and other electrical and electronics equipments. During the course of such manufacture, the appellant also manufactured machinery in the nature of testing equipments to test their final products.

The appellant had stated in their balance sheet that the addition to the plant and machinery included testing equipments. The said position was further substantiated in the Director's report wherein it was mentioned that during the year, the company developed a large number of testing equipments on its own.

However, the assessee contended that such items were assembled in the factory for purely research and development purposes, but research being unsuccessful, same were dismantled. Hence, it would not amount to manufacture.

The appellant further submitted that the said project was undertaken only to avoid importing of such equipment from the developed countries with a view to save foreign exchange.

Decision of the case: The Supreme Court observed that once the appellant had themselves made admission regarding the development of testing equipments in their own Balance Sheet, which was further substantiated in the Director's report, it could not make contrary submissions later on. Moreover, assessee's stand that testing equipments were developed in the factory to avoid importing of such equipments with a view to save foreign exchange, confirmed that such equipments were saleable and marketable. Hence, the Apex Court held that duty was payable on such testing equipments.

6. Does the process of cutting and embossing aluminium foil for packing the cigarettes amount to manufacture?

CCE v. GTC Industries Ltd. 2011 (266) E.L.T. 160 (Bom.)

Facts of the case: A roll of aluminium foil was cut horizontally to make separate pieces of the foil and word 'PULL' was embossed on it. Thereafter fixed number cigarettes were wrapped in it. Aluminium foil, being a resistant to moisture, was used as a protector for the cigarettes and to keep them dry.

Revenue submitted that the process of cutting and embossing aluminium foil amounted to manufacture. Since the aluminium foil was used as a shell for cigarettes to protect them from moisture; the nature, form and purpose of foil were changed.

Decision of the case: The High Court pronounced that cutting and embossing did not transform aluminium foil into distinct and identifiable commodity. It did not change the nature and substance of foil. The said process did not render any marketable value, only made it usable for packing. There were no records to suggest that cut to shape/embossed aluminium foils used for packing cigarettes were distinct marketable commodity. Hence, process did not amount to manufacture as per section 2(f) of Central Excise Act, 1944. Only the process which produces distinct and identifiable commodity with marketable value can be called manufacture.

7. Does a product with short shelf-life satisfy the test of marketability?

Nicholas Piramal India Ltd. v. CCEx., Mumbai 2010 (260) E.L.T. 338 (S.C.)

Facts of the case: In the instant case, the product had a shelf-life of 2 to 3 days. The appellant contended that since the product did not have shelf-life, it did not satisfy the test of marketability.

Decision of the case: The Supreme Court ruled that short shelf-life could not be equated with no shelf-life and would not ipso facto mean that it could not be marketed. A shelf-life of 2 to 3 days was sufficiently long enough for a product to be commercially marketed. Shelf-life of a product would not be a relevant factor to test the marketability of a product unless it was shown that the product had absolutely no shelf-life or the shelf-life of the product was such that it was not capable of being brought or sold during that shelf-life.

8. Whether the theoretical possibility of product being sold is sufficient to establish the marketability of a product?

Bata India Ltd. v. CCE 2010 (252) ELT 492 (SC)

Decision of the case: The Apex Court observed that marketability is essentially a question of fact to be decided on the facts of each case and there can be no generalization. The test of marketability is that the product which is made liable to duty must be marketable in the condition in which it emerges. The question is not whether there is a hypothetical possibility of a purchase and sale of the commodity, but whether there is sufficient proof that the product is commercially known. **The mere theoretical possibility of the product being sold is not sufficient but there should be commercial capability of being sold.** Theory and practice will not go together when one examines the marketability of a product.

The Supreme Court further ruled that the burden to show that the product is marketed or capable of being bought or sold is entirely on the Revenue. Revenue, in the given case, had not produced any material before the Tribunal to show that the product was either being marketed or capable of being marketed, but expressed its opinion unsupported by any relevant materials.

Note: The above judgment is in conformity with the explanation to section 2(d) of the Central Excise Act, 1944 inserted by the Finance Act, 2008.

9. Whether the machine which is not assimilated in permanent structure would be considered to be moveable so as to be dutiable under the Central Excise Act?

CCE v. Solid & Correct Engineering Works and Ors 2010 (252) ELT 481 (SC)

Facts of the case: The assessee was engaged in the manufacture of asphalt batch mix and drum mix/hot mix plant by assembling and installing its parts and components. The Revenue contended that the said plant would be considered to be moveable so as to be dutiable under the Central Excise Act, 1944.

Decision of the case: The Court opined that an attachment where the necessary intent of making the same permanent is absent cannot constitute permanent fixing, embedding or attachment in the sense that would make the machine a part and parcel of the earth permanently.

The Court observed that as per the assessee, the machine was fixed by nuts and bolts to a foundation not because the intention was to permanently attach it to the earth, but because a foundation was necessary to provide a wobble free operation to the machine.

Hence, the Supreme Court held that the plants in question were not immovable property so as to be immune from the levy of excise duty. Consequently, duty would be levied on them.

10. Does the activity of packing of imported compact discs in a jewel box along with inlay card amount to manufacture?

CCE v. Sony Music Entertainment (I) Pvt. Ltd. 2010 (249) E.L.T. 341 (Bom.)

Facts of the case: The appellant imported recorded audio and video discs in boxes of 50 and packed each individual disc in transparent plastic cases known as jewel boxes. An inlay card containing the details of the content of the compact disc was also placed in the jewel box. The whole thing was then shrink wrapped and sold in wholesale. The Department contended that the said process amounted to manufacture.

Decision of the case: The High Court observed that none of the activity that the assessee undertook involved any process on the compact discs that were imported. It held that the Tribunal rightly concluded that the activities carried out by the respondent did not amount to manufacture since the compact disc had been complete and finished when imported by the assessee. They had been imported in finished and completed form.

10. Does the process of preparation of tarpaulin made-ups after cutting and stitching the tarpaulin fabric and fixing the eye-lets amount to manufacture?

CCE v. Tarpaulin International 2010 (256) E.L.T. 481 (S.C.)

Facts of the case: The assessee was engaged in manufacture of 'tarpaulin made-ups'. The 'tarpaulin made-ups' was the tarpaulin cloth prepared by making solution of wax, aluminum stearate and pigments which were mixed. The solution was heated in a vessel and was transferred to a tank. Grey cotton canvas fabric was then dipped into this solution and passed through two rollers, whereafter the canvas was dried by exposure to atmosphere. Thereafter, the tarpaulin made-ups were prepared by cutting the cloth into various sizes and stitched and eye-lets were fitted. Department viewed that the "tarpaulin made-ups" prepared by means of cutting, stitching and fixing of eye-lets amounted to manufacture and, hence, they were exigible to duty. However, the assessee stated that the process of mere cutting, stitching and putting eyelets did not amount to manufacture and hence, the Department could not levy excise duty on tarpaulin made-ups.

Decision of the case: The Apex Court opined that stitching of tarpaulin sheets and making eyelets did not change basic characteristic of the raw material and end product. The process did not bring into existence a new and distinct product with total transformation in the original commodity. The original material used i.e., the tarpaulin, was still called tarpaulin made-ups even after undergoing the said process. Hence, it could not be said that the process was a manufacturing process. Therefore, there could be no levy of Central excise duty on the tarpaulin made-ups.

Hence, the Supreme Court, upholding the decision of the Tribunal, held that conversion of tarpaulin into tarpaulin made-ups would not amount to manufacture.

CLASSIFICATION OF EXCISABLE GOODS

1. In case of specific classification viz-à-viz classification based on material used/composition of goods, which one should be adopted?

Commissioner of Central Excise, Bhopal v. Minwool Rock Fibres Ltd. 2012 (278) E.L.T. 581 (S.C.)

Facts of the Case: Minwool Rock Fibres Ltd. started manufacturing rockwool and slagwool using more than 25% of blast furnace slag by weight in 1993. They classified them under Central Excise Tariff heading 6803.00 (i.e. Slagwool, Rockwool and similar mineral wools) and had been filing classification declarations mentioning this fact. Such declarations so filed prior to 1997-98 were accepted by the Department. However, another specific sub-heading 6807.10 of the Central Excise Tariff was introduced vide Budget 1997 for '*Goods having more than 25% by weight blast furnace slag*'. Accordingly, they claimed that the goods manufactured by them, namely, slagwool and rockwool should henceforth be classified under Chapter sub-heading 6807.10 of the Tariff.

The Revenue contended that when there was a specific sub-heading, i.e. 6803.00 wherein the goods, such as Slagwool, Rockwool and similar wools were enumerated, that entry requires to be applied and not Chapter sub-heading 6807.10.

Point of Dispute: The assessee's contention was that the appropriate classification for their product was under Chapter sub-heading 6807.10 of the Act while the Department contended that the appropriate classification was under Chapter sub-heading 6803.00 of the Act.

This was the subject matter of the appeal before the Supreme Court.

Decision of the Case: The Supreme Court held that there was a specific entry which speaks of Slagwool and Rockwool under sub-heading 6803.00 chargeable at 18%, but there was yet another entry which was consciously introduced by the Legislature under sub-heading 6807.10 chargeable at 8%, which speaks of goods in which Rockwool, Slag wool and products thereof were manufactured by use of more than 25% by weight of blast furnace slag.

It was not in dispute that the goods in question were those goods in which more than 25% by weight of one or more of red mud, press mud or blast furnace slag was used. If that be the case, then, in a classification dispute, an entry which was beneficial to the assessee required to be applied and the same had been done by the adjudicating authority, which had been confirmed by the Tribunal. Further, tariff heading specifying goods according to its

composition should be preferred over the specific heading. Sub-heading 6807.10 is specific to the goods in which more than 25% by weight, red mud, press mud or blast furnace slag is used as it is based entirely on material used or composition of goods.

Therefore, the Court opined that the goods in issue were appropriately classifiable under Sub-heading 6807.10 of the Tariff.

Note: The declaration list referred to in the above case law has been done away with now. Further, the description and rate of above relevant entries under sub-heading 6803.00 and sub-heading 6807.10 of the Tariff at the relevant time was as given below:

<i>Heading</i>	<i>Sub-Heading</i>	<i>Description of Goods</i>	<i>Rate of Duty</i>
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
6803	6803.00	Slagwool, Rockwool and similar mineral wools	18%
6807		Goods, in which more than 25% by weight of red mud, press mud or blast furnace slag or one or more of these materials have been used; all other articles of stone, plaster, cement, asbestos, mica or of similar materials, not elsewhere specified or included.	
	6807.10	Goods, in which more than 25% by weight of red mud, press mud or blast furnace slag or one or more of these materials have been used.	8%

2. In case of a specific entry viz-a-viz a residuary entry, which one should be preferred for classification purpose?

CCE v. Wockhardt Life Sciences Ltd. 2012 (277) E.L.T. 299 (S.C.)

Facts of the Case: Wockhardt Life Sciences Ltd. was the manufacturer of Povidone Iodine Cleansing Solution USP and Wokadine Surgical Scrub. The only difference between these two products was that Wokadine was a branded product whereas Povidone Iodine Cleansing Solution was a generic name.

The Revenue contended that the said products were not medicament in terms of Chapter Note 2(i) of Chapter 30 of the Tariff Act* as it neither had "Prophylactic" nor "Therapeutic" usage. The Revenue said that in order to qualify as a medicament, the goods must be capable of curing or preventing some disease or ailment. Therefore, the said products cannot be classified under Chapter Heading 3003 of Tariff Act. They submitted that the product in dispute, namely Povidone Iodine Solution or its patent and proprietary equivalent Wokadine surgical scrub, was essentially used as a medicated detergent.

The assessee stated that the Revenue, in their show cause notices, had admitted that the products in issue were antiseptic and used by surgeons for cleaning or de-germing their hands and scrubbing surface of skin of patient before operation. They further submitted that

the products were medicament in which some carriers were added and therefore, it would fall under chapter sub-heading 3003 and not under chapter 34.

Point of Dispute: The assessee's claim before the authorities and also before the Tribunal was that the aforesaid products were medicaments and, therefore, required to be classified under Chapter sub-heading 3003 of the Tariff, whereas the Revenue's stand was that the products in question are detergents and, therefore, to be classified under chapter sub-heading 3402.90.

Decision of the Case: The Supreme Court observed that it is the specific case of the assessee that the products in question are primarily used for external treatment of the human-beings for the purpose of the prevention of the disease. This is not disputed by the Revenue. Revenue's stand is that since the products in question are primarily used as detergents/cleansing preparation, they cannot be brought under the definition of medicaments. Medicaments are products which can be used either for therapeutic or prophylactic usage. The Court said that since the product in question is basically and primarily used for the prophylactic uses; the Tribunal was justified in coming to a conclusion that the product was a medicament. The miniscule quantity of the prophylactic ingredient is not a relevant factor.

The Court said that the combined factor that requires to be taken note of for the purpose of the classification of the goods are the composition, the product literature, the label, the character of the product and the use to which the product is put. In the instant case, it is not in dispute that this is used by the surgeons for the purpose of cleaning or degerming their hands and scrubbing the surface of the skin of the patient that portion is operated upon. The purpose is to prevent the infection or disease. Therefore, the product in question can be safely classified as a "medicament" which would fall under chapter sub-heading 3003 which is a specific entry and not under chapter sub-heading 3402.90 which is a residuary entry.

Thus, on the basis of the above observation by the Court the Revenue's appeal was rejected.

** Note : "Medicament" means goods (other than foods or beverages such as dietetic, diabetic or fortified foods, tonic beverages) not falling within heading 30.02 or 30.04 which are either :*

- (a) products comprising two or more constituents which have been mixed or compounded together for therapeutic or prophylactic uses; or*
- (b) unmixed products suitable for such uses put up in measured doses or in packings for retail sale or for use in hospitals.*

Further, the Tariff Items under chapter sub-heading 3003 and chapter sub-heading 3402.90, at the relevant time were as follows:

<i>Heading No.</i>	<i>Sub-heading No.</i>	<i>Description of goods</i>	<i>Rate of duty</i>
30.03		Medicaments (including veterinary medicaments)	

	3003.10	Patent or proprietary medicaments, other than those medicaments which are exclusively Ayurvedic, Unani, Siddha, Homeopathic or Bio-chemic.	15%
	3003.20	Medicaments (other than patent or proprietary) other than those which exclusively used in Ayurvedic, Unani, Siddha, Homeopathic or Bio-chemic systems Medicaments, including those in Ayurvedic, Unani, Siddha, Homeopathic or Bio-chemic systems.	8%
34.02		Organic Surface active agents (other than soap): surface-active preparations, washing preparations (including auxiliary washing preparations and cleaning preparation, whether or not containing soap.	
	3402.90	Other	18%

Note – The headings cited in the case laws mentioned above may not co-relate with the headings of the present Excise Tariff as they relate to an earlier point of time.

VALUATION OF EXCISABLE GOODS

1. Whether the price used for selling of a product below the cost price for penetration of market can be considered as transaction value?

CCEx., Mumbai v. Fiat India Pvt. Ltd. 2012 (283) E.L.T. 161 (S.C.)

Facts of the Case: The Fiat India Pvt. Ltd. (Fiat) was the manufacturer of motor cars. They were selling Fiat UNO model cars below cost and were making losses in wholesale trade. The purpose was penetration of market and competing with other manufacturers of similar goods. The prices were not based on manufacturing cost and profit. This was happening over the period of five years. The Assistant Commissioner directed for the provisional assessment of the cars at a price which would include cost of production, selling expenses including transportation and landing charges, wherever necessary and profit margin, on the ground that the cars were not ordinarily sold in the course of wholesale trade as the cost of production is much more than their wholesale price, but were sold at loss for a consideration.

Point of Dispute: - The Department disputed that as the extra commercial consideration was involved in this case an additional consideration should be added to the price for the purpose of duty. Thus, the Department invoked Best Judgment Assessment.

Decision of the Case: The Supreme Court held duty has to be paid on the "transaction value". Section 4(1)(a) of the Central Excise Act, 1944 defines transaction value as under "in a case where the goods are sold by the assessee, for delivery at the time and place of the removal, the assessee and the buyer of the goods are not related and the price is the sole consideration for the sale, be the transaction value

If any of the ingredients in the above definition is missing then the price shall not be considered as the sole consideration as transaction value.

Supreme Court opined that this is a case of extra commercial consideration in fixing of price, and artificially depressing it. Full commercial cost of manufacturing and selling was not reflected in the price as it was deliberately kept below the cost of production. Thus, price could not be considered as the sole consideration for sale. No prudent business person would continuously suffer huge loss only to penetrate market; they are expected to act with discretion to seek reasonable income, preserve capital and, in general, avoid speculative investments. It is immaterial that the cars were not sold to related persons.

In view of the above resorting to best judgment assessment was proper.

2. Whether the charges towards pre-delivery inspection and after-sale-service recovered by dealers from buyers of the cars would be included in the assessable value of cars?

Maruti Suzuki India Ltd. v. CCE 2010 (257) E.L.T. 226 (Tri. – LB)

Facts of the case: The appellants were manufacturers of various types of motor vehicles chargeable to duty on *ad valorem* basis. Department observed that while selling the vehicles to the customers, the dealers added their own margin known as the dealer's margin to the price at which the vehicles were made available to them by the appellants. This dealer's margin contained provision for rendering pre-delivery inspection and three after sale services. Hence, the Department contended that the cost of post delivery inspection and after sale services were to form part of the assessable value of the automobile while discharging the duty liability.

Decision of the case: The Larger Bench of the Tribunal drew the following propositions:-

- (i) Transaction value includes the amount paid by reason of/in connection with sales of goods

The Court noted that the transaction value does not merely include the amount paid to the assessee towards price, but also includes any amount a buyer is liable to pay by reason of or in connection with the sale of the goods, including any amount paid on behalf of assessee to the dealer or the person selling the vehicles. The reason of sale and inter connection thereto are essential elements to contribute for assessable value.

Measure of levying is expanded and its composition is broad based to bring all that a buyer is liable to pay or incur by reason of sale or in connection on therewith. The transaction value, therefore, is not confined to the amount actually paid and is not restricted to flow back of consideration or part thereof to the assessee directly but even for discharge of sales obligations both in present and future. Thus, all deferred and future considerations are added to assessable value.

- (ii) Definition of transaction value is extensive, at the same time restrictive and exhaustive in relation to the items excluded therefrom

Extensive

The use of expressions like “includes in addition to” and “including but not limited to” in the definition clause establishes that it is of very wide and extensive in nature.

Restrictive and exhaustive

At the same time, it precisely pinpoints the items which are excluded therefrom, with the prefix as “but does not include”. Exclusions being defined no presumption for further exclusions is permissible. Hence, the definition is restrictive and exhaustive in relation to the items excluded therefrom.

- (iii) PDI and after sales service charges is a payment on behalf of the assessee to the dealer by the buyer

Both, direct benefit as well as indirect benefit (wholly or partly), flowing from buyer to assessee, resulting from the payment made by the buyer to the dealer in connection with or by reason of the sale transaction will have to be included in the assessable value. Being so, any amount collected by the dealer towards pre-delivery inspection or after sale services from the buyer of the goods under the understanding between the manufacturer and the dealer or forming part of the activity of sales promotion of the goods would be a payment on behalf of the assessee to the dealer by the buyer, and hence, it would form part of the assessable value of such goods.

Hence, it was held that the charges towards pre-delivery inspection and after-sale-service recovered by dealers from buyers of the cars would be included in the assessable value of cars.

Notes:

1. As per section 4(3)(d) of the Central Excise act, 1944, transaction value is defined as follows:-

Transaction value:-

- means the price actually paid or payable for the goods, when sold, and
- includes in addition to the amount charged as price, any amount that the buyer is liable to pay to, or on behalf of, the assessee, by reason of, or in connection with the sale, whether payable at the time of the sale or at any other time,
- including, but not limited to, any amount charged for, or to make provision for, advertising or publicity, marketing and selling organization expenses, storage, outward handling, servicing, warranty, commission or any other matter;
- but does not include the amount of duty of excise, sales tax and other taxes, if any, actually paid or actually payable on such goods.

2. It may be noted that CBEC, in view of the aforesaid judgment has clarified vide Circular No. 936/26/2010-CX. dated 27-10-2010 that pre-delivery inspection charges and after-sale service charges collected by the dealers are to be included in the assessable value under section 4 of the Central Excise Act, 1944.

1. In case the testing is critical to ensure marketability of manufactured product i.e. the manufacture is not complete without testing; is CENVAT credit of the testing material allowed?

Flex Engineering Ltd. v. Commissioner of Central Excise, U.P. 2012 (276) E.L.T. 153 (S.C.)

Facts of the Case: The Flex Engineering Ltd. ('Flex' in short), a manufacturer was engaged in the manufacturing of various types of packaging machines, marketed Automatic Form Fill and Seal Machines ('F&S machines' in short). The machines were 'made to order', in as much as all the dimensions of the packaging/sealing pouches, for which the F&S machine is required, are provided by the customer. The purchase order contained the following inspection clause:

"Inspection/trial will be carried out at your works in the presence of our engineer before dispatch of equipment for the performance of the machine."

As the machine ordered was customer specific, if after inspection by the customer it was found deficient in respect of its operations for being used for a particular specified packaging, it could not be delivered to the customer, till it was re-adjusted and tuned to make it match with the required size of the pouches as per the customer's requirement. On completion of the above process and when the customer was satisfied, an entry was made in the RG-1 register declaring the machine as manufactured, ready for clearance.

As per the above clause, testing material to be used was Flexible Laminated Plastic Film in roll form & Poly Paper which are duty paid.

Point of Dispute: The Department denied CENVAT credit on the material used for testing of the packaging machines. Two questions were raised to the High Court in this regard:-

- (i) Whether duties paid on testing material would be eligible as credit under rule 57A of the erstwhile Central Excise Rules, 1944 [now rule 2(k) of the CENVAT Credit Rules, 2004]?
- (ii) Whether such use of material in testing, in view of the purposes mentioned above, could be said to be used in the manufacture of or use in relation to the manufacture of the final products viz., machines as assembled?

The High Court answered both the above questions in the negative. According to the High Court, anything required to make the goods marketable must form a part of the manufacture and any raw material or any materials used for the same would be a component part of the end product. It thus observed that materials used for testing after manufacture of the final product, viz. the F&S machine, is only to detect the deficiency in the final product and therefore, could not be considered as the goods used in or in relation to the manufacture of the final product. The Flex made an appeal to the Supreme Court against the above order.

Decision of the Case: The Supreme Court held that the process of manufacture would not be complete if a product is not saleable as it would not be marketable. Thus, the duty of excise would not be leviable on it.

The Supreme Court was of the opinion that the process of testing the customized F&S machines was inextricably connected with the manufacturing process, in as much as, until this process is carried out in terms of the afore-extracted covenant in the purchase order, the manufacturing process is not complete; the machines are not fit for sale and hence, not marketable at the factory gate. The Court was, therefore, of the opinion that the manufacturing process in the present case gets completed on testing of the said machines. Hence, the afore-stated goods viz. the flexible plastic films used for testing the F&S machines are inputs used in relation to the manufacture of the final product and would be eligible for CENVAT credit under rule 57A of the erstwhile Central Excise Rules, 1944 [now rule 2(k) of the CENVAT Credit Rules, 2004].

3. The assessee claimed the CENVAT credit on the duty paid on capital goods which were later destroyed by fire. The Insurance Company reimbursed the amount inclusive of excise duty. Is the CENVAT credit availed by the assessee required to be reversed?

CCE v. Tata Advanced Materials Ltd. 2011 (271) E.L.T. 62 (Kar.)

Facts of the case: The assessee purchased some capital goods and paid the excise duty on it. Since, said capital goods were used in the manufacture of excisable goods, he claimed the CENVAT credit of the excise duty paid on it. However, after three years the said capital goods (which were insured) were destroyed by fire. The Insurance Company reimbursed the amount to the assessee, which included the excise duty, which the assessee had paid on the capital goods. Excise Department demanded the reversal of the CENVAT credit by the assessee on the ground that the assessee had availed a double benefit.

Decision of the case: The High Court noted that the as per CENVAT Credit Rules, 2004, CENVAT credit taken irregularly stands cancelled and CENVAT credit utilised irregularly has to be paid for.

In the instant case, the Insurance Company, in terms of the policy, had compensated the assessee. The High Court observed that merely because the Insurance Company had paid the assessee the value of goods including the excise duty paid, it would not render

the availment of the CENVAT credit wrong or irregular. It was not a case of double benefit as contended by the Department.

The High Court therefore answered the substantial question of law in favour of the assessee.

4. In case of combo-pack of bought out tooth brush sold alongwith tooth paste manufactured by assessee; is tooth brush eligible as input under the CENVAT Credit Rules, 2004?

CCus. v. Prime Health Care Products 2011 (272) E.L.T. 54 (Guj.)

Facts of the case: The assessee was engaged in the manufacture of tooth paste. It was sold as a combo pack of tooth paste and a bought out tooth brush. The assessee availed CENVAT credit of central excise duty paid on the tooth brush. Revenue contended that the tooth brush was not an input for the manufacture of the tooth paste and the cost of tooth brush was not added in the M.R.P. of the combo pack and hence, the assessee had availed CENVAT credit of duty paid on tooth brush in contravention of the provisions of the CENVAT Credit Rules, 2004.

Decision of the case: The High Court noted that the process of packing and re-packing the input, that was, toothbrush and tooth paste in a unit container would fall within the ambit of "manufacture" [as per section 2(f)(iii) of the Central Excise Act, 1944].

Further, the word "input" was defined in rule 2(k) of the CENVAT Credit Rules, 2004 which also included accessories of the final products cleared along with final product. There was no dispute about the fact that on toothbrush, excise duty had been paid. The toothbrush was put in the packet along with the tooth paste and *no extra amount was recovered from the consumer on the toothbrush**.

Considering the definition given in the rules of "input" and the provisions contained in rule 3, the High Court upheld the Tribunal's decision that the credit was admissible in the case of the assessee.

**Note: The definition of inputs under rule 2(k) has been substituted vide Notification No. 3/2011-C.E. (N.T.) dated 1-3-2011.*

The erstwhile definition, inter alia, stipulated that input includes accessories of the final products cleared along with the final product. As per the new definition, input still includes accessories of the final products cleared along with the final product. However, it has also added the condition that the value of such accessory should be included in the value of the final product.

In the aforesaid judgment, since no extra amount was recovered from the customer on the toothbrush, it implies that the value of the toothbrush was included in the value of the final product i.e. toothpaste. Hence, the judgment holds good as per the provisions of the new definition.

5. Whether CENVAT credit can be denied on the ground that the weight of the inputs recorded on receipt in the premises of the manufacturer of the final products shows a shortage as compared to the weight recorded in the relevant invoice?

CCE v. Bhuwalka Steel Industries Ltd. 2010 (249) ELT 218 (Tri-LB)

The Larger Bench of the Tribunal held that each case had to be decided according to merit and no hard and fast rule can be laid down for dealing with different kinds of shortages. Decision to allow or not to allow credit under rule 3(1), in any particular case, will depend on various factors such as the following:-

- (i) Whether the inputs/capital goods have been diverted en-route or the entire quantity with the packing intact has been received and put to the intended use at the recipient factory.
- (ii) Whether the impugned goods are hygroscopic in nature or are amenable to transit loss by way of evaporation etc.
- (iii) Whether the impugned goods comprise countable number of pieces or packages and whether all such packages and pieces have been received and accounted for at the receiving end.
- (iv) Whether the difference in weight in any particular case is on account of weighment on different scales at the despatch and receiving ends and whether the same is within the tolerance limits with reference to the Standards of Weights and Measures Act, 1976.
- (v) Whether the recipient assessee has claimed compensation for the shortage of goods either from the supplier or from the transporter or the insurer of the cargo.

Tolerances in respect of hygroscopic, volatile and such other cargo has to be allowed as per industry norms excluding, however, unreasonable and exorbitant claims. Similarly, minor variations arising due to weighment by different machines will also have to be ignored if such variations are within tolerance limits.

6. Whether penalty can be imposed on the directors of the company for the wrong CENVAT credit availed by the company?

Ashok Kumar H. Fulwadhya v. UOI 2010 (251) E.L.T. 336 (Bom.)

Decision of the case: It was held that words “any person” used in rule 13(1) of the erstwhile CENVAT Credit Rules, 2002 [now rule 15(1) of the CENVAT Credit Rules, 2004] clearly indicate that the person who has availed CENVAT credit shall only be the person liable to the penalty. The Court observed that, in the instant case, CENVAT credit had been availed by the company and the penalty under rule 13(1) [now rule 15(1)] was imposable only on the person who had availed CENVAT credit [company in the given case], who was a manufacturer. The petitioners-directors of the company could not be said to be manufacturer availing CENVAT credit.

7. Can CENVAT credit be taken on the basis of private challans?

CCEx. v. Stelko Strips Ltd. 2010 (255) ELT 397 (P & H)

Issue: The issue under consideration before the High Court in the instant case was that whether private challans other than the prescribed documents are valid for taking MODVAT credit under the Central Excise Rules, 1944.

Decision of the case: The High Court placed reliance on its decision in the case of *CCE v. M/s. Auto Spark Industries CEC No. 34 of 2004 decided on 11.07.2006* wherein it was held that once duty payment is not disputed and it is found that documents are genuine and not fraudulent, the manufacturer would be entitled to MODVAT credit on duty paid on inputs.

The High Court also relied on its decision in the case of *CCE v. Ralson India Ltd. 2006 (200) ELT 759 (P & H)* wherein it was held that if the duty paid character of inputs and their receipt in manufacturer's factory and utilization for manufacturing a final product is not disputed, credit cannot be denied.

Thus, the High Court held that MODVAT credit could be taken on the strength of private challans as the same were not found to be fake and there was a proper certification that duty had been paid.

Note: Though, the principle enunciated in the above judgement is with reference to erstwhile Central Excise Rules, 1944, the same may apply in respect of CENVAT Credit Rules, 2004.

DEMAND, ADJUDICATION AND OFFENCES

1. Whether Additional Director General, Directorate General of Central Excise Intelligence can be considered a central excise officer for the purpose of issuing SCN?

Raghunath International Ltd. v. Union of India, 2012 (280) E.L.T. 321 (All.)

Facts of the Case: The appellant was engaged in the manufacture and clearance of Gutkha and Pan Masala. Search and seizure was conducted at the appellant's premises by the officers of the Directorate General of Central Excise, New Delhi. A show-cause notice was issued by Additional Director General, Directorate General of Central Excise Intelligence, asking the petitioner to show cause to the Commissioner of Central Excise, Kanpur within 30 days as to why the duty, penalty and interest were not to be imposed.

Point of Dispute: The appellant contended that Additional Director General, Directorate General of Central Excise Intelligence had no jurisdiction to issue the Show Cause Notice. It was contended that he was not a "Central Excise Officer" within the meaning of section 2(b) of the Central Excise Act, 1944. It was further contended that no notification regarding his appointment as Central Excise Officer was published in the Official Gazette as required by the rule 3(1) of the Central Excise Rules, 2002.

Another contention pressed by the appellant was that the authority who had issued the show cause notice ought to have obtained prior permission from the adjudicating authority before issuing the Show Cause Notice.

Decision of the Case: The Court on observing the issue held that Additional Director General, Directorate General of Central Excise Intelligence having been authorized to act as a Commissioner of Central Excise was a Central Excise Officer, within the meaning of section 2(b) of the Central Excise Act, 1944 and was fully authorized to issue the Show Cause Notice.

It was held that the Additional Director General, Directorate General of Central Excise Intelligence having been specified as a Commissioner of Central Excise was fully entitled to issue the show cause notice under section 11A, being a Central Excise Officer. No such provision had been referred to nor shown which may require approval before issuing the show cause notice of the adjudicating authority/officer.

The Government submitted that the Board had already issued notification dated 26-6-2001*, in exercise of power under section 2(b) of the Central Excise Act, 1944 read with sub-rule (1) of rule 3 of the Central Excise Rules, 2002, appointing the specified officers as Central Excise

Officer and investing them with all the powers, to be exercised by them throughout the territory of India. In this notification, Additional Director General, Directorate General of Central Excise Intelligence was specified as Commissioner of Central Excise. Hence, he was fully competent to issue the impugned show cause notice.

**Note: Central Excise Officer is defined under section 2(b) of the Central Excise Act, 1944. As per the said definition, Central Board of Excise and Customs is empowered to invest any person (including an officer of the State Government) with any of the powers of a Central Excise Officer under this Act. Pursuant to the powers conferred under this section, CBEC vide Notification No. 38/2001-C.E. (N.T) dated 26-6-2001 as amended has invested the Additional Director General, Directorate General of Central Excise Intelligence with the powers of Commissioner of Central Excise.*

2. Would the copy of the order mandatory to be served via registered post or a speed post also suffice?

Amidev Agro Care Pvt. Ltd. v. Union of India 2012 (279) E.L.T. 353 (Bom.)

Facts of the Case: The appellant-assessee had filed an appeal in May 2010. The date of order was 31st March 2008. The assessee contended that the copy of the order passed by the Commissioner of Central Excise (Appeals) was not served upon the assessee. It was only when the recovery proceedings were initiated, the assessee sought a copy of the order dated 31st March 2008 and the same was made available to the assessee on 26th February 2010. Immediately thereupon the assessee filed an appeal before the CESTAT on 17th May 2010.

Point of Dispute: The Department contended that appeal was not filed within the stipulated time of 3 months from 31st March 2008 while the appellant contended that the appeal filed was within three months of the date of serving of the order i.e. 26th February 2010.

Decision of the Case: As per section 37C(1)(a) of the Central Excise Act, 1944, it was obligatory on the part of the Revenue, either to tender a copy of the decision to the assessee or to send it by 'registered post with due acknowledgment' to the assessee or its authorized agent.

In the present case, neither of the above had been complied with by the Revenue. The High Court thus held that in the facts of the present case, it cannot be accepted that the requirements of section 37C had been complied with. Accordingly, the contention of the assessee that a copy of the order of Commissioner of Central Excise (Appeals) was received for the first time on 26th February 2010 would have to be accepted.

3. If Revenue accepts judgment of the Commissioner (Appeals) on an issue for one period, can it be precluded to make an appeal on the same issue for another period?

Commissioner of C. Ex., Mumbai-III v. Tikitar Industries, 2012 (277) E.L.T. 149 (S.C.)

Facts of the Case: The assessee was a manufacturer of the 'Bitulux Insulation Board' known as 'TikkiExjo Filler'. The 'TikkiExjo Filler' is obtained by the process of bituminization of the Insulation board. The adjudicating authority concluding that the above process amounts to

manufacture, levied excise duty on it. Aggrieved by the order, the assessee carried an appeal before the Commissioner (Appeals), who accepted the assessee's stand and held that the above process does not amount to manufacture. Department did not appeal against it and the above order of the appellate authority attained the finality.

In the meantime, the Revenue issued several Show Cause-cum-Demand Notices to the assessee directing the assessee to pay the differential duty, but for a time period different from the period covered in the said appeal.

Point of Dispute: The assessee was of the view that the process of bituminization of the Insulation board by which 'TikkiExjo Filler' is obtained, is not manufacture. Revenue, on the other hand, was of the view that the process of bituminization of the Insulation Board resulted in manufacture and thus, duty should be levied on it.

Decision of the Case: The Supreme Court observed that since the Revenue had not questioned the correctness or otherwise of the findings on the conclusion reached by the first appellate authority, it may not be open for the Revenue to contend this issue further by issuing the impugned show cause notices on the same issue for further periods.

4. Whether time-limit under section 11A of the Central Excise Act, 1944 is applicable to recovery of dues under compounded levy scheme?

Hans Steel Rolling Mill v. CCEx., Chandigarh 2011 (265) E.L.T. 321 (S.C.)

The Apex Court elucidated that compounded levy scheme is a separate scheme from the normal scheme for collection of excise duty on goods manufactured. Rules under compounded levy scheme stipulate method, time and manner of payment of duty, interest and penalty. Since the compounded levy scheme is comprehensive scheme in itself, general provisions of the Central Excise Act and rules are excluded from this scheme.

The Supreme Court affirmed that importing one scheme of tax administration to a different scheme is inappropriate and would disturb smooth functioning of such unique scheme. Hence, it held that the time-limit under section 11A of the Central Excise Act, 1944 is not applicable to recovery of dues under compounded levy scheme.

5. Whether non-disclosure of a statutory requirement under law would amount to suppression for invoking the larger period of limitation under section 11A?

CC Ex. & C v. Accrapac (India) Pvt. Ltd. 2010 (257) E.L.T. 84 (Guj.)

Facts of the case: The respondent-assessee was engaged in manufacture of various toilet preparations such as after-shave lotion, deo-spray, mouthwash, skin creams, shampoos, etc. The respondent procured Extra Natural Alcohol (ENA) from the local market on payment of duty, to which Di-ethyl Phthalate (DEP) is added so as to denature it and render the same unfit for human consumption. The Department alleged that the intermediate product i.e. Di-ethyl Alcohol manufactured as a result of addition of DEP to ENA, was liable to central excise duty.

Issue: The question which arose before the High Court in the instant case is whether non-disclosure as regards manufacture of Denatured Ethly Alcohol amounts to suppression of material facts thereby attracting the larger period of limitation under section 11A.

Decision of the case: The Tribunal noted that denaturing process in the cosmetic industry was a statutory requirement under the Medicinal & Toilet Preparations (M&TP) Act. Thus, addition of DEP to ENA to make the same unfit for human consumption was a statutory requirement. Hence, failure on the part of the respondent to declare the same could not be held to be suppression as Department, knowing the fact that the respondent was manufacturing cosmetics, must have the knowledge of the said requirement. Further, as similarly situated assesses were not paying duty on denatured ethyl alcohol, the respondent entertained a reasonable belief that it was not liable to pay excise duty on such product.

The High Court upheld the Tribunal's judgment and pronounced that non-disclosure of the said fact on the part of the assessee would not amount to suppression so as to call for invocation of the extended period of limitation.

1. Whether under section 11BB the interest on delayed refund would be payable from the date of deposit of tax or from the date of receipt of application for refund?

Kanyaka Parameshwari Engineering Ltd. v. Comm of Cus & Cx 2012 (26) STR 380 (A.P)

Facts of the Case: Kanyaka Parameshwari Engineering Ltd. was engaged in business of manufacture and sale of LPG cylinders. The appellant had paid excise duty under protest for the financial year 1999-2000 as the price was not finalized by the oil companies so the appellant undertook to pay the differential duty, if any, on fixation of exact price.

Pursuant to the reduction in the prices of LPG cylinders, the appellant filed applications for finalization of assessments and for refund of excess duty so paid by them. The Department refunded the excess duty paid by the appellant with interest from three months after the application for refund filed till the date of payment.

The appellant further filed an appeal demanding interest on the excess duty so paid by them as per section 11BB of Central Excise Act from the date of payment as duty was paid under protest.

Point of Dispute: Whether under section 11BB, the interest on refund is payable from the date of deposit of tax or from the date three months after the submission of the application of the refund?

Decision of the Case: Under section 11BB of the Central Excise Act, 1944, if any duty is not refunded within three months from the date of receipt of application under sub-section (1), the interest shall be paid on such duty from the date immediately after expiry of three months from the date of receipt of such application till the date of refund of such duty.

The High Court upheld the order of the CESTAT and granted interest on delayed refund from the expiry of three months from the date of application till the date of refund.

2. What is the date of commencement of the period for the purpose of computing interest on delayed refunds under section 11BB- the date of receipt of application for refund or date on which the order of refund is made?

Ranbaxy Laboratories Ltd. v. UOI 2011 (273) E.L.T. 3 (SC)

Decision of the case: The Apex Court observed that interest under section 11BB becomes payable, if on an expiry of a period of three months from the date of receipt of

the application for refund, the amount claimed is still not refunded. Thus, the only interpretation of section 11BB that can be arrived at is that interest under the said section becomes payable on the expiry of a period of three months from the date of receipt of the application under section 11B(1).

The Apex Court further noted that Explanation appearing below the proviso to section 11BB introduces a deeming fiction that where the order for refund of duty is not made by the Assistant Commissioner/Deputy Commissioner of Central Excise but by an Appellate Authority or the Court, then for the purpose of this section the order made by such higher Appellate Authority or by the Court shall be deemed to be an order made under section 11B(2). It is apparent that the explanation does not bearing or connection with the date from which interest under section 11BB becomes payable and does not postpone the said date.

In the light of the aforesaid discussion, the Supreme Court elucidated that section 11BB of the Central Excise Act, 1944 comes into play only after an order for refund has been made under section 11B. However, the liability of the revenue to pay interest under section 11BB commences from the date of expiry of three months from the date of receipt of application for refund under section 11B(1) and not on the expiry of the said period from the date on which order of refund is made.

Note: Section 11BB provides as under:

If any duty ordered to be refunded under sub-section (2) of section 11B to any applicant is not refunded within three months from the date of receipt of application under sub-section (1) of that section, there shall be paid to that applicant interest at such rate, not below five percent and not exceeding thirty per cent per annum as is for the time being fixed by the Central Government, by Notification in the Official Gazette, on such duty from the date immediately after the expiry of three months from the date of receipt of such application till the date of refund of such duty :

Where any duty ordered to be refunded under sub-section (2) of section 11B in respect of an application under sub-section (1) of that section made before the date on which the Finance Bill, 1995 receives the assent of the President, is not refunded within three months from such date, there shall be paid to the applicant interest under this section from the date immediately after three months from such date, till the date of refund of such duty. [Proviso]

Explanation - Where any order of refund is made by the Commissioner (Appeals), Appellate Tribunal National Tax Tribunal or any court against an order of the Assistant Commissioner of Central Excise or Deputy Commissioner of Central Excise, under sub-section (2) of section 11B, the order passed by the Commissioner (Appeals), Appellate Tribunal National Tax Tribunal] or, as the case may be, by the court shall be deemed to be an order passed under the said sub-section (2) for the purposes of this section.

3. Can the excess duty paid by the seller be refunded on the basis of the debit note issued by the buyer?

CCE v. Techno Rubber Industries Pvt Ltd. 2011 (272) E.L.T. 191 (Kar.)

Facts of the case: The assessee cleared the goods paying higher rate of excise duty in the month of March, although the rate of duty on the said goods had been reduced in the budget of the same financial year. However, the buyer refused to pay the higher duty which the assessee had paid by mistake. The customer raised a debit note in his name in the month of June of the same year. The assessee applied for the refund of excess excise duty paid. Revenue rejected his claim on the ground that incidence of the duty had been passed by him to the buyer.

While claiming refund, the assessee relied on the debit note raised by the buyer in his name in the month of June to demonstrate that his customer had not paid the excess duty to him. The adjudicating authority argued that since the debit note was issued in the month of June and not March, it could not be the basis for refund.

Decision of the case: The High Court elucidated that once it is admitted that the Department has received excess duty, they are bound to refund it to the person who has paid the excess duty. If the buyer of the goods has paid that excess duty, he would have been entitled to the said refund.

In the instant case, when the buyer had refused to pay excess duty claimed and had raised a debit note, the only inference to be drawn was that the assessee had not received that excess duty which he had paid to the Department. Consequently, Department was bound to refund to the assessee the excess duty calculated. Hence, the substantial question of law raised was answered in favour of the assessee and against the revenue.

4. Merely because assessee has sustained loss more than the refund claim, is it justifiable to hold that it is not a case of unjust enrichment even though the assessee failed to establish non-inclusion of duty in the cost of production?

CCE v. Gem Properties (P) Ltd. 2010 (257) E.L.T. 222 (Kar.)

Decision of the Case: The High Court answered the question of law in favour of the Revenue. The Court observed that indisputably, the assessee was not liable to pay the duty and was entitled to the refund of the excise duty wrongly paid by it. The claim of the assessee had been rejected on the ground that if the application was allowed, it would amount to unjust enrichment because all the materials sold by the assessee had been inclusive of the duty. Therefore, the burden had been heavy on the assessee to prove that while computing the cost of the material it had not included the duty paid by it.

The Court elucidated that merely because the assessee had sustained the loss in the relevant year, could not be a ground to hold it had not been a case of unjust enrichment. It was evident from the Chartered Accountant's certificate that the cost of the duty was included while computing the cost of production of the material. Therefore, on facts of the case, the High Court held that assessee could not be granted relief since it had failed to establish that the cost of the duty was not included while computing the cost of the products.

7

APPEALS

1. Whether doctrine of merger is applicable when appeal dismissed on the grounds of limitation and not on merits?

Raja Mechanical Co. (P) Ltd. v. Commissioner of C. Ex., Delhi-I, 2012 (279) E.L.T. 481 (S.C.)

Point of Dispute: The issue under consideration is that in case the first appellate authority had rejected the appeal filed by the assessee on the ground of limitation, whether the orders passed by the original authority would merge with the orders passed by the first appellate authority.

The learned counsel for the assessee contended that in given case, the orders passed by the original authority would merge with the orders passed by the first appellate authority and, therefore, the Tribunal should consider the appeal filed by the assessee.

It further submitted that the Tribunal ought to have considered the assessee's appeal not only on the ground of limitation but also on merits of the case. Since that has not been done, according to the learned counsel, the Tribunal has committed a serious error. The learned counsel further submitted that the "doctrine of merger" theory would apply in the sense that though the first appellate authority had rejected the appeal filed by the assessee on the ground of limitation, the orders passed by the original authority would merge with the orders passed by the first appellate authority and, therefore, the Tribunal ought to have considered the appeal.

On the other hand, the learned counsel for the respondent submitted that the doctrine of merger would not apply to a case where an appeal was dismissed only on the ground of the limitation.

Decision of the Case: The Court observed that if for any reason an appeal is dismissed on the ground of limitation and not on merits, that order would not merge with the orders passed by the first appellate authority. Apex Court opined that the High Court was justified in rejecting the request made by the assessee for directing the Revenue to state the case and also the question of law for its consideration and decision. In view of the above discussion, Supreme Court rejected the appeal.

2. Whether the construction of pre-fabricated components at one site to be used at different inter-connected metro construction sites in Delhi would get covered under

exemption *Notification No. 1/2011-C.E.(N.T.) dated 17-2-2011* exempting the 'goods manufactured at the site of construction for use in construction work at such site' ?

Commissioner of Central Excise v. Rajendra Narayan 2012 (281) E.L.T. 38 (Del.)

Facts of the Case:

The respondent-assessee was carrying on construction of the Delhi Metro. They had manufactured pre-fabricated components, which have been used in the construction of the Delhi Metro. The assessee claimed the exemption under *Notification No. 1/2011-C.E. (N.T.) dated 17-2-2011* which exempts the goods covered under specified chapter headings for a specified period, *manufactured at the site of construction for use in construction work at such site*. The Department contended that the respondent-assessee was not entitled to claim the exemption stating that the goods were not manufactured at the site of the construction for use in the construction work at the site.

Decision of the Court:

The Court noted that Delhi Metro Rail Corporation Ltd. had contracted and called upon the respondent-assessee to construct pre-fabricated components of different segments to be used in elevated viaducts etc.. For the purpose of pre-fabricating the components a specific casting yard, premises was allotted by Delhi Metro Rail Corporation Ltd. The said casting yard constituted the construction site. From the said construction site, components had been moved to different locations where elevated viaducts of the tunnel were being constructed. The Court held that keeping in view the facts of the present case and that the construction was done virtually all over Delhi and construction sites were interconnected, practically prefabrication was done on construction site only.

Therefore, it allowed the appeal in the favour of the respondent- assessee.

3. Can re-appreciation of evidence by CESTAT be considered to be rectification of mistake apparent on record under section 35C(2) of the Central Excise Act, 1944?

CCE v. RDC Concrete (India) Pvt. Ltd. 2011 (270) E.L.T. 625 (S.C.)

Decision of the case: In the instant case, the arguments not accepted at an earlier point of time were accepted by the CESTAT while hearing the application for rectification of mistake and it arrived at a conclusion different from earlier one.

The Apex Court elucidated that re-appreciation of evidence on a debatable point cannot be said to be rectification of mistake apparent on record. It is a well settled law that a mistake apparent on record must be an obvious and patent mistake and the mistake should not be such which can be established by a long drawn process of reasoning.

The Supreme Court observed that arguments not accepted earlier during disposal of appeal cannot be accepted while hearing rectification of mistake application. Submissions made before Tribunal while arguing rectification of mistake application had also been advanced before Tribunal when appeal heard at earlier stage. The Apex Court

held that CESTAT had reconsidered its legal view as it concluded differently by accepting the arguments which it had rejected earlier.

Hence, the Court opined that CESTAT exceeded its powers under section 35C(2) of the Act. In pursuance of a rectification application, it cannot re-appreciate the evidence and reconsider its legal view taken earlier.

Note: Section 35C(2) reads as under:-

The Appellate Tribunal may, at any time within six months from the date of the order, with a view to rectifying any mistake apparent from the record, amend any order passed by it under sub-section (1) and shall make such amendments if the mistake is brought to its notice by the Commissioner of Central Excise or the other party to the appeal.

4. Is the CESTAT order disposing appeal on a totally new ground sustainable?

CCE v. Gujchem Distillers 2011 (270) E.L.T. 338 (Bom.)

The High Court elucidated that in the instant case, the CESTAT had disposed of the appeal on a ground which was not urged by the respondents before the adjudicating authority. Thereby the CESTAT had disposed of the appeal on a totally new ground which was not laid before the adjudicating authority and which would entail a finding on facts.

The High Court explained that had the CESTAT not been satisfied with the approach of the adjudicating authority, it should have remanded the matter back to the adjudicating authority. However, it could not have assumed to itself the jurisdiction to decide the appeal on a ground which had not been urged before the lower authorities.

8

EXEMPTION BASED ON VALUE OF CLEARANCES (SSI)

1. Whether an assessee can claim the benefit of SSI exemption on the brand name of another firm if its proprietor is also a partner in such other firm?

Commissioner v. Elex Knitting Machinery Co. 2012 (283) E.L.T. A18 (S.C.)

Facts of the Case: The Elex Knitting Machinery Co. was engaged in the manufacture of flat knitting machines. They had been availing the SSI exemption. They were found using the brand name "ELEX" on those machines which belonged to M/s. Elex Engineering Works and according to the Central Excise Authorities, they were not entitled to avail the benefit of said notification. The proprietor of Elex Knitting Machinery Co. was a partner in M/s Elex Engineering Works.

Point of Dispute: The Department denied the benefit of the SSI exemption notification solely on the ground that they had manufactured and cleared the goods (flat knitting machines) under the brand name "ELEX" which belonged to M/s. ELEX Engineering Works.

Decision of the Court: The Supreme Court was of the view that the benefit of exemption could be availed only when the company is manufacturing the goods under its own brand name or the brand name being used belonged to a sister concern of that company.

The Supreme Court held that the appellant was eligible to claim benefit of the SSI exemption as the proprietor of Elex Knitting Machinery Co. was one of the partners in Elex Engineering Works. And hence being the co-owner of the brand name of Elex, he could not be said to have used the brand name of another person, in the manufacture and clearance of the goods in his individual capacity.

2. Whether the exempted goods on which duty has been paid by mistake by the assessee and refund thereof has also not been claimed would be excluded while computing turnover for current year for claiming SSI exemption?

Bonanzo Engg. & Chemical P. Ltd. v. CCEX. 2012 (277) E.L.T. 145 (S.C.)

Facts of the case: The appellant was a manufacturer of goods falling under Chapter headings 32 and 84 of the first schedule to the Central Excise Tariff Act, 1985. The goods falling under Chapter heading 84 were wholly exempt from duty vide an exemption notification, but the appellant by mistake paid the excise duty on it and did not even claim

refund of the same. For goods falling under Chapter heading 32, the appellant wanted to claim SSI exemption.

For the purposes of computing the eligible turnover for SSI exemption, the assessee excluded the goods which were exempted although duty was paid mistakenly on them. However, the Revenue contended that clearances of such goods should be included while computing the eligible turnover although the appellant satisfied all the other conditions for claiming the SSI exemption.

Decision of the Case: The Supreme Court opined that SSI exemption would be allowable to the assessee, as they meet all the conditions thereof. The amount of clearances in the SSI exemption notification needs to be computed after excluding the value of exempted goods. Merely because the assessee by mistake paid duty on the goods which were exempted from the duty payment under some other notification, did not mean that the goods would become goods liable for duty under the Act. Secondly, merely because the assessee had not claimed any refund on the duty paid by him would not come in the way of claiming benefit of the SSI exemption.

Accordingly, the appeal was allowed in the favor of the appellant-assessee. The Court directed the adjudicating authority to apply the SSI exemption notification in the assessee's case without taking into consideration the excess duty paid by the assessee under the other exemption notification.

3. Whether the clearances of two firms having common brand name, goods being manufactured in the same factory premises, having common management and accounts etc. can be clubbed for the purposes of SSI exemption?

CCE v. Deora Engineering Works 2010 (255) ELT 184 (P & H)

Facts of the case: The respondent-assessee was using the brand name of "Dominant" while clearing the goods manufactured by it. One more manufacturing unit was also engaged in the manufacture and clearance of the same goods under the same brand name of "Dominant" in the same premises. Both the firms had common partners, the brand name was also common and the machines were cleared from both the units under common serial number having common accounts. Department clubbed the clearance of the goods from the both the units for the purposes of SSI exemption because both the units belong to same persons and they had common machinery, staff and office premises etc.

Decision of the case: The High Court held that indisputably, in the instant case, that the partners of both the firms were common and belonged to same family. They were manufacturing and clearing the goods by the common brand name, manufactured in the same factory premises, having common management and accounts etc. Therefore, High Court was of the considered view that the clearance of the common goods under the same brand name manufactured by both the firms had been rightly clubbed.

SETTLEMENT COMMISSION

1. Can the Settlement Commission decline to grant immunity from prosecution and confirming the demand and imposing the penalty without placing the burden on the Department to prove the clandestine manufacture and clearances of goods?

Maruthi Tex Print & Processors P. Ltd. v. C. & C. Ex. Sett.Comm., Chennai 2012(281) E.L.T. 509 (Mad.)

Facts of the Case: M/s. Maruthi Tex Print & Processors Pvt. Limited, Hyderabad, was a concern registered with the Excise Department for manufacture of man-made fabrics (MMF) and also for manufacture of cotton fabrics. During the course of business, search was carried out at various places, including the factory, registered office premises, their godown and dealers' premises, which resulted in recovery of certain records relating to delivery of processed fabrics, and seizure of certain quantities of grey and processed fabrics. The Department issued SCN confirming demand at the higher rate of duty and interest and penalty thereon and seized goods also. However, there was no clear evidence to hold that the fabrics mentioned in all delivery challans were attracting higher rate of duty. The assessee approached the Settlement Commission. The Settlement Commission confirmed the entire demand, penalty, seizure and denied the immunity from the prosecution. The assessee approached the High Court.

Point of Dispute: Can the Settlement Commission decline to grant immunity from prosecution after confirming the demand and imposing the penalty?

Decision of the Court: The High Court held that when an allegation of clandestine manufacture and clearances is made, the person making the allegation should establish the complete charge including the nature of the goods and its value involved for determining the appropriate demand of duty.

Secondly, the Settlement Commission can be approached if a person, who suffered a show cause notice on the charge of evasion of duty, finally wants to settle the matter, by making full disclosure admitting certain omissions/commissions. The Settlement Commission, by looking at the onus upon the Department to prove about the nature of goods cleared without payment of duty, should decide the matter. However, in the present case, without placing the burden on the Department to prove their case, the Settlement Commission confirmed the demand on the assessee.

Settlement Commission should not have refused the benefit of immunity from prosecution. Hence, that part of refusal to grant immunity for prosecution is alone interfered with. Accordingly, the Court set aside the order relating to non-grant of immunity for prosecution and resultantly, the assessee was granted immunity from being prosecuted.

2. Whether a consolidated return filed by the assessee after obtaining registration, but for the period prior to obtaining registration, could be treated as a return under clause (a) of first proviso to section 32E(1)?

Icon Industries v. UOI 2011 (273) E.L.T. 487 (Del.)

Facts of the case: The petitioner got its units registered after few days of the search conducted in its units. Thereafter, it filed consolidated return with the Department for the period prior to search. After that, it filed a settlement application in respect of the proceedings issued by the Commissioner.

The Settlement Commission opined that the units were registered only after the search was conducted and prior to that there was no registration and no returns as mandated by clause (a) of first proviso to section 32E(1) of the Central Excise Act, 1944 were filed. Consequently, the Commission rejected the settlement application on the ground that the application did not conform to the parameters as stipulated under section 32E(1) of the Act.

Decision of the case: The High Court noted that certain riders have been provided in section 32E(1) for entertaining applications for settlement. Clause (a) of first proviso clearly lays down that unless the applicant has filed returns, showing production, clearance and Central Excise duty paid in the prescribed manner, no such application shall be entertained.

The Court referred the case of *M/s. Emerson Electric Company India Pvt. Ltd.* wherein it was held that although section 32E(1) does not refer to rule 12 of the Central Excise Rules, 2002 under which ER-1/ER-3 returns are prescribed, since the said returns contain details of excisable goods manufactured, cleared and duty paid in the prescribed manner, the said return can be deemed to be the 'return' referred to in section 32E(1). Hence, the concept of return has to be understood in context of rule 12 of the Central Excise Rules, 2002. However, in case of consolidated returns filed in the instant case, the applicant would not be able to indicate 'duty paid' in the prescribed manner (or even in any manner) and question would continue to agitate about the details of production and clearance to be filled in such belated returns.

Considering the above discussion, it rejected the submission of the petitioner that filing of consolidated return covering all the past periods would serve the purpose. Hence, it held that the order passed by the Settlement Commission was absolutely justifiable.

3. Is the Settlement Commission empowered to grant the benefit under the proviso to section 11AC in cases of settlement?

Ashwani Tobacco Co. Pvt. Ltd. v. UOI 2010 (251) E.L.T. 162 (Del.)

Decision of the case: The Court ruled that benefit under the proviso to section 11AC could not be granted by the Settlement Commission in cases of settlement.

It elucidated that the order of settlement made by the Settlement Commission is distinct from the adjudication order made by the Central Excise Officer. The scheme of settlement is contained in Chapter-V of the Central Excise Act, 1944 while adjudication undertaken by a Central Excise Officer is contained in the other Chapters of the said Act. Unlike Settlement Commission, Central Excise Officer has no power to accord immunity from prosecution while determining duty liability under the Excise Act.

Once the petitioner has adopted the course of settlement, he has to be governed by the provisions of Chapter V. Therefore, the benefit under the proviso to section 11AC, which could have been availed when the matter of determination of duty was before a Central Excise Officer was not attracted to the cases of a settlement, undertaken under the provisions of Chapter-V of the Act.

SERVICE TAX

IMPORTANT NOTE

The Finance Act, 2012 made a major shift in the service tax regime effective from July 1, 2012. While some of the areas of the taxability have been changed completely, some other, which are more of procedural in nature have been retained as they were in the old regime (i.e. prior to 1st July, 2012). Broadly, the change can be summarised as follows:

- In the old regime, about 119 services were taxable as per their respective definition, in the new regime, there is a single definition of service encompassing almost all activities not related to sale or manufacture of goods/ immovable property.
- The rules relating to export and import of services in the old regime have been omitted and a new set of rules namely Place of Provision of Services Rules, 2012 (POP rules) have been introduced.
- There is no major change in the Service Tax Rules, 1994 and Point of Taxation rules, 2011.
- There is no fundamental change in the Service Tax (Determination of Value of Services) Rules, 2006. The changes in the rules majorly relate to the change in definition and taxability of works contract service.

In the above background, please note that the judgments discussed in the service tax relate to the law applicable in the old regime. However, these judgments would remain relevant in the new regime also. While the fundamental principles, based on which these judgments have been made remain the same in the new regime, the manner and placement of related provision may be different in the new regime.

BASIC CONCEPTS OF SERVICE TAX

1. Whether the service tax liability created under law can be shifted by a clause entered in the contract?

Rashtriya Ispat Nigam Ltd. v. Dewan Chand Ram Saran 2012 (26) S.T.R. 289 (S.C.)

Facts of the Case: Rashtriya Ispat Nigam Ltd., the appellant was engaged in the manufacture of steel products and pig-iron for sale in the domestic and export markets. The respondent was a partnership firm carrying on the business of clearing and forwarding agents. In the year 1997, the appellant appointed the respondent as the handling contractor in respect of appellant's iron and steel materials from their stockyard. A formal contract was entered into between the two of them. One of the terms and conditions of the contract read as follows:-

"The contractor shall bear and pay all taxes, duties and other liabilities in connection with discharge of his obligations under this order. Any income tax or any other taxes or duties which the company may be required by law to deduct shall be deducted at source and the same shall be paid to the tax authorities for the account of the contractor and the service recipient shall provide the contractor with required tax deduction certificate."

In the year 2000, liability to pay service tax in case of clearing and forwarding agent's services was shifted from service provider (contractor in the given case) to service receiver retrospectively from 16-7-1997 (refer note below). Consequent thereupon, the appellant deducted 5% tax on the bills of the respondent. The respondent, however, refused to accept the deductions saying that the contractual clause cannot alter the liability placed on the service recipient (appellant) by law.

Point of Dispute: Where the law places liability to pay service tax on the service recipient, can the service provider be made liable to pay service tax on account of such clause provided in the contract?

Decision of the Case: The Supreme Court observed that reading the agreement between the parties as a whole and harmonizing various provisions thereof, it can be inferred that service provider (contractor) accepted liability to pay service tax, since it arose out of discharge of their obligations under contract.

With regard to the submission of shifting of tax liability, Supreme Court held that service tax is indirect tax which may be passed on. Thus, assessee can contract to shift their liability. Finance Act, 1994 is relevant only between assessee and tax authorities; it is irrelevant to

determine rights and liabilities between service provider and recipient as agreed in contract between them. There is nothing in law to prevent them from entering into agreement regarding burden of tax arising under contract between them.

Note: In present context, liability to pay service tax does not lie on service recipient under clearing and forwarding agent's services. However, the principle derived in the above judgment that 'service tax liability can be shifted by one party on to the other by way of contractual clause' still holds good.

2. Will service tax paid mistakenly arouse service tax liability?

CCE (A) v. KVR Construction 2012 (26) STR 195 (Kar.)

Facts of the Case: KVR Construction was a construction company rendering services under category of "construction of residential complex service" and were paying the service tax in accordance with Finance Act, 1994. They undertook certain construction work on behalf of a trust and paid service tax accordingly. However, later they filed refund claim for the service tax so paid contending that they were not actually liable to pay service tax as it was exempt.

The appellant, on the other hand, rejected the refund claim on the ground that the refund application filed by the respondent-assessee was beyond the limitation period as stated in section 11B of Central Excise Act. Department did not dispute the fact that service tax was exempted in the instant case.

Point of Dispute: Is assessee liable to claim refund on service tax paid on construction activity so done by them?

Decision of the Case: The Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka, distinguishing the landmark judgment by Supreme Court in the case of *Mafatlal Industries v. UOI 1997 (89) E.L.T. 247 (S.C.)* relating to refund of duty/tax, held that service tax paid mistakenly under construction service although actually exempt, is payment made without authority of law. Mere payment of amount would not make it 'service tax' payable by the respondents. When once there is lack of authority to collect such service tax from the respondent, it would not give authority to Department to retain such amount and validate it. In view of the above, it was held that refund of an amount mistakenly paid as service tax could not be rejected on ground of limitation under section 11B of the Central Excise Act, 1944.

3. Is the service tax and excise liability mutually exclusive?

Commissioner of Service Tax v. Lincoln Helios (India) Ltd. 2011 (23) S.T.R. 112 (Kar.)

Facts of the case: The assessee undertook not only manufacture and sale of its products, but also erected and commissioned the finished products. The customer was charged for the services rendered as well as the value of the manufactured products. The assessee had paid the excise duty on whole value including that for services, but did not

pay the service tax on the value of services on the ground that there could not be levy of tax under two parliamentary legislations.

Decision of the case: The High Court held that the excise duty is levied on the aspect of manufacture and service tax is levied on the aspect of services rendered. Hence, it would not amount to payment of tax twice and the assessee would be liable to pay service tax on the value of services.

4. In case where rooms have been rented out by Municipality, can it pass the burden of service tax to the service receivers i.e. tenants?

Kishore K.S. v. Cherthala Municipality 2011 (24) S.T.R. 538 (Ker.)

Facts of the case: The petitioners entered into agreements with the respondent-Municipality and had taken rooms on rent from it. They were called upon to pay service tax.

The primary contentions of the petitioners were as follows:-

- (a) Under the agreement, there was no provision for payment of service tax. Therefore, the demand for payment of service tax was illegal. Further, service tax was payable by the Municipality and there was no authority with which the Municipality could pass it on to the petitioners.
- (b) Since they were small tenants, the Municipality must be treated as units of the State within the meaning of Article 289 of the Constitution of India and, therefore, levy of service tax on the property or on the income of the Municipality was unsustainable.

The Revenue contended that service tax was an indirect tax. Though primarily the person liable to pay the tax was Municipality, there was nothing in the law which prevented passing of the liability to the tenants.

Decision of the case: The High Court rejected the contentions of the assessee and opined as under:-

- (a) As regards the contention that there was no mention of the service tax liability in the contract, the Court held that this is a statutory right of the service provider/Municipality by virtue of the provisions under law to pass it on to the tenants. It is another matter that they may decide not to pass it on fully or partly. It is not open to the petitioners to challenge the validity of the demand for service tax, in view of the fact that service tax is an indirect tax and the law provides that it can be passed on to the beneficiary. Hence, the service tax can be passed on by the service provider i.e. Municipality.
- (b) The word "State" in Article 289 does not embrace within its scope the Municipalities. Hence, when service tax is levied on the Municipality there is no violation of Article 289. Moreover, Municipality has not raised the contention that there was a violation of Article 289.

Hence, it was held that Municipality can pass on the burden of service tax to the tenants.

5. Were services provided to the pilgrims taxable under short term accommodation service?

Tirumala Tirupati Devasthanams, Tirupati V. Superintendent of Customs, Central Excise, Service Tax (2012-TIOL-97-HC-AP-ST)

Facts of the Case: Tirumala Tirupati Devasthanams, Tirupati was running guest houses for the pilgrims. The department issued S.C.N stating that the assessee were liable to get service tax registration under "short term accommodation service" and thus liable to pay service tax. The assessee, on the other hand, submitted that they were not club or any other association and thus, were not liable to get registered under service tax.

Point of Dispute: Assessee contested that since they were running guest houses without any profit motive hence they were not liable to pay service tax.

Decision of the Case: The Andhra Pradesh High Court held that the petitioner was religious and charitable institution and was running guest houses by whatever name called, whether it was a shelter for pilgrims or any other name for a considerable time and thus was liable to get itself registered under 'Short term accommodation service' and pay service tax on the same.

Note: In the new regime, this case would be relevant in context of short accommodation service.

6. Can a software be treated as goods and if so, whether its supply to a customer as per an "End User Licence Agreement" (EULA) would be treated as sale or service?

Infotech Software Dealers Association (ISODA) v. Union of India 2010 (20) STR 289 (Mad.)

Decision of the case: The High Court observed that the law as to whether the software is goods or not is no longer res integra as it has been settled by the Supreme Court ruling in *TCS case [2004 (178) ELT 22 (SC)]*. The High Court reiterated that software is goods as per Article 366(12) of the Constitution. A software programme may consist of various commands which enable the computer to perform a designated task. The copyright in that programme may remain with the originator of the programme. Goods could be tangible property or an intangible one. A software, whether customized or non-customised, would become goods provided it has the attributes thereof having regard to (a) utility (b) capable of being bought and sold (c) capable of transmitted, transferred, delivered, stored and possessed.

On the issue as to whether the transaction would amount to sale or service, the High Court was of the view that it would depend upon the nature of individual transaction. The High Court stated that as a transaction could be exclusive sale or exclusive service or composite one i.e., where the element of sales and service both are involved; the nature of transaction becomes relevant for imposition of tax. The High Court explained that when a statute, particularly a taxing statute is considered with reference to the legislative

competence, the nature of transaction and the dominant intention on such transaction would be relevant.

In the instant case, the terms of EULA indicated the dominant intention of parties whereby the developer retained the copyright of each software, be it canned, packaged or customised, and only the right to use with copyright protection was transferred to the subscribers or the members. The High Court opined that in the transactions taking place between the members of ISODA with its customers, the software is not sold as such, but only the contents of the data stored in the software are sold which would only amount to service and not sale. Further, the High Court was of the view that such transactions could also not be treated as deemed sale under Article 366(29A)(d) of the Constitution of India as that requires a transfer of right to use any goods and in the instant case, the goods as such are not transferred.

As regards constitutional validity of service tax levy on information technology software service, the High Court did not agree with the contention of the assessee that since software is goods, all transactions between the members of ISODA and their customers would amount to sales and be liable to sales tax/VAT and that State Government alone would be competent to enact law therefor. The High Court observed that though software is goods, the transaction may not amount to sale in all cases and it may vary depending upon the terms of EULA. The High Court stated that the relevant test for this purpose would be whether section 65(105)(zzzz) of the Finance Act, 1994* can be brought under Entry 97 of List I of Schedule VII of Constitution as the Parliament has the legislative competence to make laws for service tax in terms of the said entry. Entry 97 is a residuary entry and relates to taxable service. The High Court referred to the case of *Tamil Nadu Kalyana Mandapam Association v. Union Of India* 2006 (3) STR 260 (SC) wherein it was held by the Apex Court that the Parliament is empowered to make law for service tax under said residuary powers in the absence of entry under List II. Thus, the High Court held that amended provisions to levy service tax on IT software service are not unconstitutional by virtue of the residuary power available to the Parliament under Entry 97.

**Note: Services of development, design, programming, customisation, adaptation, upgradation, enhancement, implementation of information technology software have now been included in the declared service under section 66E.*

7. Whether service tax is chargeable on the buffer subsidy provided by the Government for storage of free sale sugar, under the category of 'storage and warehousing services'?

CCE v. Nahar Industrial Enterprises Ltd. 2010 (19) STR 166 (P & H)

Facts of the case: The assessee was engaged in the manufacture of sugar. The Central Government directed him to maintain buffer stock of free sale sugar for the specified period. In order to compensate the assessee, the Government of India extended buffer

subsidy towards storage, interest and insurance charges for the said buffer stock of sugar.

Revenue issued a show cause notice to the assessee raising the demand of service tax alleging that amount received by the assessee as buffer subsidy was for the services covered within the definition of 'storage and warehousing services'.

Decision of the case: The High Court noted that apparently, service tax could be levied only if service of 'storage and warehousing' was provided. Nobody can provide service to himself. In the instant case, the assessee stored the goods owned by him. After the expiry of storage period, he was free to sell them to the buyers of its own choice. He had stored goods in compliance to directions of Government of India issued under the Sugar Development Fund Act, 1982. He had received subsidy not on account of services rendered to Government of India, but had received compensation on account of loss of interest, cost of insurance etc. incurred on account of maintenance of stock. Hence, the act of assessee could not be called as rendering of services.

The High Court upheld the Tribunal's decision that just because the storage period of free sale sugar had to be extended at the behest of Government of India, neither the assessee becomes 'storage and warehouse keeper' nor the Government of India becomes their 'client' in this regard. Therefore, the storage of specific quantity of free sale sugar could not be treated as providing 'storage and warehousing' services to the Government of India.

DEMAND, ADJUDICATION AND OFFENCES

1. Whether the penalty is payable even when service tax and interest has been paid before issue of show cause notice?

CCE & ST v. Adecco Flexione Workforce Solutions Ltd. 2012 (26) S.T.R 3 (Kar)

Facts of the Case: Adecco Flexione Workforce Solutions Ltd. had paid both the service tax and interest for delayed payment before issue of show cause notice under the Act. Section 73(3) of the Finance Act, 1994 categorically stated that if the payment of service tax and interest has been intimated to the authorities in writing, the authorities should not serve any notice for the amount so paid. But to the above, the authorities issued SCN to the appellant for delay in payment of service tax.

Point of Dispute: Assessee contested the issue of SCN when they had already paid the service tax along with interest for delayed payment of service tax.

Decision of the Case: The Karnataka High Court held that the authorities had no authority to initiate proceedings for recovery of penalty under section 76 of the Act when the tax payer paid service tax along with interest for delayed payments promptly. As per section 73(3), no notice shall be served against persons who had paid tax with interest; the authorities can initiate proceedings against defaulters who had not paid tax and not to harass persons who had paid tax with interest on their own. If the notices were issued contrary to this section, the person who had issued notice should be punishable and not the person to whom it was issued.

OTHER PROVISIONS

1. Can appeal be filed to High Court for deciding the question relating to the taxability of service tax?

CCEx. & ST v. Volvo India Ltd. 2011 (24) S.T.R. 25 (Kar.)

Decision of the case: The High Court held that the question as to whether the assessee is liable to pay service tax falls squarely within the exception carved cut in section 35G of the Central Excise Act, 1944, '*an order relating, among other things, to the determination of any question having a relation to the rate of duty of excise or to the value of goods for purposes of assessment*', and the High Court has no jurisdiction to adjudicate the said issue. The appeal lies to the Apex Court under section 35L of the Central Excise Act, 1944, which alone has exclusive jurisdiction to decide the said question.

CUSTOMS

1

BASIC CONCEPTS

1. In case no statutory definition is provided under law, can the opinion of expert in trade who deals in those goods be considered while determining duty liability?

Commissioner of Customs (Import), Mumbai v. Konkan Synthetic Fibres 2012 (278) E.L.T. 37 (S.C.)

Facts of the Case: Konkan Synthetic Fibres was an importer. It had imported one unit of the equipment which was declared as "Kari Mayer High Speed Draw Warping Machine with 1536 ends along with essential spares". The importer claimed that these goods are covered under an exemption notification.

Under said notification, exemption was available in respect of the High Speed Warping Machine with yarn tensioning, pneumatic suction devices and accessories. Undisputedly, the assessee had imported High Speed Warping Machine, but it had drawing unit and not the pneumatic suction device. The textile commissioner, who was well conversant with these machines, had stated that the goods imported by the assessee were covered under the exemption notification. He further stated that drawing unit was just an essential accessory to the machines imported by assessee and, therefore, was covered under said notification. The opinion so furnished is taken note of by the Tribunal while granting relief to the assessee.

The Customs authorities refused to accept the request of the assessee and accordingly, had directed the assessee to pay the duty under the provisions of the Customs Act, 1962.

Point of Dispute: Revenue contended that the machine imported by the assessee was not in consonance with the exemption notification and, therefore, the benefit of exemption should not be available under the notification to the assessee.

Decision of the Case: The Supreme Court stated that it was a settled proposition in a fiscal or taxation law that while ascertaining the scope or expressions used in a particular entry, the opinion of the expert in the field of trade, who deals in those goods, should not be ignored, rather it should be given due importance. The Supreme Court on referring to the case of *Collector of Customs v. Swastik Woollens (P) Ltd. 1988 (37) E.L.T. 474 (S.C.)*, held that when no statutory definition was provided in respect of an item in the Customs Act or the Central Excise Act, the trade understanding, i.e. the understanding in the opinion of those who deal with the goods in question was the safest guide.

Thus, the Supreme Court concluded that the imported goods were covered under the exemption notification.

2. Are the clearance of goods from DTA to Special Economic Zone chargeable to export duty under the SEZ Act, 2005 or the Customs Act, 1962?

Tirupati Udyog Ltd. v. UOI 2011 (272) E.L.T. 209 (A.P.)

Decision of the case: The High Court, while deciding the aforesaid question of law, made the following observations:-

- A charging section has to be construed strictly. If a person has not been brought within the ambit of the charging section by clear words he cannot be taxed at all.
- SEZ Act does not contain any provision for levy and collection of export duty for goods supplied by a DTA unit to a Unit in a Special Economic Zone for its authorised operations. In the absence of a charging provision in the SEZ Act providing for the levy of customs duty on such goods, export duty cannot be levied on the DTA supplier by implication.
- With regard to the Customs Act, 1962, a conjoint reading of section 12(1) with sections 2(18), 2(23) and 2(27) of the Customs Act, 1962 makes it clear that customs duty can be levied only on goods imported into or exported beyond the territorial waters of India. Since both the SEZ unit and the DTA unit are located within the territorial waters of India, Section 12(1) of the Customs Act 1962 (which is the charging section for levy of customs duty) is not attracted for supplies made by a DTA unit to a unit located within the Special Economic Zone.

The High Court thus inferred that the clearance of goods from DTA to Special Economic Zone is not liable to export duty either under the SEZ Act, 2005 or under the Customs Act, 1962.

Notes:

1. Chapter X-A of the Customs Act, 1962, inserted by Finance Act 2002, contained special provisions relating to Special Economic Zones. However, with effect from 11-5-2007, Chapter X-A, in its entirety, was repealed by Finance Act, 2007. Consequently, Chapter X-A of the Customs Act is considered as a law which never existed for the purposes of actions initiated after its repeal.
2. Karnataka High Court in case of *CCE v. Biocon Ltd.* 2011 (267) E.L.T. 28 has also taken a similar view as elucidated in the aforesaid judgment.

LEVY OF AND EXEMPTIONS FROM CUSTOMS DUTY

1. Whether remission of duty is permissible under section 23 of the Customs Act, 1962 when the remission application is filed after the expiry of the warehousing period (including extended warehousing period)?

CCE v. Decorative Laminates (I) Pvt. Ltd. 2010 (257) E.L.T. 61 (Kar.)

Facts of the case: The respondent imported resin impregnated paper and plywood for the purpose of manufacture of furniture. The said goods were warehoused from the date of its import. The respondent sought an extension of the warehousing period which was granted by the authorities. However, even after the expiry of the said date, it did not remove the goods from the warehouse. Subsequently, the assessee applied for remission of duty under section 23 of the Customs Act, 1962 on the ground that the said goods had become unfit for use on account of non-availability of orders for clearance.

Decision of the case: The High Court, while interpreting section 23, stipulated that section 23 states that only when the imported goods have been lost or destroyed at any time before clearance for home consumption, the application for remission of duty can be considered. Further, even before an order for clearance of goods for home consumption is made, relinquishing of title to the goods can be made; in such event also, an importer would not be liable to pay duty.

Therefore, the expression “*at any time before clearance for home consumption*” would mean the time period as per the initial order during which the goods are warehoused or before the expiry of the extended date for clearance and not any period after the lapse of the aforesaid periods. The said expression cannot extend to a period after the lapse of the extended period merely because the licence holder has not cleared the goods within the stipulated time.

Moreover, since in the given case, the goods continued to be in the warehouse, even after the expiry of the warehousing period, it would be a case of goods improperly removed from the warehouse as per section 72(1)(b) read with section 71.

The High Court, overruling the decision of the Tribunal, held that the circumstances made out under section 23 were not applicable to the present case since the destruction of the goods or loss of the goods had not occurred before the clearance for home consumption within the meaning of that section. When the goods are not cleared within the period or extended period as given by the authorities, their continuance in the warehouse will not attract section 23 of the Act.

CLASSIFICATION OF GOODS

1. Where a classification (under a Customs Tariff head) is recognized by the Government in a notification any point of time, can the same be made applicable in a previous classification in the absence of any conscious modification in the Tariff?

Keihin Penalfa Ltd. v. Commissioner of Customs 2012 (278) E.L.T. 578 (S.C.)

Facts of the Case: Department contended that 'Electronic Automatic Regulators' were classifiable under Chapter sub-heading 8543.89 whereas Keihin Penalfa Ltd. was of the view that the aforesaid goods were classifiable under Chapter sub-heading 9032.89. An exemption notification dated 1-3-2002 exempted the disputed goods classifying them under chapter sub-heading 9032.89. The period of dispute, however, was prior to 1-3-2002.

Point of Dispute: The dispute was on classification of Electronic Automatic Regulators.

Decision of the Court: The Apex Court observed that the Central Government has issued a exemption notification dated 1-3-2002 and in the said notification it has classified the Electronic Automatic Regulators under Chapter sub-heading 9032.89. Since the Revenue itself has classified the goods in dispute under Chapter sub-heading 9032.89 from 1-3-2002, the said classification need to be accepted.

2. Whether classification of the imported product changes if it undergoes a change after importation and before being actually used?

Atherton Engineering Co. Pvt. Ltd. v. UOI 2010 (256) E.L.T. 358 (Cal.)

Decision of the case: The Court noted that it was the use of the product that had to be considered in the instant case. If a product undergoes some change after importation till the time it is actually used, it is immaterial, provided it remains the same product and it is used for the purpose specified in the classification. Therefore, in the instant case, it examined whether the nature and character of the product remained the same.

The Court opined that if the embryo within the egg was incubated in controlled temperature and under hydration, a larva was born. This larva did not assume the character of any different product. Its nature and characteristics were same as the product or organism which was within the egg.

Hence, the Court held that the said product should be classified as feeding materials for prawns under the heading 2309. These embryos might not be proper prawn feed at the time of importation but could become so, after incubation.

Note - The Headings cited in this case law may not co-relate with the Headings of the present Customs Tariff as this case relates to an earlier point of time.

3. Will the description of the goods as per the documents submitted along with the Shipping Bill be a relevant criterion for the purpose of classification, if not otherwise disputed on the basis of any technical opinion or test? Whether a separate notice is required to be issued for payment of interest which is mandatory and automatically applies for recovery of excess drawback?

M/s CPS Textiles P Ltd. v. Joint Secretary 2010 (255) ELT 228 (Mad.)

Decision of the case: The High Court held that the description of the goods as per the documents submitted along with the Shipping Bill would be a relevant criteria for the purpose of classification, if not otherwise disputed on the basis of any technical opinion or test. The petitioner could not plead that the exported goods should be classified under different headings contrary to the description given in the invoice and the Shipping Bill which had been assessed and cleared for export.

Further, the Court, while interpreting section 75A(2) of the Customs Act, 1962, noted that when the claimant is liable to pay the excess amount of drawback, he is liable to pay interest as well. The section provides for payment of interest automatically along with excess drawback. No notice need be issued separately as the payment of interest become automatic, once it is held that excess drawback has to be repaid.

VALUATION UNDER THE CUSTOMS ACT, 1962

1. Whether subsequent increase in the market price of the imported goods due to inflation would lead to increase in customs duty although the contract price between the parties has not increased accordingly?

Commissioner of Cus., Vishakhapatnam v. Aggarwal Industries Ltd. 2011 E.L.T. 641 (S.C.)

Facts of the Case: On 26th June 2001, Aggarwal Industries Ltd. entered into a contract with foreign suppliers viz M/s. Wilmar Trading Pvt. Ltd., Singapore, for import of 500 metric tons of crude sunflower seed oil at the rate of US \$ 435 CIF/metric ton. Under the contract, the consignment was to be shipped in the month of July 2001. However, the mutually agreed time for shipment was extended to 'mid August 2001'. Thus, the goods were actually shipped on 5th August 2001 at the price prevailing at the contract date.

Point of Dispute: The Revenue contended that when actual shipment took place, after the expiry of the original shipment period, the international market price of crude sunflower seed oil had increased drastically, and, therefore, the contract price could not be accepted as the 'transaction value' in terms of rule 4 of the erstwhile Customs Valuation (Determination of Price of Imported Goods) Rules, 1988 [now rule 3 of Customs Valuation (Determination of Value of Imported Goods) Rules, 2007]. Therefore the duty should be imposed on the increased prices.

Decision of the Case: The Supreme Court held that in the instant case, the contract for supply of crude sunflower seed oil @ US \$ 435 CIF/ metric ton was entered into on 26th June 2001. It could not be performed on time because of which extension of time for shipment was agreed between the contracting parties. It is true that the commodity involved had volatile fluctuations in its price in the international market, but having delayed the shipment; the supplier did not increase the price of the commodity even after the increase in its price in the international market. There was no allegation of the supplier and importer being in collusion. Thus, the appeal was allowed in the favour of the respondent- assessee.

1. Whether the issue of the imported goods warehoused in the premises of 100% EOU for manufacture/production/processing in 100% EOU would amount to clearance for home consumption?

Paras Fab International v. CCE 2010 (256) E.L.T. 556 (Tri. – LB)

Issue: Following questions arose before the Larger Bench of the Tribunal for consideration:-

- (a) Whether the entire premises of 100% EOU should be treated as a warehouse?
- (b) Whether the imported goods warehoused in the premises of 100% EOU are to be held to have been removed from the warehouse if the same is issued for manufacture/production/processing by the 100% EOU?
- (c) Whether issue for use by 100% EOU would amount to clearance for home consumption?
- (d) Whether non-filing of ex-bond bill of entry before using the goods by the 100% EOU makes the goods as not cleared for home consumption?

Facts of the case: The appellants were 100% EOU in Alwar. They imported the impugned goods namely HSD oil through Kandla Port and filed 'into Bond Bill of Entry' for warehousing the imported goods. The impugned goods were warehoused in their 100% EOU in Alwar and subsequently used in the factory within the premises of the 100% EOU for manufacture of the finished goods. The Department demanded customs duty on the impugned goods.

The contention of the appellants was that since (i) the entire premises of the 100% EOU had been licensed as a warehouse under the Customs Act; (ii) the impugned goods had been warehoused therein and subsequently utilized for manufacture of finished goods in bond; and (iii) the impugned goods had not been removed from the warehouse, there could not be any question of demanding duty on the same.

Department contended that the entire premises of the 100% EOU could not be treated as a warehouse. The Appellants had executed a common bond B-17 for fulfilling the requirements under the Customs Act, 1962 and the Central Excise Act, 1944. Under the Central Excise Law, the removal of goods for captive consumption would be treated as removal of goods and the assessee were required to pay duty on such removal.

Decision of the case: The Tribunal observed that as per Customs manual, the premises of EOU are approved as a Customs bonded warehouse under the Warehousing provisions of the Customs Act. It is also stated therein that the manufacturing and other operations are to be carried out under customs bond. The goods are required to be imported into the EOU premises directly and prior to undertaking import, the unit is required to get the premises customs bonded. The imported goods, except capital goods and spares are required to be utilized within a period of one year or within such period as may be extended by the Customs authorities and the importer is required to maintain a proper record and proper account of the import, consumption and utilization of all imported materials and exports made and file periodical returns. The EOUs are licensed to manufacture goods within the bonded premises for the purpose of export.

Tribunal held that neither the scheme of the Act nor the provisions contained in the Manual require filing of ex-bond bills of entry or payment of duty before taking the imported goods for manufacturing in bond nor there is any provision to treat such goods as deemed to have been removed for the purpose of the Customs Act, 1962.

The Tribunal answered the issues raised as follows:-

- (a) The entire premises of a 100% EOU has to be treated as a warehouse if the licence granted under section 58 to the unit is in respect of the entire premises.
- (b), (c) and (d) Imported goods warehoused in the premises of a 100% EOU (which is licensed as a Customs bonded warehouse) and used for the purpose of manufacturing in bond as authorized under section 65 of the Customs Act, 1962, cannot be treated to have been removed for home consumption.

1. Whether Revenue can prefer an appeal in case of a consent order?

CCus v. Trilux Electronics 2010 (253) E.L.T. 367 (Kar.)

Decision of the case: High Court held that if an order was passed by CESTAT based on consent and the matter was remanded at the instance of Revenue, then Revenue could not pursue an appeal against such order in a higher forum.

In the instant case, the Tribunal had remanded the matter in order to re-compute the duty payable by the assessee on the basis of representation of Revenue. Thereafter, the Revenue filed an appeal against the said order.

The assessee contended that the appeal filed by the Revenue was not maintainable since the order had been passed by the Tribunal on the submission of the representative of the Revenue. Further, since it is a consent order, no appeal would lie. The High Court held that an appeal against the consent order cannot be filed by the Revenue.

Note: A consent order is a judicial decree expressing a voluntary agreement between parties to a suit, especially an agreement by a defendant to cease activities alleged by the Government to be illegal in return for an end to the charges.

1. Whether Chartered Accountant's certificate alone is sufficient evidence to rule out the unjust enrichment under customs?

CCus., Chennai v. BPL Ltd. 2010 (259) E.L.T. 526 (Mad.)

Decision of the case: The High Court noted that section 27 of the Customs Act mandates on the importer to produce such documents or other evidence, while seeking refund, to establish that the amount of duty in relation to which such refund is claimed, has not been passed on by him to any other person.

However, in the given case, the respondent had not produced any document other than the certificate issued by the Chartered Accountant to substantiate its refund claim. The certificate issued by the Chartered Accountant was merely a piece of evidence acknowledging certain facts. It would not automatically entitle a person to refund in the absence of any other evidence. Hence, the respondent could not be granted refund merely on the basis of the said certificate.

Thus, the High Court, overruling the Tribunal's decision, answered the question of law in favour of revenue.

2. Can a refund claim be filed under section 27 of the Customs Act, 1962 if the payment of duty has not been made pursuant to an assessment order?

Aman Medical products Ltd. v. CCus., Delhi 2010 (250) ELT 30 (Del.)

Decision of the case: The assessee filed a Bill of Entry and paid the higher duty in ignorance of a notification which allowed him the payment of duty at a concessional rate. There was no assessment order for being challenged in the appeal which was passed under erstwhile section 27(1)(i) [now clause (a) of sub-section (1) of section 27] of the Act. The Revenue contended that a refund in appeal can be asked for under section 27 of the Customs Act, 1962 only if the payment of duty had been made pursuant to an assessment order.

Decision of the case: The High Court, referring to the language of section 27, interpreted that it is not necessary that the duty paid by the importer must be pursuant to an order of assessment. The duty paid by the importer can also be 'borne by him'. Clauses (i) and (ii) of erstwhile sub-section (1) of section 27 (now clause (a) and (b) of sub-section (1) of section 27) are clearly in the alternative because the expression 'or' is

found in between the two clauses. The object of section 27(ii) [now section 27(b)] is to cover those classes of case where the duty is paid by a person without an order of assessment.

The High Court held that the refund claim of the appellant was maintainable under section 27 and the non-filing of the appeal against the assessed bill of entry did not deprive the appellant to file its claim for refund under section 27 of the Customs Act, 1962. The refund claim, in the case on hand, would fall under clause (ii) of erstwhile sub-section (1) of section 27 [now clause (b) of sub-section (1) of section 27].

3. Can the assessee be denied the refund claim only on the basis of contention that he had produced the attested copy of TR-6 challan* and not the original of the TR-6 challan*?

Narayan Nambiar Meloths v. CCus. 2010 (251) E.L.T. 57 (Ker.)

Facts of the case: In the instant case, the refund application filed by the assessee was not entertained on the ground that the petitioner had not produced original of the TR-6 Challan* and what was produced was only an attested copy. According to respondents, production of original of the TR-6 challan* was a mandatory requirement for processing the refund application.

Decision of the case: The Kerala High Court decided that the petitioner could not be denied the refund claim on account of following mentioned grounds:-

Firstly, the Court opined that the only contention raised against the petitioner was that TR-6 Challan* he produced was only an attested copy, which was purely a technical contention and could not be accepted.

Secondly, as per clarification issued vide *F.No. 275/37/2K-CX. 8A dated 2-1-2002*, a simple letter from the person who made the deposit, requesting for return of the amount, along with the appellate order and attested Xerox copy of the Challan in Form TR-6* would suffice for processing the refund application. Evidently, in the instant case, the petitioner had fully complied with the requirement laid down in this clarification.

**Note: Now TR-6 Challan has been replaced with GAR-7 challan*

PROVISIONS RELATING TO ILLEGAL IMPORT, ILLEGAL EXPORT, CONFISCATION, PENALTY & ALLIED PROVISIONS

1. Whether discharge of liability on indicated value would still make the assessee liable for confiscation of goods if he has initially made a mis-declaration of the value thereof?

Wringley India Pvt.Ltd. v. Commr.of Cus.(Imports), Chennai 2011 (274) E.L.T. 172 (Mad.)

Facts of the Case: Wringley India Pvt. Ltd. had imported second-hand machinery along with spare parts from its sister concern located at Spain as per Bill of Entry dated 28-4-2006. There was indication in the invoice that the machinery was certified by M/s. S.G.S. Spain, the load port Chartered Engineer at Euro 35876.49. However, the certificate issued by M/s. S.G.S. Spain, the load port Chartered Engineer was not enclosed along with the Bill of Entry and only the invoice was submitted. Since the appellant didn't submit the valuation report, the Custom authorities referred the matter for valuation to local valuer. It entrusted the valuation to the local Chartered Engineer-M/s S.G.S. India Pvt. Ltd. During the process of valuation, M/s. S.G.S. India Private Limited found that the report originally issued by M/s. S.G.S. Spain was showing a higher value of goods than the value declared by the appellant to the customs authorities. Wringley India then paid duty on that high value indicated as per the original report of M/s. S.G.S. Spain.

Point of Dispute: The Revenue contended that since the appellant had mis-declared the value of the goods imported, therefore the imported goods should be confiscated under section 111(m) of the Customs Act, 1962.

Decision of the Case: The High Court held that since the appellant made an attempt to mis-declare the value of the imported goods and to misguide the Customs Department, which was also evident from the fact that when the Customs Department directed the appellant to obtain the certificate from the local Chartered Engineer, even at that time they did not disclose the true value assessed by the load port Chartered Engineer M/s. S.G.S. Spain. Even after obtaining the valuation certificate from M/s. S.G.S. India Private Limited, the appellant had no grievance. In fact the valuation so done by the local

Chartered Engineer was readily accepted by the appellant as evident from the letter issued by them to the Customs Department and the subsequent payment made by them.

The High Court was thus convinced that there was clear mis-declaration of value by the appellant and as per section 111(m) of the Customs Act, the Revenue was asked to confiscate the goods so imported.

2. Whether the smuggled goods can be re-exported from the customs area without formally getting them release from confiscation?

In Re: Hemal K. Shah (Order No. 102/2011-Cus., Dated 14-6-2011 In F.No. 380/82/B/10-RA)

Before the Government of India, Ministry Of Finance (Before the Government of India, Ministry Of Finance)

Facts of the Case: Shri Hemal K. Shah, a passenger, who arrived at SVPI Airport, Ahmedabad on 20-6-2009, had declared the total value of goods as ₹ 13,500 in the disembarkation slip. On detailed examination of his baggage, it was found to contain Saffron, Unicore Rhodium Black, Titan Wrist watches, Mobile Phones, assorted perfumes, Imitation stones and bags. Since, the said goods were in commercial quantity and did not appear to be a bona fide baggage, the said goods were placed under seizure. The passenger in his statement admitted the offence and showed his readiness to pay duty on seized goods or re-shipment of the said goods. The adjudicating authority determined total value of seized goods as ₹ 8,39,760/- (CIF) and ₹ 10,91,691/- (LMV); ordered confiscation of seized goods under section 111(d) and 111(m) of the Customs Act, 1962; imposed penalty of ₹ 2,50,000/- on Hemal K. Shah; confirmed and ordered for recovery of customs duty on the goods with interest and gave an option to redeem the goods on payment of fine of ₹ 2,00,000/- which should be exercised within a period of three months from date of receipt of the order. On appeal by Hemal K. Shah, the appellate authority allowed re-export of the confiscated goods.

Point of Dispute: The Department disputed the re-export of confiscated goods. They said that the goods which have been confiscated were being smuggled in by the passenger without declaring the same to the Customs and are in commercial quantity. In view of these facts, the appellate authority has erred in by allowing the re-export of the goods by reducing the redemption fine and penalty. While doing so, he has not taken into account the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of *CC, Kolkata v. Grand Prime Ltd.* [2003 (155) E.L.T. 417 (S.C.)]

Decision of the Case: The Government noted that the passenger had grossly mis-declared the goods with intention to evade duty and smuggle the goods into India. As per the provision of section 80 of the Customs Act, 1962 when the baggage of the passenger contains article which is dutiable or prohibited and in respect of which the declaration is made under section 77, the proper officer on request of passenger detain such article for the purpose of being returned to him on his leaving India. Since passenger neither made

true declaration nor requested for detention of goods for re-export, before customs at the time of his arrival at airport. So, the re-export of said goods cannot be allowed under section 80 of Customs Act.

Note: The aforesaid case is the revision application filed to the Central Government under section 129DD of the Customs Act, 1962.

3. Can the goods be detained indefinitely without any formal order under section 110 of the Customs Act, 1962?

S.J. Fabrics Pvt. Ltd. v. UOI 2011 (268) E.L.T. 475 (Cal.)

Decision of the case: The High Court held that there is no time limit for issuance of an order under section 110 and/or the proviso thereof. However, such notice should ordinarily be issued immediately upon interception and detention of the goods. The goods cannot indefinitely be detained without any order under section 110.

The High Court observed that section 110(2) provides that when any goods are seized under sub-section (1) and no notice in respect thereof is given under clause (a) of section 124 within six months of the seizure of the goods, the goods shall be returned to the person from whose possession, the goods were seized. The proviso to Section 110(2), however, empowers the Commissioner of Customs to extend the aforesaid period of six months by a further period of not exceeding six months on sufficient cause being shown.

Note: Although, it has already been established in number of cases that detention and seizure are not same under the customs provisions, in the aforesaid judgment, the two terms seem to have been used inter-changeably. The said fact may be borne in mind while going through the aforesaid decision.

4. Is it mandatory for the Revenue officers to make available the copies of the seized documents to the person from whose custody such documents were seized?

Manish Lalit Kumar Bavishi v. Addl. DIR. General, DRI 2011 (272) E.L.T. 42 (Bom.)

Facts of the case: The assessee sought copies of the documents seized from his office premises under panchanama and print outs drawn from the Laptop during his attendance in DRI. However, Revenue officers replied that the documents would be provided to him on completion of the investigation.

Decision of the case: The High Court held that from the language of section 110(4), it was apparent that the Customs officers were mandatorily required to make available the copies asked for. It was the party concerned who had the choice of either asking for the document/seeking extract and not the officer.

If any document was seized during the course of any action by an officer and relatable to the provisions of the Customs Act, that officer was bound to make available copies of those documents. The denial by the Revenue to make the documents available was clearly an act without jurisdiction.

The High Court directed the Revenue to make available the copies of the documents asked for by the assessee which was seized during the course of the seizure action.

5. Under what circumstances can the penalty be imposed in terms of section 112(a)(ii) of the Customs Act, 1962?

O.T. Enasu v. UOI 2011 (272) E.L.T. 51 (Ker.)

The High Court noted that under sub-clause (ii) of clause (a) of section 112, the liability to penalty is determined on the basis of duty sought to be evaded. Therefore, the jurisdictional fact to impose a penalty in terms of section 112(a)(ii) includes the essential ingredient that “duty was sought to be evaded”. Being a penal provision, it requires to be strictly construed. “Evade” means, to escape, slip away, to escape or avoid artfully, to shirk, to baffle, elude. The concept of evading involves a conscious exercise by the person who evades. Therefore, the process of “seeking to evade” essentially involves a mental element and the concept of the status “sought to be evaded” is arrived at only by a conscious attempt to evade.

In view of the above discussion, the High Court inferred that unless it is established that a person has, by his omissions or commissions, led to a situation where duty is sought to be evaded, there cannot be an imposition of penalty in terms of section 112(a)(ii) of the Act.

6. Can separate penalty under section 112 of the Customs Act be imposed on the partners when the same has already been imposed on partnership firm?

Textoplast Industries v. Additional Commissioner of Customs 2011 (272) E.L.T. 513 (Bom.)

Decision of the case: The High Court noted that Explanation to section 140 of the Customs Act, 1962 brings within purview of “Company”, a firm or an association of individuals, and “Director” in relation to firm, includes its partner. The High Court observed that in case of Apex Court judgment of *Standard Chartered Bank v. Directorate of Enforcement*, there emerged the principle that the deeming fiction is not confined to a criminal prosecution but will also extend to an adjudication proceeding as well. Hence, the High Court, in the instant case, held that the deeming fiction in section 140(2) making Director, Manager, Secretary or other officer of company liable to penalty, would not be confined to criminal prosecution but extends to adjudication proceeding as well.

The High Court explained that had it been otherwise, it would have led to strange situation where, for criminal prosecution, partner as well as person in charge responsible for conduct of business of partnership firm would be liable whereas for adjudication purposes, a narrower construction had to be adopted. There was no reason to exclude penalty on partnership firm, particularly when it was consistent with overall scheme and object of the Act.

In view of the above discussion, the High Court held that for the purpose of imposing penalty, the adjudicating authority under Customs Act, 1962 might, in an appropriate case, impose a penalty both upon a partnership firm as well as on its partners.

Note: The Gujarat High Court, in case of CCE & C, Surat-II v. Mohammed Farookh Mohammed Ghani 2010 (259) E.L.T. 179, has held that separate penalty under section 112 could not be imposed on the partners in addition to the penalty on the partnership firm. However, the Gujarat High Court, while deciding the said case, has not considered the principle enunciated by the Supreme Court in the Standard Chartered Bank case. In the circumstances, it appears that separate penalty under section 112 can be imposed on the partners in addition to the penalty on the partnership firm.

7. Is the want of evidence from foreign supplier enough to cancel the confiscation order of goods undervalued?

CCus. v. Jaya Singh Vijaya Jhaveri 2010 (251) E.L.T. 38 (Ker.)

Decision of the case: In the instant case, the High Court held that in a case of confiscation of goods because of their under valuation, Tribunal could not cancel the confiscation order for the want of evidence from the foreign supplier. The Court considered it be illogical that a person who was a party to undervaluation would give evidence to the Department to prove the case that the invoice raised by him on the respondent was a bogus one and that they had received underhand payment of the differential price. Resultantly, the Court upheld the confiscation order.

8. Whether the benefit of exemption meant for imported goods can also be given to the smuggled goods?

CCus. (Prev.), Mumbai v. M. Ambalal & Co. 2010 (260) E.L.T. 487 (SC)

Decision of the case: The question which arose before the Apex Court for consideration was whether goods that were smuggled into the country could be considered as 'imported goods' for the purpose of granting the benefit of the exemption notification.

The Apex Court held that the smuggled goods could not be considered as 'imported goods' for the purpose of benefit of the exemption notification. It opined that if the smuggled goods and imported goods were to be treated as the same, then there would have been no need for two different definitions under the Customs Act, 1962.

The Court observed that one of the principal functions of the Customs Act was to curb the ills of smuggling on the economy. Hence, it held that it would be contrary to the purpose of exemption notifications to give the benefit meant for imported goods to smuggled goods.

SETTLEMENT COMMISSION

1. In case of a Settlement Commission's order, can the assessee be permitted to accept what is favourable to them and reject what is not?

Sanghvi Reconditioners Pvt. Ltd. V. UOI 2010 (251) ELT 3 (SC)

Decision of the case: The Apex Court held that the application under section 127B of the Customs Act, 1962 is maintainable only if the duty liability is disclosed. The disclosure contemplated is in the nature of voluntary disclosure of concealed additional customs duty. The Court further opined that having opted to get their customs duty liability settled by the Settlement Commission, the appellant could not be permitted to dissect the Settlement Commission's order with a view to accept what is favourable to them and reject what is not.

2. Can the order of the Settlement Commission be considered to be a judicial proceeding?

UOI v. East and West Shipping Agency 2010 (253) E.L.T. 12 (Bom.)

Facts of the case: The Custom House Agent License of the respondents was suspended on the ground that authorised agent of the respondents had committed misconduct by taking active part in the act of smuggling and had thus violated the Custom House Agent Licensing Regulations, 2004. During pendency of the misconduct proceedings, respondents approached Settlement Commission. The Settlement Commission after hearing all the parties held that Revenue had failed to prove that the authorised agent of the respondent Custom House Agent (CHA) had a conscious knowledge of mis-declaration of goods. On the basis of said order of the Settlement Commission, Tribunal decided the case in favour of the respondents and dropped the misconduct proceedings against them. The appellants challenged the Tribunal's order alleging that the order passed by the Settlement Commission was ab-initio, null and void being without jurisdiction.

Decision of the case: The High Court observed that as per section 127M of the Customs Act, 1962, the order passed by the Settlement Commissioner is in judicial proceedings and it is a judicial order. Further, the appellants had not challenged the said order. Hence, the order passed by the Settlement Commissioner could not be brushed aside considering the scheme of Chapter XVIA. It must be held good in law so long as it is not set aside. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, the High Court

answered the question of law in affirmative in favour of the respondents and against the appellant.

3. Does the Settlement Commission have jurisdiction to settle cases relating to the recovery of drawback erroneously paid by the Revenue?

Union of India v. Cus. & C. Ex. Settlement Commission 2010 (258) ELT 476 (Bom.)

Facts of the case: The above question was the issue for consideration in a writ petition filed by the Union of India to challenge an order passed by the Settlement Commission in respect of a proceeding relating to recovery of drawback. The Commission vide its majority order overruled the objection taken by the Revenue challenging jurisdiction of the Commission and vide its final order settled the case. The aforesaid order of the Settlement Commission was the subject matter of challenge in this petition.

The contention of the Revenue was that the recovery of duty drawback does not involve levy, assessment and collection of customs duty as envisaged under section 127A(b) of the Customs Act, 1962. Therefore, the said proceedings could not be treated as a case fit to be applied before the Settlement Commission. However, the contention of the respondent was that the word “duty” appearing in the definition of “case” is required to be given a wide meaning. The Customs Act provides for levy of customs duty as also the refund thereof under section 27. The respondent contended that the provisions relating to refund of duty also extend to drawback as drawback is nothing but the return of the customs duty and thus, the proceedings of recovery of drawback would be a fit case for settlement before the Commission.

Decision of the case: The High Court noted that the Settlement Commission while considering the aforesaid question of its jurisdiction for taking up the cases relating to drawback had considered the definition of “drawback” as defined in rules relating to drawback as also the definition of the word “case” as defined in section 127A(b) and after referring to the various judgments of the Tribunal came to the conclusion that the Commission had jurisdiction to deal with the application for settlement. The High Court stated that the reasons given by the Settlement Commission in support of its order are in consonance with the law laid down by the Supreme Court in the case of *Liberty India v. Commissioner of Income Tax (2009) 317 ITR 218 (SC)* wherein the Supreme Court has observed that drawback is nothing but remission of duty on account of statutory provisions in the Act and Scheme framed by the Government of India.

The High Court thus concluded that the duty drawback or claim for duty drawback is nothing but a claim for refund of duty may be as per the statutory scheme framed by the Government of India or in exercise of statutory powers under the provisions of the Act. Thus, the High Court held that the Settlement Commission has jurisdiction to deal with the question relating to the recovery of drawback erroneously paid by the Revenue.