



::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 / 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, GST Bhavan  
रेस कोर्स रिंग रोड / Race Course Ring Road  
राजकोट / Rajkot - 360 001



सत्यमेव जयते

Tele Fax No. 0281 - 2477952/2441142 Email: commrappl3-cexamd@nic.in

रजिस्टर्ड डाक ए.डी.द्वारा

DIN-20211164SX000000CE0A

क	अपील / फाइल संख्या/ Appeal / File No.	मूल आदेश सं / O.I.O. No.	दिनांक/ Date
	V2/7/RAJ/2021	7/D/Supdt/20-21	15-01-2021

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

**RAJ-EXCUS-000-APP-047-2021**

आदेश का दिनांक / Date of Order:	15.11.2021	जारी करने की तारीख / Date of issue:	17.11.2021
------------------------------------	------------	--	------------

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. Saurashtra Gramin Bank (1st floor, LIC Jivan Prakash Building), Wing-2, Tagore Road, Rajkot-360001, Gujarat.

इस आदेश (अपील) से ब्यथित 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) सामान्य शुल्क, केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क एवं सेवाकर अपीलार्थ न्यायाधिकरण क प्रांत 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 अपीलों सीमा शुल्क, केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क एवं सेवाकर अपीलीय न्यायाधिकरण (विस्टेट) की पश्चिम क्षेत्रीय पीठिका, द्वितीय तल, बहुमाली भवन असाबा अहमदाबाद- 380016 को की जानी चाहिए। /

To the West regional bench of Customs, Excise & Service Tax Appellate Tribunal (CESTAT) at, 2<sup>nd</sup> 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 मांग, ब्याज की मांग 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 रजिस्ट्रार 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 सकती है 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 मांग, ब्याज की मांग 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 रजिस्ट्रार 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 fees of Rs. 1000/- where the amount of service tax & interest demanded & penalty levied is more than five lakhs or less, Rs.5000/- 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 सकती 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 अपीलिय 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 अपीलिय 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 अपीलिय प्राधिकरण में अपील करते समय उत्पाद शुल्क/सेवा कर मांग के 10 प्रतिशत (10%), जब मांग एवं जमाना विवादित है, या जमाना, जब केवल जमाना विवादित है, का भुगतान किया जाए, बशर्ते कि इस धारा के अंतर्गत जमा कि जाने वाली अपेक्षित देय राशि इस करोड़ रुपए से अधिक न हो।  
केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क एवं सेवाकर के अंतर्गत "मांग किए गए शुल्क" में निम्न शामिल है
- धारा 11 डी के अंतर्गत रकम
  - सेनवेट जमा की ली गई गलत राशि
  - सेनवेट जमा नियमावली के नियम 6 के अंतर्गत देय रकम
- बशर्ते यह कि इस धारा के प्रावधान वित्तीय (सं 2) अधिनियम 2014 के अरंभ से पूर्व किसी अपीलिय प्राधिकारी के समक्ष विचाराधीन स्थगन अर्जी एवं अपील को लागू नहीं होगी।  
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 कोपनरीक्षण आवेदन :  
**Revision application to Government of India:**  
इस आदेश की पुनरीक्षणयाचिका निम्नलिखित मामलों में, केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क अधिनियम, 1994 की धारा 35EE के प्रथमपरतुक के अंतर्गत अवर सचिव, भारत सरकार, पुनरीक्षण आवेदन इकाई, वित्त मंत्रालय, राजस्व 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:
- 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
  - 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 छूट (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 on excisable material used in the manufacture of the goods which are exported to any country or territory outside India.
  - 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.
  - मुनिश्चित उत्पाद के उत्पादन शुल्क के भुगतान के लिए जो छूटी 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 समाप्तविधि 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.
  - 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, इन आदेश के संप्रेषण के 3 माह के अंतर्गत की जानी चाहिए। उपरोक्त आवेदन को एक 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.
  - पुनरीक्षण आवेदन के साथ निम्नलिखित निर्धारित शुल्क की अदायगी की जानी चाहिए।  
जहां 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 होने हुए भी की लिखा पत्र कार्य से बचने के लिए यथास्थिति अपीलिय न्यायाधिकरण को एक अपील या केन्द्रीय सरकार को एक आवेदन किया जाता है। / In case if the order covers various umbers 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 अपीलिय न्यायाधिकरण (कार्य विधि) नियमावली, 1982 में वर्णित एवं अन्य संबन्धित 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 अपीलिय प्राधिकारी को अपील दाखिल करने से संबंधित व्यापक, विस्तृत और नवीनतम प्रावधानों के लिए, अपीलार्थी विभागीय वेबसाइट [www.cbec.gov.in](http://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](http://www.cbec.gov.in).

**:: ORDER-IN-APPEAL ::**

M/s. Saurashtra Gramin Bank, Rajkot (hereinafter referred to as 'appellant') has filed appeal No. V2/7/RAJ/2021 against the Order-In-Original No. 7/D/Supdt/20-21 dated 15.1.2021 (hereinafter referred to as 'impugned order') passed by the Superintendent(Adjudication), Central GST Division-I, Rajkot (hereinafter referred to as "adjudicating authority").

2. The facts of the case, in brief, are that the appellant was holding Service Tax registration No. AAHAS2116HSD001 under the category of "Banking and other Financial Services". During the course of audit of the records of the appellant by the officers of CERA Audit, it was observed that they had paid Service Tax on the Insurance Premium related to the Accidental Insurance Policy and Gratuity Scheme extending the benefits to their employees and accordingly, availed Cenvat credit to the extent of fifty percent of the total Service Tax paid by them, treating them as input services on the strength of the invoices issued during the period from F.Y. 2013-14 to F.Y. 2014-15. It was found that Cenvat credit involved on the Insurance Premium paid on the Accidental Insurance Policy and Gratuity Scheme were out of the purview of the input services and therefore, the appellant was not entitled to avail Cenvat credit of the same. The appellant had continued such practice of availing Cenvat credit and availed and utilized Cenvat Credit of Rs. 1,99,736/- during F.Y. 2015-16, being fifty percent of the total service tax amount. The Appellant was issued two Show Cause Notices for the aforesaid period for recovery of wrongly availed Cenvat credit.

2.1 The Appellant vide letter dated 21.7.2017 furnished details of Cenvat credit availed and utilized during the subsequent period of April, 2016 to June, 2017. It appeared that the Appellant had wrongly availed and utilised Cenvat credit of Rs. 2,28,625/- during the said period.

3. The Show Cause Notice No. V.84(4)2/MP/D/Supdt/2017-18 dated 9.4.2019 was issued to the Appellant calling them to show cause as to why wrongly availed Cenvat Credit of Rs. 2,28,625/- should not be disallowed and recovered from them under Rule 14 of the Cenvat Credit Rules, 2004 (hereinafter referred to as "CCR,2004") read with Section 73(1) of the Finance Act, 1994 (hereinafter referred to as "Act"), along with interest. It



was also proposed to impose penalty upon the appellant under Sections 76 and 77(2) of the Act.

4. The above mentioned Show Cause Notice was adjudicated by the adjudicating authority vide impugned order, wherein he confirmed demand of Rs. 2,28,625/- under Rule 14 of CCR, 2004 read with Section 73(1) of the Act along with interest and imposed penalty of Rs. 10,000/- under Section 77(2) and penalty of Rs. 22,900/- under Section 76 of the Act.

5. Being aggrieved, the appellant preferred the present appeal contending, *inter alia*, that the adjudicating authority erred in computing Service Tax liability as they were eligible for availing input credit; that he erred in disallowing input Service Tax credit of Rs. 2,28,625/- which they have paid to various insurance companies; that the adjudicating authority erred in imposing interest liabilities as well as penalties on them.

6. Hearing in the matter was scheduled in virtual mode through video conferencing on 21.10.2021. Shri Gautam Acharya, C.A. appeared on behalf of the Appellant. He reiterated the submissions made in appeal memorandum and stated that the Hon'ble Tribunal has allowed their appeal on similar matter for the past period.

7. I have carefully gone through the facts of the case, the impugned order, the appeal memorandum and submission made during the personal hearing. The issue to be decided in the present appeal is whether the Appellant is eligible to avail Cenvat credit of service tax paid on insurance premium related to the Accidental Insurance Policy and Gratuity Scheme of their employees or not.

8. . On perusal of the records, I find that the Appellant had availed Cenvat credit of service tax paid on insurance premium related to the Accidental Insurance Policy and Gratuity Scheme of their employees during the period from April, 2016 to June, 2017. The adjudicating authority had denied the said Cenvat credit on the grounds that the same is covered under exclusion clause (C) of term 'input service' defined under Rule 2(l) of CCR, 2004 and hence, said Cenvat credit cannot be considered as input service for the Appellant.

8.1 It has been contended by the Appellant that the demand for previous



period was allowed by the Hon'ble CESTAT, Ahmedabad.

9. I have gone through the Hon'ble CESTAT, Ahmedabad's Order No. A/10480/2018 dated 26.2.2018 passed in Appellant's own case for the previous period, which has been relied upon by the Appellant. I find that the Hon'ble CESTAT in the said order has held that,

"3. The short issue involved in the present case is : whether the appellant are entitled to avail Cenvat credit of Rs. 1,99,736/- service tax paid on various insurance policies during the period 2013-14 to 2015-16.

4. The Ld. Chartered Accountant Shri G. Acharya for the appellant submits that they are entitled to avail credit of service tax paid on the premium of insurance policies, namely, Accidental Insurance Policy, Group Gratuity Scheme and Group Personal Policy for the workers. He submits that the service tax paid on insurance policies are eligible to credit in view of the judgements of this Tribunal in the case of Granules India Ltd. Vs. CCE, Hyderabad vide final Order No. 30585-30586/2017 dated 19.04.2017, M/s. Sarita Handa export (P) Ltd. Vs. CCE, Gurgaon-II vide final Order No. 60064/2016 dated 12.05.2016, M/s FieM Industries Ltd. Vs. CCE vide final order No. 40554/2016 dated 29.03.2016 and M/s. Talent Maximus India Pvt. Ltd. Vs. CST, Chennai vide final order No. 41397/2017 dated 04.08.2017.

5. The Ld AR for the Revenue reiterated the findings of the Ld. Commissioner (Appeals).

6. I find that the service tax paid on aforementioned insurance policies held to be 'Input Service' within the definition of Rule 2 (l) of CCR, 2004 post amendment and accordingly held admissible to credit in the aforesaid judgements of this Tribunal. Following the said precedents, the impugned order being devoid of merit is accordingly set aside and the appeal is allowed with consequential relief, if any, as per law."

10. By respectfully following the above Order of the Hon'ble Tribunal, I hold that the Appellant has correctly availed Cenvat credit of service tax in dispute.

11. I find that the Appellant had relied upon aforesaid Order of the Hon'ble CESTAT, Ahmedabad during adjudication proceedings. However, the adjudicating authority discarded their contention by observing at para 18 of the impugned order that the said order was accepted by the Department on



monetary limit and hence cannot be said to have attained finality and that it does not have precedence value.

11.1 I do not agree with the findings of the adjudicating authority. Once the Department had accepted the said Order of the Hon'ble CESTAT, Ahmedabad even on monetary limit, as observed by the adjudicating authority, fact remains that said Order of the Tribunal has not been reversed or stayed by higher appellate authority and consequently said Order is binding upon the adjudicating authority. The judicial discipline required the adjudicating authority to have followed the said Order, in letter and spirit. It is pertinent to mention that when any Order is accepted on monetary limit, the Department may agitate the issue in appropriate case in other appeal proceedings, but it is not open for the adjudicating authority to pass order on merit disregarding binding precedent. The adjudicating authority may distinguish relied upon decision, if there is change in facts or change in legal position. However, the adjudicating authority has not brought on record as to how the said relied upon Order of the Tribunal is not applicable to the facts of the present case. My views are supported by the Order passed by the Hon'ble CESTAT, New Delhi in the case of RGL Converters reported as 2015 (315) E.L.T. 309 (Tri. - Del.), wherein it has been held that,

“10. It is axiomatic that judgments of this Tribunal have precedential authority and are binding on all quasi-judicial authorities (Primary or Appellate), administering the provisions of the Act, 1944. If an adjudicating authority is unaware of this basic principle, the authority must be inferred to be inadequately equipped to deliver the quasi-judicial functions entrusted to his case. If the authority is aware of the hierarchical judicial discipline (of precedents) but chooses to transgress the discipline, the conduct amounts to judicial misconduct, liable in appropriate cases for disciplinary action.

11. It is a trite principle that a final order of this Tribunal, enunciating a ratio decidendi, is an operative judgment per se; not contingent on ratification by any higher forum, for its vitality or precedential authority. The fact that Revenue's appeal against the judgment of this Tribunal was rejected only on the ground of bar of limitation and not in affirmation of the conclusions recorded on merits, does not derogate from the principle that a judgment of this Tribunal is per se of binding precedential vitality qua adjudicating authorities lower in the hierarchy, such as a primary adjudicating authority or a Commissioner (Appeals). This is too well settled to justify elaborate analyses and exposition, of this protean principle.

12. Nevertheless, the primary and the lower appellate authorities in this case, despite adverting to the judgment of this Tribunal and without concluding that the judgment had suffered either a temporal or plenary eclipse (on account of suspension or reversal of its ratio by any higher judicial authority), have chosen to ignore judicial discipline and have recorded conclusions diametrically contrary to the judgment of this Tribunal. This is either



illustrative of gross incompetence or clear irresponsible conduct and a serious transgression of quasi-judicial norms by the primary and the lower appellate authorities, in this case. Such perverse orders further clog the appellate docket of this Tribunal, already burdened with a huge pendency, apart from accentuating the faith deficit of the citizen/assessee, in departmental adjudication.”

11.2 I further rely on the decision rendered by the Hon'ble Gujarat High Court in the case of *Claris Lifesciences Ltd.* reported as 2013 (298) E.L.T. 45 (Guj.), wherein it has been held that,

“8. The adjudicating officer acts as a quasi judicial authority. He is bound by the law of precedent and binding effect of the order passed by the higher authority or Tribunal of superior jurisdiction. If his order is thought to be erroneous by the Department, the Department can as well prefer appeal in terms of the statutory provisions contained in the Central Excise Act, 1944.

9. Counsel for the petitioners brought to our notice the decision of the Apex Court in the case of *Union of India v. Kamlakshi Finance Corporation Ltd.* reported in 1991 (95) ELT 433 (SC) in which while approving the criticism of the High Court of the Revenue Authorities not following the binding precedent, the Apex Court observed that :-

“6...It cannot be too vehemently emphasized that it is of utmost importance that, in disposing of the quasi-judicial issues before them, revenue officers are bound by the decisions of the appellate authorities. The order of the Appellate Collector is binding on the Assistant Collectors working within his jurisdiction and the order of the Tribunal is binding upon the Assistant Collectors and the Appellate Collectors who function under the jurisdiction of the Tribunal. The principles of judicial discipline require that the orders of the higher appellate authorities should be followed unreservedly by the subordinate authorities. The mere fact that the order of the appellate authority is not “acceptable” to the department - in itself an objectionable phrase - and is the subject-matter of an appeal can furnish no ground for not following it unless its operation has been suspended by a competent Court. If this healthy rule is not followed, the result will only be undue harassment to assessees and chaos in administration of tax laws.

7. The impression or anxiety of the Assistant Collector that, if he accepted the assessee's contention, the department would lose revenue and would also have no remedy to have the matter rectified is also incorrect. Section 35D confers adequate powers on the department in this regard. Under sub-section (1), where the Central Board of Excise and Customs (Direct Taxes) comes across any order passed by the Collector of Central Excise with the legality or propriety of which it is not satisfied, it can direct the Collector to apply to the Appellate Tribunal for the determination of such points arising out of the decision or order as may be specified by the Board in its order. Under sub-section (2) the Collector of Central Excise, when he comes across any order passed by an authority subordinate to him, if not satisfied with its legality or propriety, may direct such authority to apply to the Collector (Appeals) for the determination of such points arising out of the decision or order as may be specified by the Collector of Central Excise in his order and there is a further right of appeal to the department. The position now, therefore, is that, if any order passed by an Assistant Collector or Collector is adverse to the interests

*du*

of the Revenue, the immediately higher administrative authority has the power to have the matter satisfactorily resolved by taking up the issue to the Appellate Collector or the Appellate Tribunal as the case may be. In the light of these amended provisions, there can be no justification for any Assistant Collector or Collector refusing to follow the order of the Appellate Collector or the Appellate Tribunal, as the case may be, even where he may have some reservations on its correctness. He has to follow the order of the higher appellate authority. This may instantly cause some prejudice to the Revenue but the remedy is also in the hands of the same officer. He has only to bring the matter to the notice of the Board or the Collector so as to enable appropriate proceedings being taken under S. 35E(1) or (2) to keep the interests of the department alive. If the officer's view is the correct one, it will no doubt be finally upheld and the Revenue will get the duty, though after some delay which such procedure would entail."

11.3 I also rely on the decision rendered by the Hon'ble Madras High Court in the case of Industrial Mineral Company (IMC) reported as 2018 (18) G.S.T.L. 396 (Mad.), wherein it has been held that,

"8. This Court is of the view that when the order passed by the Tribunal has not been stayed or set aside by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, it is the bounden duty of the Adjudicating Authority to follow the law laid down by the Tribunal. Since a binding decision has not been followed by the Adjudicating Authority in this case, this Court can interfere straightaway without relegating the assessee to file an appeal."

12. In view of above discussion, I hold that confirmation of demand totally amounting to Rs. 2,28,625/- is not sustainable on merits and required to be set aside and I order accordingly. Since, demand is set aside, recovery of interest and penalty imposed under Sections 76 and 77 are also set aside.

13. In view of above, I set aside the impugned order and allow the appeal filed by the appellant.

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

14. The appeal filed by the Appellant is disposed off as above.

सत्यापित,

V/S

विपुल शाह

अधीक्षक (अपील्स)

*Akhil Kumar*  
15 November 2021

(AKHILESH KUMAR)  
Commissioner (Appeals)

By R.P.A.D.

To, M/s. Saurashtra Gramin Bank, 1 <sup>st</sup> Floor, S. J. Palace, Opp. Andh Mahila Vikas Gruh, Dhebar Road, Gopalnagar, Rajkot.	सेवा में, मे. सौराष्ट्र ग्रामीण बैंक, पहेली मंज़िल, एस.जे. पेलेस, अंध महिला विकास गृह के सामने, देबर रोड, राजकोट.
--	---



प्रतिलिपि:-

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



