



::आयुक्त (अपील्स) का कार्यालय, वस्तु एवं सेवा कर और केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क::
O/O THE COMMISSIONER (APPEALS), GST & CENTRAL EXCISE,
द्वितीय तल, जी एस टी भवन / 2nd Floor, GST Bhavan,
रेस कोर्स रिंग रोड, / Race Course Ring Road,



राजकोट / Rajkot - 360 001

Tele Fax No. 0281 - 2477952/2441142 Email: cexappealsrajkot@gmail.com

सत्यमेव जयते

रजिस्टर्ड डाक ए.डी.द्वारा :-

DIN-20210264SX0000611778

क	अपील / फाइल संख्या/ Appeal / File No.	मूल आदेश सं / OIO No.	दिनांक/ Date
	V2/44/RAJ/2020	DC/JAM/R-10/2020-21	03.06.2020

ख अपील आदेश संख्या (Order-In-Appeal No.):

RAJ-EXCUS-000-APP-005-2021

आदेश का दिनांक /
Date of Order: **24.02.2021** जारी करने की तारीख /
Date of issue: **25.02.2021**

श्री अखिलेश कुमार, आयुक्त (अपील्स), राजकोट द्वारा पारित/
Passed by Shri Akhilesh Kumar, Commissioner (Appeals),
Rajkot

ग अपर आयुक्त/ संयुक्त आयुक्त/ उपायुक्त/ सहायक आयुक्त, केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क/ सेवाकर/ वस्तु एवं सेवाकर,
राजकोट / जामनगर / गांधीधाम। द्वारा उपरलिखित जारी मूल आदेश से सृजित: /
Arising out of above mentioned OIO issued by Additional/Joint/Deputy/Assistant Commissioner, Central
Excise/ST / GST,
Rajkot / Jamnagar / Gandhidham :

घ अपीलकर्ता & प्रतिवादी का नाम एवं पता / Name & Address of the Appellant & Respondent :-

M/s. Divine Impex, Plot No. 4, GIDC, Phase-II, Dared, Jamnagar-361004.

इस आदेश (अपील) से व्यथित कोई व्यक्ति निम्नलिखित तरीके में उपयुक्त प्राधिकारी / प्राधिकरण के समक्ष अपील दायर कर सकता है।/
Any person aggrieved by this Order-in-Appeal may file an appeal to the appropriate authority in the following way.

(A) सीमा शुल्क, केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क एवं सेवाकर अपीलीय न्यायाधिकरण के प्रति अपील, केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क अधिनियम, 1944 की धारा 35B के अंतर्गत एवं वित्त अधिनियम, 1994 की धारा 86 के अंतर्गत निम्नलिखित जगह की जा सकती है।/
Appeal to Customs, Excise & Service Tax Appellate Tribunal under Section 35B of CEA, 1944 / Under Section 86 of the Finance Act, 1994 an appeal lies to:-

(i) वर्गीकरण मूल्यांकन से सम्बन्धित सभी मामले सीमा शुल्क, केन्द्रीय उत्पादन शुल्क एवं सेवाकर अपीलीय न्यायाधिकरण की विशेष पीठ, वेस्ट ब्लॉक नं 2, आर. के. पुरम, नई दिल्ली, को की जानी चाहिए।/
The special bench of Customs, Excise & Service Tax Appellate Tribunal of West Block No. 2, R.K. Puram, New Delhi in all matters relating to classification and valuation.

(ii) उपरोक्त परिच्छेद 1(a) में बताए गए अपीलों के अलावा शेष सभी अपीलें सीमा शुल्क, केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क एवं सेवाकर अपीलीय न्यायाधिकरण (सिस्टेट) की पश्चिम क्षेत्रीय पीठिका, द्वितीय तल, बहुमाली भवन असारवा अहमदाबाद- 380016 को की जानी चाहिए।/
To the West regional bench of Customs, Excise & Service Tax Appellate Tribunal (CESTAT) at, 2nd Floor, Bhaumali Bhawan, Asarwa Ahmedabad-380016 in case of appeals other than as mentioned in para- 1(a) above

(iii) अपीलीय न्यायाधिकरण के समक्ष अपील प्रस्तुत करने के लिए केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क (अपील) नियमावली, 2001, के नियम 6 के अंतर्गत निर्धारित किए गये प्रपत्र EA-3 को चार प्रतियों में दर्ज किया जाना चाहिए। इनमें से कम से कम एक प्रति के साथ, जहां उत्पाद शुल्क की माँग, ब्याज की माँग और लगाया गया जुर्माना, रुपए 5 लाख या उससे कम, 5 लाख रुपए या 50 लाख रुपए तक अथवा 50 लाख रुपए से अधिक है तो क्रमशः 1,000/- रुपये, 5,000/- रुपये अथवा 10,000/- रुपये का निर्धारित जमा शुल्क की प्रति संलग्न करें। निर्धारित शुल्क का भुगतान, संबंधित अपीलीय न्यायाधिकरण की शाखा के सहायक रजिस्टार के नाम से किसी भी सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र के बैंक द्वारा जारी रेखांकित बैंक ड्राफ्ट द्वारा किया जाना चाहिए। संबंधित ड्राफ्ट का भुगतान, बैंक की उस शाखा में होना चाहिए जहां संबंधित अपीलीय न्यायाधिकरण की शाखा स्थित है। स्थगन आदेश (स्टे ऑर्डर) के लिए आवेदन-पत्र के साथ 500/- रुपए का निर्धारित शुल्क जमा करना होगा।/
The appeal to the Appellate Tribunal shall be filed in quadruplicate in form EA-3 / as prescribed under Rule 6 of Central Excise (Appeal) Rules, 2001 and shall be accompanied against one which at least should be accompanied by a fee of Rs. 1,000/- Rs.5000/- Rs.10,000/- where amount of duty demand/interest/penalty/refund is upto 5 Lac., 5 Lac to 50 Lac and above 50 Lac respectively in the form of crossed bank draft in favour of Asst. Registrar of branch of any nominated public sector bank of the place where the bench of any nominated public sector bank of the place where the bench of the Tribunal is situated. Application made for grant of stay shall be accompanied by a fee of Rs. 500/-.

(B) अपीलीय न्यायाधिकरण के समक्ष अपील, वित्त अधिनियम, 1994 की धारा 86(1) के अंतर्गत सेवाकर नियमावली, 1994, के नियम 9(1) के तहत निर्धारित प्रपत्र S.T.-5 में चार प्रतियों में की जा सकेगी एवं उसके साथ जिस आदेश के विरुद्ध अपील की गयी हो, उसकी प्रति साथ में संलग्न करें (उनमें से एक प्रति प्रमाणित होनी चाहिए) और इनमें से कम से कम एक प्रति के साथ, जहां सेवाकर की माँग, ब्याज की माँग और लगाया गया जुर्माना, रुपए 5 लाख या उससे कम, 5 लाख रुपए या 50 लाख रुपए तक अथवा 50 लाख रुपए से अधिक है तो क्रमशः 1,000/- रुपये, 5,000/- रुपये अथवा 10,000/- रुपये का निर्धारित जमा शुल्क की प्रति संलग्न करें। निर्धारित शुल्क का भुगतान, संबंधित अपीलीय न्यायाधिकरण की शाखा के सहायक रजिस्टार के नाम से किसी भी सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र के बैंक द्वारा जारी रेखांकित बैंक ड्राफ्ट द्वारा किया जाना चाहिए। संबंधित ड्राफ्ट का भुगतान, बैंक की उस शाखा में होना चाहिए जहां संबंधित अपीलीय न्यायाधिकरण की शाखा स्थित है। स्थगन आदेश (स्टे ऑर्डर) के लिए आवेदन-पत्र के साथ 500/- रुपए का निर्धारित शुल्क जमा करना होगा।/
The appeal under sub section (1) of Section 86 of the Finance Act, 1994, to the Appellate Tribunal shall be filed in quadruplicate in Form S.T.5 as prescribed under Rule 9(1) of the Service Tax Rules, 1994, and shall be accompanied by a copy of the order appealed against (one of which shall be certified copy) and should be accompanied by a fee of Rs. 1,000/- where the amount of service tax & interest demanded & penalty levied is more than five lakhs but not exceeding Rs. Fifty Lakhs, Rs.10,000/- where the amount of service tax & interest demanded & penalty levied is more than fifty Lakhs rupees, in the form of crossed bank draft in favour of the Assistant Registrar of the bench of nominated Public Sector Bank of the place where the bench of Tribunal is situated. / Application made for grant of stay shall be accompanied by a fee of Rs.500/-.

The appeal under sub section (1) of Section 86 of the Finance Act, 1994, to the Appellate Tribunal shall be filed in quadruplicate in Form S.T.5 as prescribed under Rule 9(1) of the Service Tax Rules, 1994, and shall be accompanied by a copy of the order appealed against (one of which shall be certified copy) and should be accompanied by a fee of Rs. 1,000/- where the amount of service tax & interest demanded & penalty levied is more than five lakhs but not exceeding Rs. Fifty Lakhs, Rs.10,000/- where the amount of service tax & interest demanded & penalty levied is more than fifty Lakhs rupees, in the form of crossed bank draft in favour of the Assistant Registrar of the bench of nominated Public Sector Bank of the place where the bench of Tribunal is situated. / Application made for grant of stay shall be accompanied by a fee of Rs.500/-.

(B) अपीलीय न्यायाधिकरण के समक्ष अपील, वित्त अधिनियम, 1994 की धारा 86(1) के अंतर्गत सेवाकर नियमावली, 1994, के नियम 9(1) के तहत निर्धारित प्रपत्र S.T.-5 में चार प्रतियों में की जा सकेगी एवं उसके साथ जिस आदेश के विरुद्ध अपील की गयी हो, उसकी प्रति साथ में संलग्न करें (उनमें से एक प्रति प्रमाणित होनी चाहिए) और इनमें से कम से कम एक प्रति के साथ, जहां सेवाकर की माँग, ब्याज की माँग और लगाया गया जुर्माना, रुपए 5 लाख या उससे कम, 5 लाख रुपए या 50 लाख रुपए तक अथवा 50 लाख रुपए से अधिक है तो क्रमशः 1,000/- रुपये, 5,000/- रुपये अथवा 10,000/- रुपये का निर्धारित जमा शुल्क की प्रति संलग्न करें। निर्धारित शुल्क का भुगतान, संबंधित अपीलीय न्यायाधिकरण की शाखा के सहायक रजिस्टार के नाम से किसी भी सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र के बैंक द्वारा जारी रेखांकित बैंक ड्राफ्ट द्वारा किया जाना चाहिए। संबंधित ड्राफ्ट का भुगतान, बैंक की उस शाखा में होना चाहिए जहां संबंधित अपीलीय न्यायाधिकरण की शाखा स्थित है। स्थगन आदेश (स्टे ऑर्डर) के लिए आवेदन-पत्र के साथ 500/- रुपए का निर्धारित शुल्क जमा करना होगा।/
The appeal under sub section (1) of Section 86 of the Finance Act, 1994, to the Appellate Tribunal shall be filed in quadruplicate in Form S.T.5 as prescribed under Rule 9(1) of the Service Tax Rules, 1994, and shall be accompanied by a copy of the order appealed against (one of which shall be certified copy) and should be accompanied by a fee of Rs. 1,000/- where the amount of service tax & interest demanded & penalty levied is more than five lakhs but not exceeding Rs. Fifty Lakhs, Rs.10,000/- where the amount of service tax & interest demanded & penalty levied is more than fifty Lakhs rupees, in the form of crossed bank draft in favour of the Assistant Registrar of the bench of nominated Public Sector Bank of the place where the bench of Tribunal is situated. / Application made for grant of stay shall be accompanied by a fee of Rs.500/-.

The appeal under sub section (1) of Section 86 of the Finance Act, 1994, to the Appellate Tribunal shall be filed in quadruplicate in Form S.T.5 as prescribed under Rule 9(1) of the Service Tax Rules, 1994, and shall be accompanied by a copy of the order appealed against (one of which shall be certified copy) and should be accompanied by a fee of Rs. 1,000/- where the amount of service tax & interest demanded & penalty levied is more than five lakhs but not exceeding Rs. Fifty Lakhs, Rs.10,000/- where the amount of service tax & interest demanded & penalty levied is more than fifty Lakhs rupees, in the form of crossed bank draft in favour of the Assistant Registrar of the bench of nominated Public Sector Bank of the place where the bench of Tribunal is situated. / Application made for grant of stay shall be accompanied by a fee of Rs.500/-.



- (i) वित्त अधिनियम, 1994 की धारा 86 की उप-धाराओं (2) एवं (2A) के अंतर्गत दर्ज की गयी अपील, सेवाकर नियमवाली, 1994, के नियम 9(2) एवं 9(2A) के तहत निर्धारित प्रपत्र S.T.-7 में की जा सकेगी एवं उसके साथ आयुक्त, केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क अथवा आयुक्त (अपील), केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क द्वारा पारित आदेश की प्रतियाँ संलग्न करें (उनमें से एक प्रति प्रमाणित होनी चाहिए) और आयुक्त द्वारा सहायक आयुक्त अथवा उपायुक्त, केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क/ सेवाकर, को अपीलीय न्यायाधिकरण को आवेदन दर्ज करने का निर्देश देने वाले आदेश की प्रति भी साथ में संलग्न करनी होगी। /

The appeal under sub section (2) and (2A) of the section 86 the Finance Act 1994, shall be filed in Form ST.7 as prescribed under Rule 9 (2) & 9(2A) of the Service Tax Rules, 1994 and shall be accompanied by a copy of order of Commissioner Central Excise or Commissioner, Central Excise (Appeals) (one of which shall be a certified copy) and copy of the order passed by the Commissioner authorizing the Assistant Commissioner or Deputy Commissioner of Central Excise/ Service Tax to file the appeal before the Appellate Tribunal.

- (ii) सीमा शुल्क, केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क एवं सेवाकर अपीलीय प्राधिकरण (सेस्टेट) के प्रति अपीलों के मामले में केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क अधिनियम 1944 की धारा 35एफ के अंतर्गत, जो की वित्तीय अधिनियम, 1994 की धारा 83 के अंतर्गत सेवाकर को भी लागू की गई है, इस आदेश के प्रति अपीलीय प्राधिकरण में अपील करते समय उत्पाद शुल्क/सेवा कर मांग के 10 प्रतिशत (10%), जब मांग एवं जुर्माना विवादित है, या जुर्माना, जब केवल जुर्माना विवादित है, का भुगतान किया जाए, बशर्ते कि इस धारा के अंतर्गत जमा कि जाने वाली अपीलित देय राशि दस करोड़ रूप से अधिक न हो।

केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क एवं सेवाकर के अंतर्गत "मांग किए गए शुल्क" में निम्न शामिल है

- (i) धारा 11 डी के अंतर्गत रकम
(ii) सेनवेट जमा की ली गई गलत राशि
(iii) सेनवेट जमा नियमावली के नियम 6 के अंतर्गत देय रकम

- बशर्ते यह कि इस धारा के प्रावधान वित्तीय (सं. 2) अधिनियम 2014 के आरंभ से पूर्व किसी अपीलीय प्राधिकारी के समक्ष विचाराधीन स्थगन अर्ज़ी एवं अपील को लागू नहीं होगा। /

For an appeal to be filed before the CESTAT, under Section 35F of the Central Excise Act, 1944 which is also made applicable to Service Tax under Section 83 of the Finance Act, 1994, an appeal against this order shall lie before the Tribunal on payment of 10% of the duty demanded where duty or duty and penalty are in dispute, or penalty, where penalty alone is in dispute, provided the amount of pre-deposit payable would be subject to a ceiling of Rs. 10 Crores.

Under Central Excise and Service Tax, "Duty Demanded" shall include :

- (i) amount determined under Section 11 D;
(ii) amount of erroneous Cenvat Credit taken;
(iii) amount payable under Rule 6 of the Cenvat Credit Rules

- provided further that the provisions of this Section shall not apply to the stay application and appeals pending before any appellate authority prior to the commencement of the Finance (No.2) Act, 2014.

- (C) भारत सरकार को पुनरीक्षण आवेदन :

Revision application to Government of India:

इस आदेश की पुनरीक्षणयाचिका निम्नलिखित मामलों में केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क अधिनियम, 1994 की धारा 35EE के प्रथमपरंतुक के अंतर्गत अवर सचिव, भारत सरकार, पुनरीक्षण आवेदन इकाई, वित्त मंत्रालय, रजिस्टर विभाग, चौथी मंजिल, जीवन दीप भवन, संसद मार्ग, नई दिल्ली-110001, को किया जाना चाहिए। /

A revision application lies to the Under Secretary, to the Government of India, Revision Application Unit, Ministry of Finance, Department of Revenue, 4th Floor, Jeevan Deep Building, Parliament Street, New Delhi-110001, under Section 35EE of the CEA 1944 in respect of the following case, governed by first proviso to sub-section (1) of Section-35B ibid:

- (i) यदि माल के किसी नुकसान के मामले में, जहां नुकसान किसी माल को किसी कारखाने से भंडार गृह के पारगमन के दौरान या किसी अन्य कारखाने या फिर किसी एक भंडार गृह से दूसरे भंडार गृह पारगमन के दौरान, या किसी भंडार गृह में या भंडारण में माल के प्रसंस्करण के दौरान, किसी कारखाने या किसी भंडार गृह में माल के नुकसान के मामले में। /
In case of any loss of goods, where the loss occurs in transit from a factory to a warehouse or to another factory or from one warehouse to another during the course of processing of the goods in a warehouse or in storage whether in a factory or in a warehouse
- (ii) भारत के बाहर किसी राष्ट्र या क्षेत्र को निर्यात कर रहे माल के विनिर्माण में प्रयुक्त कच्चे माल पर भरी गई केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क के छुट (रिबेट) के मामले में, जो भारत के बाहर किसी राष्ट्र या क्षेत्र को निर्यात की गयी है। /
In case of rebate of duty of excise on goods exported to any country or territory outside India of an excisable material used in the manufacture of the goods which are exported to any country or territory outside India.
- (iii) यदि उत्पाद शुल्क का भुगतान किए बिना भारत के बाहर, नेपाल या भूटान को माल निर्यात किया गया है। /
In case of goods exported outside India export to Nepal or Bhutan, without payment of duty.
- (iv) सुनिश्चित उत्पाद के उत्पादन शुल्क के भुगतान के लिए जो ड्यूटी क्रेडिट इस अधिनियम एवं इसके विभिन्न प्रावधानों के तहत मान्य की गई है और ऐसे आदेश जो आयुक्त (अपील) के द्वारा वित्त अधिनियम (नं. 2), 1998 की धारा 109 के द्वारा नियत की गई तारीख अथवा समावाधि पर या बाद में पारित किए गए हैं। /
Credit of any duty allowed to be utilized towards payment of excise duty on final products under the provisions of this Act or the Rules made there under such order is passed by the Commissioner (Appeals) on or after, the date appointed under Sec. 109 of the Finance (No.2) Act, 1998.
- (v) उपरोक्त आवेदन की दो प्रतियां प्रपत्र संख्या EA-8 में, जो की केन्द्रीय उत्पादन शुल्क (अपील) नियमावली, 2001, के नियम 9 के अंतर्गत विनिर्दिष्ट है, इस आदेश के संप्रेषण के 3 माह के अंतर्गत की जानी चाहिए। उपरोक्त आवेदन के साथ मूल आदेश व अपील आदेश की दो प्रतियां संलग्न की जानी चाहिए। साथ ही केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क अधिनियम, 1944 की धारा 35-EE के तहत निर्धारित शुल्क की अदायगी के साक्ष्य के तौर पर TR-6 की प्रति संलग्न की जानी चाहिए। /
The above application shall be made in duplicate in Form No. EA-8 as specified under Rule, 9 of Central Excise (Appeals) Rules, 2001 within 3 months from the date on which the order sought to be appealed against is communicated and shall be accompanied by two copies each of the OIO and Order-In-Appeal. It should also be accompanied by a copy of TR-6 Challan evidencing payment of prescribed fee as prescribed under Section 35-EE of CEA, 1944, under Major Head of Account.
- (vi) पुनरीक्षण आवेदन के साथ निम्नलिखित निर्धारित शुल्क की अदायगी की जानी चाहिए।
जहाँ संलग्न रकम एक लाख रुपये या उससे कम हो तो रुपये 200/- का भुगतान किया जाए और यदि संलग्न रकम एक लाख रुपये से ज्यादा हो तो रुपये 1000 -/ का भुगतान किया जाए।
The revision application shall be accompanied by a fee of Rs. 200/- where the amount involved in Rupees One Lac or less and Rs. 1000/- where the amount involved is more than Rupees One Lac.
- (D) यदि इस आदेश में कई मूल आदेशों का समावेश है तो प्रत्येक मूल आदेश के लिए शुल्क का भुगतान, उपर्युक्त ढंग से किया जाना चाहिये। इस तथ्य के होते हुए भी की लिखा पढ़ी कार्य से बचने के लिए यथास्थिति अपीलीय न्यायाधिकरण को एक अपील या केन्द्रीय सरकार को एक आवेदन किया जाता है। / In case, if the order covers various numbers of order- in Original, fee for each O.I.O. should be paid in the aforesaid manner, notwithstanding the fact that the one appeal to the Appellant Tribunal or the one application to the Central Govt. As the case may be, is filled to avoid scriptoria work if excising Rs. 1 lakh fee of Rs. 100/- for each.
- (E) यथासंशोधित न्यायालय शुल्क अधिनियम, 1975, के अनुसूची-1 के अनुसार मूल आदेश एवं स्थगन आदेश की प्रति पर निर्धारित 6.50 रुपये का न्यायालय शुल्क टिकट लगा होना चाहिए। /
One copy of application or O.I.O. as the case may be, and the order of the adjudicating authority shall bear a court fee stamp of Rs.6.50 as prescribed under Schedule-I in terms of the Court Fee Act, 1975, as amended.
- (F) सीमा शुल्क, केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क एवं सेवाकर अपीलीय न्यायाधिकरण (कार्य विधि) नियमावली, 1982 में वर्णित एवं अन्य संबंधित मामलों को सम्मिलित करने वाले नियमों की ओर भी ध्यान आकर्षित किया जाता है। /
Attention is also invited to the rules covering these and other related matters contained in the Customs, Excise and Service Appellate Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 1982.
- (G) उच्च अपीलीय प्राधिकारी को अपील दाखिल करने से संबंधित व्यापक, विस्तृत और नवीनतम प्रावधानों के लिए, अपीलार्थी विभागीय वेबसाइट www.cbec.gov.in को देख सकते हैं। /
For the elaborate, detailed and latest provisions relating to filing of appeal to the higher appellate authority, the appellant may refer to the Departmental website www.cbec.gov.in



:: ORDER-IN-APPEAL ::

M/s Divine Impex, Plot No. 4, GIDC, Phase – II, Dared, Jamnagar - 361005 (hereinafter referred to as "appellant") filed the Appeal No. V2/44/RAJ/2020 against Order-in-Original No. DC/JAM/R-10/2020-21 dated 03.06.2020 (hereinafter referred to as "impugned order") passed by the Deputy Commissioner, Central GST, Division-I, Jamnagar (hereinafter referred to as "adjudicating authority").

2. The facts of the case, in brief, are that during the course of CERA Audit conducted on the premises of the appellant firm from 19.01.2015 to 22.01.2015, they have raised objection for non recovery of duty on goods belonging to appellant lost by theft. Against this objection, Appellant had paid the duty amount of Rs. 1,96,297/- vide Challan No. 00262 dated 28.04.2015. The appellant filed an FIR on 05.09.2012 with the Police Department regarding theft of their goods. Theft goods were captured by the Police and Court case was held for the theft goods. The Hon'ble Court had given decision for handing over the said goods to the appellant. Accordingly, the Police Department had handed over the theft goods of 2000 kgs to the appellant on 08.02.2020. Thereafter, appellant filed refund claim of Rs. 1,96,297/- under Section 11B of the Central Excise Act, 1944 (hereinafter referred to as "the Act"), on 10.02.2020 for Central Excise duty paid on theft goods, as the same had been returned back to their factory. SCN dated 20.04.2020 was issued to the appellant which was adjudicated vide impugned order underwhich said refund claim was rejected under Section 11B of the Act on the ground of limitation.

3. Being aggrieved, the appellant preferred the present appeal, *inter-alia*, on the various grounds as under:

(i) that impugned order rejecting the refund claim as time barred is unsustainable in law since the payment of duty was made 'under protest' and therefore limitation of one year for filing of refund claim, as provided under Section 11(B)(1) of the Act, is not applicable in the present case.

(ii) That adjudicating authority at Para 15 of the impugned order held that there is no mention anywhere in the challan that duty was paid under protest and there are no records of intimation filed by the appellant, at the relevant time, that subject duty was paid under protest.



To rebut, the appellant contends that since the payment was made online and there is no independent column in the challan for such 'under protest' payments, the same was handwritten. Further, the subject payment was made on the basis of observations made by the CERA audit and subsequent letter dated 17.02.2015 of the jurisdictional authorities, hence it cannot be treated as a voluntary payment but has to be treated as a payment 'under protest'. Hence, impugned order rejecting refund claim on the grounds of time barred is untenable in law and relied upon following case laws:

- (a) Shree Ram Food Industries reported at 2003 (152) ELT 285 (Guj.)
- (b) NSP Electronics Ltd 2016 reported at (331) ELT 451 (Tri.-Bang.)
- (c) Wardes Pharmaceuticals Pvt Ltd reported at 2011 (22) STR 274 (Mad.)
- (d) Jai Mata Glass Ltd reported at 2006 (195) ELT 94 (Tri.-Del.)

(iii) That the present refund claim was filed on receiving theft goods (on which appellant was forced to pay duty) and the same was result of an order dated 30.12.2019 passed by the Addl. Chief Judicial Magistrate, Jamnagar. Hence, limitation period of one year for filing of refund claim should be calculated from 30.12.2019 only and not from the date of payment of duty. That subject materials were handed over to appellant on 08.02.2020 and refund claim was filed on 10.02.2020 i.e. well within one year limitation period from the date of judicial order. Appellant refers explanation (B)(ec) to the Section 11B of the Act.

(iv) That at Para 17 in the impugned order, it is held that FIR was filed for theft of brass scrap and the goods received back in the factory premises of the appellant was brass billets; that value on which duty was paid and value of goods received was different; that appellant failed to provide the copy of FIR dated 05.09.2012; that appellant failed to provide proof regarding receipt of the goods.

To counter, appellant submits that it is an admitted fact that there was theft of 2000 kgs of Brass scarp/ Brass Turning Scrap from the factory premises of the appellant and the recovered goods was 2000 kgs of Brass Billets which were handed over to the appellant by Police Department on the direction of Court Order. That the difference in theft goods and recovered goods has no relevance, since both the quantities are same and secondly both the above goods are used by the appellant in manufacturing of their final products namely Brass Electrical Parts. As a matter of fact, Brass Scarp



du

is their raw material and Brass Billets are their intermediate goods which were ultimately used in manufacturing of Brass Electrical Parts. Appellant further submits that the difference in value of goods on which duty was paid and value of goods received back has no implication in the present matter, since the appellant has received back same quantity of goods and secondly, the appellant has filed refund claim of the same amount which was originally paid by them.

(vi) That regarding allegation of non-submission of proof of receipt of goods is not correct, since proof regarding receipt of goods like court order, weighment slip and a letter dated 13.03.2020 of the Customs Department confirming the receipt of goods were already submitted to the adjudicating authority vide letter dated 27.05.2020. Appellant further submits that the receipt of goods was also duly reflected by them in their periodical return for the month of February 2020 which were submitted with the Customs Department on 02.03.2020.

4. The appellant was granted opportunities for personal hearing on 11.09.2020 and 28.09.2020. They vide letter dated 26.09.2020 reiterated grounds of appeal and waived personal hearing. Hence, I proceed to decide the case on the basis of the available records.

5. I have carefully gone through the facts of the case, impugned order and the submissions of the appellant in the memorandum of appeal as well as submission made vide letter dated 26.09.2020. The issue to be decided in the present appeal is whether refund claim of the appellant rejected vide impugned order on the ground of limitation is legal, proper and correct or otherwise.

6. It is observed that 2000 Kgs of Brass Scrap/ Brass Turning Scrap were stolen/theft from the factory premises of the appellant between May, 2012 to September, 2012. The appellant had filed FIR with Police Department, a copy of which was also submitted by the appellant. Further, during audit of the records of the appellant conducted by CERA team, it was observed by them that appellant was required to pay duty amount of Rs. 1,96,297/- towards loss of material due to above referred theft which was paid by the appellant on 28.04.2015 vide Challan No. 00262. After completing inquiry and on the basis of court's order, Police department had handed over the theft goods weighing 2000 kgs to the appellant on 08.02.2020 as per appellant's submission. Subsequently, appellant had filed



Handwritten signature

refund claim of duty paid amounting to Rs. 1,96,297/- on 10.02.2020 on their goods contending that the same was returned back to their factory. The refund claim was rejected by the adjudicating authority vide the impugned order on the grounds of limitation being time barred as well as other grounds narrated in the impugned order.

7. I find that since the refund claim was rejected on the ground of limitation, it is pertinent to examine the relevant provisions of Section 11B of the Act, which are reproduced as under:

"SECTION 11B. Claim for refund of [duty and interest, if any, paid on such duty. —

(1) Any person claiming refund of any [duty of excise and interest, if any, paid on such duty] may make an application for refund of such [duty and interest, if any, paid on such duty] to the [Assistant Commissioner of Central Excise or Deputy Commissioner of Central Excise] before the expiry of [one year] [from the relevant date] in such form and manner as may be prescribed and the application shall be accompanied by such documentary or other evidence (including the documents referred to in section 12A) as the applicant may furnish to establish that the amount of [duty of excise and interest, if any, paid on such duty] in relation to which such refund is claimed was collected from, or paid by, him and the incidence of such [duty and interest, if any, paid on such duty] had not been passed on by him to any other person :

- (2) ...
 (3) ...
 (4) ...
 (5) ...

[Explanation. — For the purposes of this section, -

(A)

(B) "relevant date" means, -

(a) in the case of goods exported out of India where a refund of excise duty paid is available in respect of the goods themselves or, as the case may be, the excisable materials used in the manufacture of such goods, -

(i) if the goods are exported by sea or air, the date on which the ship or the aircraft in which such goods are loaded, leaves India, or

(ii) if the goods are exported by land, the date on which such goods pass the frontier, or

(iii) if the goods are exported by post, the date of dispatch of goods by the Post Office concerned to a place outside India;

(b) in the case of goods returned for being remade, refined, reconditioned, or subjected to any other similar process, in any factory, the date of entry into the factory for the purposes aforesaid;

(c) in the case of goods to which banderols are required to be affixed if removed for home consumption but not so required when exported outside India, if returned to a factory after having been removed from such factory for export out of India, the date of entry into the factory;

(d) in a case where a manufacturer is required to pay a sum, for a certain period, on the basis of the rate fixed by the Central Government by notification in the Official Gazette in full discharge of his liability for the



dy

duty leviable on his production of certain goods, if after the manufacturer has made the payment on the basis of such rate for any period but before the expiry of that period such rate is reduced, the date of such reduction;

(e) in the case of a person, other than the manufacturer, the date of purchase of the goods by such person;]

(ea) in the case of goods which are exempt from payment of duty by a special order issued under sub-section (2) of section 5A, the date of issue of such order;]

(eb) in case where duty of excise is paid provisionally under this Act or the rules made thereunder, the date of adjustment of duty after the final assessment thereof;]

(ec) in case where the duty becomes refundable as a consequence of judgment, decree, order or direction of appellate authority, Appellate Tribunal or any court, the date of such judgment, decree, order or direction;

(f) in any other case, the date of payment of duty.”

[Emphasis supplied]

7.1 On perusal of the case records in the backdrop of the legal provisions above, I find that the Appellant had paid duty amount of Rs. 1,96,297/- on 28.4.2015 on goods lost by theft. Subsequently, on recovery of theft goods, they filed refund claim on 10.2.2020. These facts are not under dispute. The relevant date in the present case is one year from date of payment of duty in terms of clause (B)(f) of Explanation contained in Section 11B *ibid*. Thus, the Appellant was required to file refund claim within one year from date of payment of duty in terms of limitation provided under Section 11B of the Act i.e. on or before 28.4.2016. However, the Appellant filed refund claim on 10.2.2020, which is beyond one year from date of payment of duty on 28.4.2015. Hence, the refund claim is barred by limitation provided under Section 11B of the Act and the refund sanctioning authority has correctly rejected it *vide* the impugned order. As regards the appellant contention that the duty was paid under protest so time limit under the said Section was not applicable, I find that the appellant has not made any such intimation to the department while making payment and hence the contention is rejected.

8. The Appellant has further contended that the refund claim was filed as a result of Order dated 30.12.2019 passed by the Addl. Chief Judicial Magistrate, Jamnagar and hence, limitation period of one year for filing the refund claim should be calculated from 30.12.2019. I find that the Appellant had filed criminal complaint for theft of goods and Hon'ble CJM Court, Jamnagar would have passed the verdict after examining the evidences with reference to CRPC Act, 1973. Apparently, liability to pay Central Excise duty by the Appellant on theft goods was not subject matter before the Hon'ble Court. Under the circumstance, it cannot be



dy

construed that the refund of duty paid by the Appellant has arisen as a consequence of Order dated 30.12.2019 passed by the Addl. Chief Judicial Magistrate, Jamnagar. I, therefore, discard the contention of the Appellant as devoid of merit.

9. In view of the above discussion, I hold that the refund claim was hit by limitation under Section 11B of the Act and correctly rejected vide the impugned order. I, therefore, uphold the impugned order and reject the appeal.

10. अपीलकर्ता द्वारा दर्ज की गई अपील का निपटारा उपरोक्त तरीके से किया जाता है।

10. The appeal filed by the appellant stands disposed off accordingly.

सत्यापित

जे. एस. नाग्रेचा
अधीक्षक (अपील्स)

Akhilesh Kumar
24/5 February, 2021
(Akhilesh Kumar)
Commissioner (Appeals)

By RPAD

To,

M/s. Divine Impex, Plot No. 4, GIDC, Phase-II, Dared, Jamnagar-361 004.	मै. डिवाइन इम्पेक्स, प्लॉट नंबर 4, जीआईडीसी, फेज -II, दरेड, जामनगर - 361 004
--	---

प्रतिलिपि :-

- 1) मुख्य आयुक्त, वस्तु एवं सेवा कर एवं केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क, गुजरात क्षेत्र, अहमदाबाद को जानकारी हेतु।
- 2) आयुक्त, वस्तु एवं सेवा कर एवं केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क, राजकोट आयुक्तालय, राजकोट को आवश्यक कार्यवाही हेतु।
- 3) सहायक आयुक्त, वस्तु एवं सेवा कर एवं केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क, जामनगर-1 मण्डल, को आवश्यक कार्यवाही हेतु।
- 4) गार्ड फ़ाइल।

