

::आयुक्त (अपील्स) का कार्यालय, वस्तु एवं सेवा करऔरकेन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क:: O/O THE COMMISSIONER (APPEALS), GST &CENTRAL EXCISE

द्वितीय तल,जी एस टी भवन / 2nd Floor, GST Bhavan रेस कोर्स रिंग रीड / Race Course Ring Road

राजकोट / Raikot – 360 001 Tele Fax No. 0281 - 2477952/2441142

Email: commrappl3-cexamd@nic.in

जिस्टर्ड डाक ए.डी.द्वारा:-

DIN-20221164SX0000558355

do

77

अपीत / फाइलसंख्या/ Appeal /File No.

V2/25/GDM /2022

मूल आदेश सं / O.I.O. No.

दिनांक/

The Parity of th

79/AC/Urban/2021-22

Date 15-02-2022

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

KCH-EXCUS-000-APP-044-2022

आदेश का दिनांक /

Date of Order:

28.11.2022

जारी करने की तारीख़ /

Date of issue:

29.11.2022

श्री **शिव प्रताप सिंह** , आयुक्त (अपील्स), राजकोट द्वारा पारित /

Passed by Shri Shiv Pratap Singh, Commissioner (Appeals), Rajkot.

अपर आयुक्ता संयुक्त आयुक्ता उपायुक्ता सहायक आयुक्त, केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्का सेवाकर/वस्तु एवंसेवाकर,राजकोट / जामनगर / गांथीधा 🗀 उपरलिखित जारी मूल आदेश से सजित: /

Arising out of above mentioned OIO issued by Additional/Joint/Deputy/Assistant Commissioner, Control Excise/ST / GST, Rajkot / Jamnagar / Gendhidham:

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

M/s Samim Ansari, Plot No. 102, Shop No. 4,, Sector-9C, National Highwa Office.

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 follow: way.

सीमा शुल्क ,केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क एवं सेवाकर अपीलीय न्यायाधिकरण के प्रति अपील, केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क अधिनियम ,1944 की धारा 35E अंतर्गत एवं वित्त अधिनियम, **1994** की धारा **86** के अंतर्गत निम्न<mark>लिखित जगह की जा सकती है ।</mark>/

Appeal to Customs, Excise & Service Tax Appellate Tribunal under Section 35B of CEA, 1944 / Under Section of the Finance Act, 1994 an appeal lies to: -

वर्गीकरण मूल्यांकन से सम्बन्धित सभी मामले सीमा शुल्क, केन्द्रीय उच्चादंन शुल्क एवं सेवाकर अपीलीय न्यायाधिकरण की विशेष पीठ, वेस्ट बर्गेट 🕟 २, 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, $N_{\rm C}$ Delhi in all matters relating to classification and valuation.

उपरोक्त परिच्छेद 1(a) में बताए गए अ<mark>पीलों के अलावा शेष सभी अपीलें सीमा शु</mark>ल्क,केंद्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क एवं सेवाकर अपीलीय न्यायाधिकः । (सिस्टेट)की पश्चिम क्षेत्रीय पीठिका,,द्वितीय तल, बहुमाली भवन असार्वा अहमदाबाद- ३८००१६को को जानी चाहिए ।/

To the West regional bench of Customs, Excise & Service Tax Appellate Tribunal (CESTAT) at, 2nd Fic Bhaumali Bhawan, Asarwa Ahmedabad-380016 in case of appeals other than as mentioned in para- 1(a) above Bhaumali Bhawan, Asarwa Ahmedabad-380016 in case of appeals other than as mentioned in para- 1(a) above अपीलीय न्यायाधिकरण के समक्ष अपील प्रस्तुत करने के लिए केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क (अपील)नियमावली, 2001, के नियम 6 के अंतर्गत निर्धाक्तिए 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, ज्याज किए 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 १,४६६ रुपये, 5,000/- रुपये अथवा 10,000/- रुपये का निर्धारित जमा शुल्क की प्रति संलग्न करें। निर्धारित शुल्क का भुगतान, संबंधित अपील न्यायाधिकरण की शाखा के सहायक रिजस्ता जाना चाहिए संबंधित उपाद का भुगतान, बैंक की उस शाखा में होना चाहिए जहां संबंधित अपीलीय न्यायाधिकरण की शाखा स्थित है। स्थगन आदेश (स्टे आई) 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 for Central Excise (Appeal) Rules, 2001 and shall be accompanied against one which at least should accompanied by a fee of Rs. 1.000/- Rs.5000/-, Rs.10,000/- where amount of duadrenard/interest/penalty/refund is upto 5 Lac., 5 Lac to 50 Lac and above 50 Lac respectively in the form crossed bank draft in favour of Asst, Registrar of branch 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/-

अपीलीय न्यायाधिकरण के समक्ष अपील, वित्त अधिनियम, 1994 की धारा 86(1) के अंतर्गत सेवाकर नियमवाली, 1994, के नियम 9(1) के दें निधारित प्रपन्न 8.7.-5 में चार प्रतियों में की जा सकेगी एवं उसके साथ जिस आदेश के विरुद्ध अपील की गयी हो, उसकी प्रति साथ में संलग्न वे ! (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 जुर्माना, रुपए 5 लाख या उससे कम, 5 लाख रुपए था 50 लाख रुपए तक अथवा 50 लाख रुपए से अधिक है तो कमशः 1,000/- रुपये, 5 लिए अथवा 10,000/- रुपये का निधारित जाम शुल्क की प्रति संलग्न करें। निधारित शुल्क का भुगतान, संबंधित अपीलीय न्यायाधिकरण की श के सहायक रजिस्टार के नाम से किसी भी सावजिनक क्षेत्र के बँक द्वारा जाते रखाकित बँक द्वारा किया जाना चाहिए। संबंधित उपित होन्द संवाद के सहायक रजिस्टार की उस शाखा में होना चाहिए जहां संबंधित अपीलीय न्यायाधिकरण की शाखा स्थित है। स्थान आदेश (स्टे ऑर्डर) के लिए अवेद पत्र के साध 500%, रुपए का विधारित शालक जम्म करना होगा। पॅत्र के साथ 5001- 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 a in quadruplicate in Form S.T.5 as prescribed under Rule 9(1) of the Service Tax Rules, 1994, and Shall accompanied by a copy of the order appealed against (one of which shall be certified copy) and should accompanied by a fees of Rs. 1000/- where the amount of service tax & interest demanded & penalty levied Rs. 5 Lakhs or less, Rs.5000/- where the amount of service tax & interest demanded & penalty levied is more five lakhs but not exceeding Rs. Fifty Lakhs, Rs.10,000/- where the amount of service tax & interest demanded & penalty levied is more 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 bank Registrar of the bench of nominated Public Sector Bank of the place where the bench of Tribunal situated. Application made for grant of stay shall be accompanied by a fee of Rs.500/-.

 $i\Delta j$

 S_{ij}^{α}

(iii)

(3)

(6)

वित्त अधिनियम,1994 की धारा 86 की उप-धाराओं (2) एवं (2A) के अंतर्गत दर्ज की गर्मी अपील, सेवाकर नियमवाली, 1994, के नियम 9(2) एवं 9(2A) के तहत निर्धारित प्रपत्र S.T.-7 में की जा संकेगी 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 वाल आदेश की प्रति भी साथ में संलग्न 0

की धारा 35एफ के अंतर्गत, जो की वित्तीय अधिनयम, 1984 की धारा 83 के अंतर्गत सेवाकर को भी लागू की गई है, इस आदेश के प्रति अपीलीय प्राधिकरण में अपील करते समय उत्पाद शुल्कासेवा कर मांग के 10 प्रतिशत (10%), जब मांग एवं जुर्माना विवादित है, या जुर्माना, जह केवल जुर्माना विवादित है, का भुगतान किया जाए, बशर्ते कि इस धारा के अंतर्गत जमा कि जाने वाली अधिक्षत देय राशि दस 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 गुलत राशि

(ii)

(3)

सेनवेट जमा नियमावली के नियम ह के अंतर्गत देय रकम (iii)

्बंशर्ते यह कि इस धारा के प्रावधान वित्तीय (सं° 2) अधिनियम 2014 के आरंभ से पूर्व किसी अपीलीय प्राधिकारी के समत विचाराधीन स्थगन अर्ज़ी एवं अपील को लागू नहीं होगे।/

विचाराधीन स्थान अर्ज़ी एवं अपील को लागू नहीं होगे।!

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 be 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 Cenvet Credit taken;

(iii) amount payable under Rule 6 of the Cenvet 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.

भारत सरकार कोपुनरीक्षण आवेदन : भारत सरकार कोपूनरीक्षण आवेदन :
Revision application to Government of India:
इस आदेश की पुनरीक्षणभाविका निम्नलिखित मामला में, केद्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क अधिनियम, 1994 की धारा 35EE के प्रथमपरंतुक के अंतर्गतअवर सचिव, भारत सरकार, पुनरीक्षण आवेदन ईकाई, 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 subsection [1] of Section-35B ibid: (0)

यदि माल के किसी नुकसान के मामले में, जहां नुकसान किसी माल को किसी कारखाने से भंडार गृह के पारगुमन के दौरान या किसी अन्य कारखाने या फिर किसी एक भंडार गृह से दूसरे भंडार गृह से पारगुमन के दौरान, या किसी भंडार गृह में या भंडारण में माल के प्रसंकरण के दौरान, किसी कारखाने या किसी भंडार गृह में या भंडारण में माल के प्रसंकरण 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 शुक्क के छुट (रिबेट) के मामले में, जो भारत के बहिर 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. (ii)

यदि उत्पाद शुक्क का भुगतान किए बिना भारत के बाहर, नेपाल या भूटान को माल निर्पात किया गया है। / In case of goods exported outside India export to Nepal or Bhutan, without payment of duty.

सुनिश्चित उत्पाद के उत्पादन शुल्क के भुगतान के लिए जो ड्यूटी क्रेडीट इस अधिनियम एवं इसके विभिन्न प्रावधानों के तहत मान्य की गई है और ऐसे आदेश जो आयुक्त (अपील) के द्वारा वित्त अधिनियम (न° 2),1998 की धारा 109 के द्वारा नियंत की गई तारीख अथवा समायाविधि पर या बाद में पारित किए गए हैं। . v1 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 प्रपन्न संख्या EA-8 में, जो की केन्द्रीय उत्पादन शुल्क (अपील)नियमावली,2001, के नियम 9 के अंतर्गत विनिर्दिश 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. (7)

पुनरीक्षण आवेदन के साथ निम्नलिखित निर्धारित शुल्क की अद्वायगी की जानी चाहिए। जहाँ सेलग्न रकम एक लाख रूपये या उससे कम हो तो रूपये 200/- का भुगतान किया जाए और यदि संलग्न रकम एक लाख रूपये से ज्यादा हैं तो रूपये 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. (vi)

यदि इस आदेश में कई मूल आदेशों का समावेश है तो प्रत्येक मूल आदेश के लिए शुल्क का भगतान, उपर्यंक्त दंग से किया जाना चाहिये। इस तथा के हींदें हुए भी की लिखा पढ़ी कार्य से बचने के लिए यथास्थित अपीलीय नयाधिकरण की एक अपील या केंद्रीय सरकार की एक आवेदन किया जाती हैं। / 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 or Rs. 100/- for each. 7 DI

यथासंशोधित न्यायालय शुल्क अधिनियम, 1975, के अनुसूची-। के अनुसार मूल आदेश एवं स्थमन आदेश की प्रति पर निर्धारित 6.50 रुपये क न्यायालय शुल्क टिकिट लेगा 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. (Ξ)

सीमा शुक्क, केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुक्क एवं सेवाकर अपीलीय न्यायाधिकरण (कार्य विधि) नियमावली, 1982 में वर्णित एवं अन्य संबन्धित मामलों के समिमितित करने वाले नियमों की और 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 हरी।

उच्च अपीलीय प्राधिकारी को अपील द्वाखिल 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. (G)



:: ORDER-IN-APPEAL ::

M/s Samim Alim Ansari, (hereinafter referred to as 'appellant') has filed present appeal against Order-in-Original No. 79/AC/Urban/2021-22, dated 15.02.2022 (hereinafter referred to as 'impugned order'), issued by the Assistant Commissioner, Central GST Urban Division, Gandhidham(hereinafter referred to as 'adjudicating authority').

- 2. The facts of the case, in brief, are that the Appellant was engaged in the activities of providing Services and was holding Permanent Account Number AEIPA7449D with the Income Tax Department. The Appellant was not registered with the Service Tax Department for the purpose of payment of Service tax. On the basis of information regarding value of gross receipts from services shared by the Central Board of Direct Taxes (Income Tax Department), it appeared that the appellant had not disclosed their true and correct gross value of services provided. Since the appellant failed to submit the required clarification and information, the tax liability was calculated on the basis of 'Best Judgement' assessment method under Section 72 of the Finance Act, 1994.
- 3. It was alleged that the appellant had contravened various provisions of the Service tax Act, 1994 by their failure to obtain Service tax registration and pay Service tax at the material time. They also failed to furnish information and documents as called for by the Jurisdictional Range Officer. Hence based on the information provided by the Income tax department, the adjudicating authority confirmed the demand amounting toRs. 9,22,853/- on the basis of Best judgement assessment under Section 72 of the Finance Act, 1994, under Section 73(1) of the Finance Act by invoking extended period along with interest and penalty.
- 4. Being aggrieved with the impugned order, Appellant has preferred appeal on various grounds, *inter alia*, as below:-
 - (i) That the adjudicating authority has violated the principles of Natural justice by issuing the impugned order without providing opportunity for personal hearing and to submit relevant documents.
 - (ii) That the adjudicating authority has overlooked the basic provisions of the Finance Act by ignoring the fact that Service tax was to be paid by the Service recipient under RCM;
 - (iii) That the adjudicating authority has overlooked important Judicial pronouncements in as much as, "Service Tax" cannot be automatically /mechanically determined in the basis of Income tax Return and Form 26AS

of Income Tax TDS; they placed reliance upon the following decisions:-

18:17

Appeal No: V2/25/GDM/2022

- (a) Supreme Court judgement in the case of Cosmic Dye Chemical V/s Collector of Central Excise Equivalent citation 1994 (48)ECC 55, 1995 (75-ELT 721 SC, 1995 (66) SCC 117, 1994 95 STC 604 SC;
- (b) Commissioner of Service tax, Ahmedabad Versus Purani ADS Pvt Ltd 2010 (19) STR 242 (Tri-Ahmd.);
- (c) M/s Reliance Inds. Ltd V/s Commissioner of Cen.Ex., Rajkot 2008 (10) STR 243 (Tri-Ahmd).
- (iv) That the adjudicating authority failed to carry out proper verification of records/materials and overlooked the fact that they had only two trucks and the Services provided by them was covered under Exemption Notification No 30/2012 ST dated 20.06.2012 and the recipient of services were liable to pay Service tax on RCM basis.

In view of their above submissions they requested to set aside the impugned order.

- 4.1 Personal Hearing in the matter was held on 02.11.2022 in virtual mode. Ms Winny Channd, Advocate, appeared for hearing on behalf of the appellant. She submitted that the appellant was eligible for benefit of Notification No 30/2012 ST for GTA. She reiterated that the appellant had gone to the office of the adjudicating authority on 22.01.2022 but no one was available to record their Personal Hearing. She undertook to make additional submissions within two days and requested to either set aside the Order In Original or remand the matter for de novo adjudication.
- 4.2 The appellant vide their email dated 03.11.2022, filed additional written submission in support of oral submissions made through video conference dated 02.11.2022, wherein they submitted that:-
 - (i) the appellant was a very small GTA service provider having only two trucks;
 - (ii) the appellant used to provide GTA services to various customer on trip basis and claimed exemption under Notification 30/2012-ST as service recipients used to pay service tax on RCM basis;
 - (iii) the appellant has never issued any invoice on the basis of forward charges and had not collected service tax from their customers, therefore they had not taken Service tax registration;
 - (iv) they submitted certificate issued by certain freight carriers showing payment of freight charges and wherein it is mentioned that service tax is payable by recipient on RCM basis.

they submitted that the assessing authority had not verified the details with the recipients and had calculated the service tax liability on the basis of Form 26AS, which is not legal and proper and have accordingly requested to set aside the impugned order or remand back the matter to



the original adjudicating authority.

- 5. I have carefully gone through the facts of the case, the impugned order, the appeal memorandum and written as well as oral submissions made by the Appellants. The issue to be decided is whether the activity carried out by the appellant is covered under category of taxable services or under the Negative list and whether the impugned order, in the facts of this case, confirming demand and imposing penalty on the Appellant is correct, legal and proper or not.
- I find that in the present case, Show Cause Notice was issued on the basis of third-party data, invoking provisions of Section 72 of the Finance Act, i.e 'Best Judgement Method'. However, the appellant has submitted that except for one hearing notice dtd. 20/22.01.2022, they had not received any notice, letter, communication or Show Cause Notice from the adjudication authority, prior to the impugned 0.1:0 dated 15.02.2022.
- 7. The appellant has submitted in their appeal memorandum that they were engaged in the business of GTA Services through two trucks owned by them and that in view of provisions contained in Notification 30/2012-ST dated 20.06.2012, they were not liable to pay Service tax. Service tax was payable by the recipient of service under Reverse charge mechanism. However, I find that there is no mention regarding the nature of service provided in the impugned order. The adjudicating authority has not carried out any verification regarding the nature of service provided but merely on the basis of the data contained in the Form 26 AS, he has come to the conclusion that the appellant has provided taxable services.
- 8. In the present case the adjudicating authority has confirmed the demand under Section 72 of the Finance Act, ordering the Best Judgement Assessment in respect of Service Tax demanded from the appellants. Section 72 of the Finance Act reads as under:-

"Section 72: Best Judgement Assessment: If any person, liable to pay Service tax,

- (a) Fails to furnish the returns under Section 70;
- (b) Having made a return, fails to assess the tax in accordance with the provisions of this Chapter or Rules made thereunder,
- the Central Excise Officer, may require the person to produce such accounts, documents or other evidence as he may deem necessary and after taking into account all the relevant material which is available or which he has gathered, shall by an order in writing, after giving the person an opportunity of being heard, make the assessment of value of taxable services to the best of his judgement and determine the sum payable by the assesse or refundable to the assesse on the basis of such assessment."

Return under Section 70 or having made a return, fails to assess the tax in

Bir

Excise Officers are empowered to make the Best Judgement Assessment. In the present case, the adjudicating authority had asked the appellants to provide complete details of the services provided and copy of the ST-3 Returns, if any, filed by the appellants. During the course of hearing the Advocate of the appellant submitted that they had gone to the office of the adjudicating authority on 22.01.2022, but no one was available to record their Personal hearing. The adjudicating authority had invoked Best Judgement Assessment for want of information/documents/ ST-3 Returns, which the appellants failed to furnish.

- 10. As the adjudicating authority has passed the impugned order without proper verification and as the appellants are willing to provide the information desired by the department, I remand back the matter to the original authority for de-novo consideration after providing an opportunity of personal hearing to the appellants. The appellants are also directed to provide all the information sought for by the adjudicating authority within a month of receipt of this order.
- 11. Accordingly, I set aside the impugned order and remand the matter back to the adjudicating authority to decide the case afresh after taking into consideration all the documents and submissions of the appellant.
- 12. अपीलकर्ता द्वारा दर्ज कीगई अपील का निपटारा उपरोक्त तरीकेसे किया जाता है।
- 12. The appeal filed by the Appellant is disposed off as above.

सत्यापित (Attested

Superintendent Central GST (Appeals) Rajkot (SHIV PRATAP SINGH)
Commissioner(Appeals)

By R.P.A.D.

To,

Shri Samim Alim Ansari, P.No. 102, Shop No 4, Sector 9C, National Highway Office, Gandhidham - 370201. सेवा मे,

श्री समीम अलीम अंसारी, पी.सं. 102, शॉपनंबर 4, सेक्टर 9 सी, राष्ट्रीय राज मार्ग कार्यालय, गांधीधाम - 370201

प्रतिलिपि :-

4) गार्ड फ़ा

- 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,गांधीधाम, आयुक्तालय,गांधीधाम, को आवश्यक कार्यवाही हेत्।

3) सहायक आयुक्त, वस्तु एवं सेवा कर एवं केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क मण्डल गांधीधाम, (urban) आवश्यक कार्यवाही हेता.