

Credit Rules, 2004 read with Section 119C of the Central Excise Act, 1944. Ordered to appropriate the amount of Rs. 31,105/- paid by the appellant vide TR2 Challan No. 00003 dated 28.02.2014 towards penalty and also ordered for payment of outstanding amount by the appellant.

(v) Disallowed CENVAT Credit of Rs. 1,07,31,04/- (Rupees One Lakh Seven Thousand Three Hundred and Ten only) under the provisions of Rule 14 of the CENVAT Credit Rules, 2004. Ordered to appropriate the payment made by the appellant vide TR1 entry No. 1577 dated 28.02.2014 in RGS 239 Part II against the disallowed CENVAT credit mentioned above.

(vi) Ordered to recover interest from the appellant on the above mentioned disallowed CENVAT Credit under Section 119A of the Central Excise Act, 1944. Ordered to appropriate the payment made by the appellant of Rs. 1,98,800/- vide TR3 Challan No. 00004 dated 28.02.2014 against the interest liability and also ordered for payment of outstanding amount if any by the appellant.

(vii) Imposed penalty of Rs. 1,01,910/- (Rupees One Lakh Seven Thousand Three Hundred and Ten Only) on the appellant under the provisions of Rule 14 of the CENVAT Credit Rules, 2004 read with Section 119C of the Central Excise Act, 1944. Ordered to appropriate the amount of Rs. 53,947/- paid by the appellant vide TR6 Challan No. 00004 dated 28.02.2014 towards penalty and also order for payment of outstanding amount by the appellant.

III. Ordered to recover interest of Rs. 1,38,71/- from the appellant on excess availing of CENVAT Credit on capital goods in the year 2012-13 under Section 119A of the Central Excise Act, 1944.

IV. Allowed the CENVAT Credit of Rs. 13,213/- (Rupees Thirteen Thousand Two Hundred and Thirteen Only) availed in Service tax on Membership Fees of various confederations.

2. Being aggrieved with the impugned order, the appellant files the present appeal on the following grounds:

(i) Repair and maintenance charges paid by the appellant to 'wholesaler' which goods are used solely by them in the manufacture of their final products and service of same is covered under the category of 'input service' under Rule 2(i) of CCR, 2004 which provides that 'input services' should be directly or indirectly used in or in relation to the manufacture of final products. It cannot be said that the definition of 'input service' is restricted to the services used within the factory premises for manufacture of final products. Because the definition of 'input service' is wider than the definition of 'input'. Appellant produced copy of O.A. No. D15/EX/2016-2017-AP/2076-7017-18 dated 20.12.2017 issued by the Commissioner (Appeals), Rajkot in their own identical case, wherein Hon'ble Commissioner (Appeals) decided in favour of appellant.

(ii) Items namely Refreshery Drinks, Souper wire, India Mobiles are their regular inputs being used in the manufacturing of final taxable product and hence the same fall within the ambit of rule 2(g) of the CENVAT Credit Rules, 2004. Definition of 'input' is very wide and so long as it fulfills the test of having been used in the manufacture of the final product, it would qualify as inputs and CENVAT credit on the same would be permissible.

(iii) Disallowance of CENVAT credit by the lower adjudicating authority is based on a different interpretation of CENVAT credit rules, 2004. There is no any evidence on record to establish willful intent to evade taxes or fraud or suppression of facts by the appellant which would impose penalty under Section 14AC read with 5021 of CCR, 2004.

(iv) Appellant has paid the amount demanded along with interest before the issuance of SCN, however the lower adjudicating authority has refused to take cognizance of Section 140(1)(c) of the CEA, 1944. The said demand was paid under protest since the appellant intended to file appeal against the said disallowance.

(v) The demand issued to the appellant for the FY ending 31.03.2014 was returned to be issued within one year from the said date. The SCN is issued on 31.01.2016, which stands time barred by almost 18 months. Hence impugned order ceases to be quashed.

(vi) The appellant has relied on various case laws as per appeal memorandum.

4. Subsequently, in pursuance of Board's Notification No.26/2017-C Ex.(NT) dated 17.10.2017 read with Board's Order No.05/2017-ST dated 13.11.2017, the instant appeal has been taken on hand for passing Order-in-Appeal.

5. Personal hearing in the case was fixed on 06.09.2018. Shri G R Saigal, Chartered Accountant and authorized representative appeared on behalf of the appellant. He reiterated that entire power generation from windmills is consumer and not sold and hence not CENVAT credit on repair and maintenance of windmills is allowable. He produced the copy of C.A. No. BHV-EXCJ3-EG02-APP-071/2017-16 dated 26.10.2017 issued by the Commissioner (Appeals), Raikot, in the same issue and in their own case, which has been decided in their favour. Regarding Refreshery Drinks, Souper wire, India Mobiles and Tea are their regular inputs being used in the manufacturing of final taxable product and hence the same fall within the definition of rule 2(g) of the CENVAT Credit Rules, 2004 and should not be treated as capital goods, since they are consumed in the manufacturing process. They paid complete Service tax on the capital additions and there is no intention to defraud that has brought in CIO. He also submit that SCN has been issued beyond the prescribed time limit and same is time barred.

6. Findings in case of instant appeal, the impugned order was received by the appellant on 18.11.2016 and date of filing of appeal is 11.01.2016. Hence, the appeal

have been filed within the stipulated time period and there is no delay in filing the appeal. The condition of pre-deposit, also stands fulfilled.

7. I have gone through the grounds of appeal mentioned in the appeal memorandum, oral and written submissions made by the appellant during personal hearing, statement of facts and records available on file. I propose to decide the appeal on merit. Fact that Mr (W/O) Issler in his appeal are need to decide.

(i) Whether CENVAT credit on the service of repair and maintenance of windmill is allowable?

(ii) Whether 100% CENVAT Credit acquired by the appellant on items like Mercury 5 litre Copper wire, Indian Matchless and Petrol are correct or otherwise.

(iii) Whether in the present case penalty is imposed under Section 174D of the Central Excise Act, 1944 or otherwise.

8. On going through the impugned order, I find that lower adjudicating authority has confirmed the demand of recovery of CENVAT credit taken on services used for repair and maintenance of wind mills on the ground that appellant failed to produce any evidence that all electricity generated by the two windmills of appellant have been wholly used in their factory for manufacture of final excisable goods and the electricity so generated is not sold outside water suit. Further since the electricity generated by the wind mills is not directly supplied to the appellant but transferred to the appellant, it could be that the entire electricity generated at the wind mill is not so transferred and consumed and would be sold. I find that matter is no more res integra in view of the issue already decided by this office in the appellant's own case vide C.A.No. DIT/EXCISE-INDIA-AP-470-23/7-13 dated 20/12/2017 issued by the Commissioner (Appeals), Rajkot, wherein it has been held that appellant is eligible to take Cenvat Credit of Service Tax on repairs and maintenance of Windmills even if situated at a distant place from the factory premises.

9. As regards the second ground regarding consumption of refractory bricks, copper wire, Indian matchless & petrol are concerned, the lower adjudicating authority has confirmed the demand that all these materials are falling under the definition of Capital goods under Rule 2(a) of the CCR, 2004. But the appellant submit that these materials are only integral part of the manufacturing process and are regularly used as inputs for the production of excisable goods and destroyed after single use, therefore same are covered under the definition of Input taxables 2(a) of the CCR, 2004.

10. As per Rule 2(a) of Central Excise Rules 2004 definition of capital goods means:

(a) the following goods, namely:



- (j) all goods falling under Chapter 82, Chapter 84, Chapter 85, Chapter 86, heading 8800, grading wheels and the like, and parts thereof falling under heading 8800 and sub-heading 880032 of the First Schedule to the Excise Tariff Act;
- (k) solution control equipment;
- (l) attachments, spares and accessories of the goods specified at (i) and (j);
- (m) moulds and dies, jigs and fixtures;
- (n) refractory and refractory materials;
- (o) tubes and pipes and fittings thereof, [];
- (p) storage tank, [and];
- (q) motor vehicles other than those falling under tariff headings 8702, 8703, 8704, 8705 and the chassis (air including engines and 199670).

From the above definition, Refractories and Refractory material are specifically mentioned in the definition of Capital goods. Accordingly Refractory Bricks, Indian Melchite (moulding sand) and Pits which are used in casting process are well within covered under the above definition of capital goods. The appellant has contested that definition of noun is very wide however as these items are covered under definition of input under rule 2(k) of the CGR, 2004. The avowment of appellant is not correct as these item are specifically included in the definition of capital goods list.

11. Further, Rule 4 of Central Goods Rules 2004 deals with availment of Central credit on capital goods. Rule 4(2)(a) Central credit, 2004 provides that "the lowest credit in respect of capital goods is available to the extent of 50% of the credit in the same financial year." The rest, 50% Central credit can be availed in the subsequent financial year. Accordingly I find that appellant is entitled to take 50% of Central Credit during the year of receipt and balance of 50% credit in the subsequent year.

12. I rely on Hon'ble Supreme Court Judgment in the matter Commissioner of Central Excise, Guwahati & Others v. Jeebhari Mills Ltd. & Others reported at 2001, 132 JLT 3 (S.C.). The Supreme Court in the said case has held as under:-

4. The aforesaid definition of "capital goods" is very wide. Capital goods can be machines, machinery, plant, equipment, apparatus, tools or appliances. Any of these goods if used for producing or processing of any goods or for bringing about any change in any substance for the manufacturer of final product would be "capital goods", and, therefore, qualify for availing MGOVAI credit. For Clause (a) (i), the components, spare parts and accessories of the goods mentioned in Clause (a) (i) used for the purposes enumerated therein would also be capital goods and qualify for MGOVAI credit entitlement. Clause (c) makes moulds and dies, jigs and fixtures and weightbridges used in factory of the manufacturer as capital goods and thus qualify for availing MGOVAI credit. The goods enumerated in Clause (e) need not be used for producing the final product or used in the process of any change in any substance for the manufacture of final product and the only requirement is that the same should be used in the factory of the manufacturer. Thus, it can be seen that the language used in the explanation is very broad.

The above mentioned decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court was followed by the Hon'ble High Court of Chhattisgarh, Bhopal in the matter of Commissioner of Central Excise, Bhopal Versus Century Electronics reported at 2008 (200) E.L.T. 343 (Chhattisgarh), wherein the Hon'ble High Court held that any of these goods for producing or processing or any goods or for bringing about any change in any substance for the manufacture of final product could be 'input goods' and, therefore, qualify for availing CENVAT credit. In the case on hand on examining the above issue, it is found that all the above stated articles are used for manufacture of finished goods as capital goods and in absence of any of the above stated items, manufacture of 'finished' goods is not possible. Applying the above judgment, I find that appellant is eligible to avail the Cenvat Credit as per Rule 2(2)(a) Cenvat credit 2004 on the said items considering the same as capital goods. I also find that appellant immediately paid/reversed the Cenvat Credit along with interest on being pointed by the audit. I find that contention regarding waiver of penalty made by the appellant has ample force. Since they have paid Cenvat Credit along with interest immediately on being pointed out by Audit and before issuance of show cause notice, I also find that there is no suppression of facts/misconduct with intent to evade payment of duty therefore, they deserve leniency in this regard. Considering my view point, period relates to the decision of APOLLO COMPUTER EDUCATION LTD vs COMMISSIONER OF C. EX., MADURAI reported at 2011 (21) S.T.R. 33 (Trib. - Chennai), wherein keeping in view the Section 83 of Service Tax Act, the imposition of penalties under section 80 and 81 were set aside. Applying the ratio of said decision, I find that in the present case no penalty is required to be imposed under Section 11 AC of the Central Excise Act, 1944 read with Rule 10 of the Cenvat Credit Rules, 2004.

10. In view of foregoing discussions and findings, the appeal filed by the appellant stands dismissed on above terms.



(P. A. Vasava)
Commissioner (Appeals)
Commissioner
CGST & Central Excise,
Kuldh (Gardhamani)

Appl No. 12/2017-17

Date: 10.05.2019

By Regd. Post A.D. / Speed Post

To

M/s Investment & Precision Castings Limited,
Nar Road,
Bhadrnagar
C/o. Kuldh (Gardhamani)

Copy to:

1. The Chief Commissioner, CGST & C.Ex. Ahmednagar Zone, Ahmednagar
2. The Commissioner, CGST & C.Ex., Bhadrnagar.
3. The Additional Commissioner, CGST & C.Ex.(System), Bhadrnagar
4. Joint Commissioner CGST & C. Ex., Bhadrnagar

cc: Guard File.