



:: आयुक्त (अपील) 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: commrappl3-cexamd@nic.in

रजिस्टर्ड डाक ए.डी. द्वारा

DIN-20221264SX000000D280

क	अपील / फाइल संख्या / Appeal / File No.	मूल आदेश सं / O.I.O. No.	दिनांक / Date
	V2/3/BVR/2022	13/AC/STAX/DIV/2014-15	24-12-2014

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

BHV-EXCUS-000-APP-113-2022

आदेश का दिनांक / Date of Order:	07.12.2022	जारी करने की तारीख / Date of issue:	08.12.2022
------------------------------------	------------	--	------------

श्री शिव प्रताप सिंह, आयुक्त (अपील), राजकोट द्वारा पारित /
Passed by Shri Shiv Pratap Singh, Commissioner (Appeals), Rajkot.

ग अपर आयुक्त/ संयुक्त आयुक्त/ उपायुक्त/ सहायक आयुक्त, केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क/ सेवाकर/ वस्तु एवं सेवाकर, राजकोट / जामनगर / गांधीधामा 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. Superintendent of Police, Chital Road, Amreli,

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) सीमा शुल्क, केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क एवं सेवाकर अपील 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:-

(B) वर्गीकरण मूल्यांकन से सम्बन्धित सभी मामले सीमा शुल्क, केन्द्रीय उत्पादन शुल्क एवं सेवाकर अपील 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.

(C) उपरोक्त परिच्छेद 1(a) में बताया गए अपीलों के अलावा शेष सभी अपीलों सीमा शुल्क, केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क एवं सेवाकर अपील न्यायाधिकरण (सिस्टेट) की पश्चिम क्षेत्रीय पीठिका, द्वितीय तल, बहुमाली भवन असर्वा 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

(D) अपील न्यायाधिकरण के समक्ष अपील प्रस्तुत करने के लिए केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क (अपील) नियमवली, 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 अपील 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 अपील 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/-

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. 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/-

अपील न्यायाधिकरण के समक्ष अपील, वित्त अधिनियम, 1994 की धारा 86(1) के अंतर्गत सेवाकर नियमवली, 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 अपील 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 अपील 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. 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 (1) 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 प्रामाणित्व होती 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 Service Tax Rules, 1994 and shall be accompanied by a copy of order 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 1994 की धारा 35एफ के अंतर्गत, जो की विधायक 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 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 दस करोड़ रुपए 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 की गई गलत राशि
(iii) सेनवेट जमा नियमावली के नियम 6 के अंतर्गत देय रकम
- बशर्ते यह कि इस धारा के प्रावधान विधायक अधिनियम (सं. 2) अधिनियम 2014 के आरंभ से पूर्व किसी अपीलीय प्राधिकारी के समक्ष विचारामय स्थगन अर्जी एवं अपील को लागू नहीं होये। / 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 made 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 प्रथमपारंतक 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:
(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 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 छूट (रिवेट) 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.
(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 ब्युटी 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 ममायादिधि 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 संरेषण 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 साथ 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 बंध से किया जाना चाहिये। इस तथ्य के होते हुए भी की लिखा पत्री 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 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-I के अनुसार मूल आदेश एवं स्थगन आदेश की प्रति पर निर्धारित 6.50 रुपए 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 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.
(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.



:: अपील आदेश / ORDER-IN-APPEAL ::

The Superintendent of Police, Amreli (hereinafter referred to as "Appellant") has filed Appeal No. V2/3/BVR/2022 against Order-in-Original No. 13/AC/STAX/DIV/2014-15 dated 24.12.2014 (hereinafter referred to as 'impugned order') passed by the Assistant Commissioner, Service Tax Division, Bhavnagar (hereinafter referred to as 'adjudicating authority').

2. The facts of the case, in brief, are that the Appellant was engaged in providing 'Security Agency Service' as defined under Section 65(105)(w) of the Finance Act, 1994 (hereinafter referred to as "the Act") through offices under his jurisdiction and was not registered with the Service Tax Department under chapter V of the Act and Service Tax Rules, 1994 (hereinafter referred to as "the Rules") made thereunder. Letters dated 07.07.2011, 18.07.2011, 08.12.2011, 22.12.2011, 31.01.2012 and 21.03.2012 were issued to the Appellant by the jurisdictional range superintendent to provide the details of the Security/ Escort charges collected by the Appellant during the financial year 2006-07 to 2010-11 with a request to obtain the service tax registration as per the provisions of Section 69 the Act read with Rule 4 of the Rules. The Appellant neither provided the details of Security/ Escort charges collected by them nor got registered with the Service Tax Department.

2.1 In absence of data/information, an unquantified show cause notice bearing No. V/15-08/ST/DIV/2012-13 dated 16.04.2012 was issued to the Appellant demanding Service Tax and cess on the taxable service provided by them during the period October-2006 to March-2012 under Section 73(1), interest under Section 75 & penalties under Section 76, 77 & 78 of the Act. During the course of personal hearing held on 12.11.2013, Shri G. A. Joshi, incharge of the Appellant assured to submit the details of Security/Escort charges collected by them for the purpose of quantifying the Service Tax liability within 10 days. The Appellant vide their letter dated 01.05.2014 provided the details of Security/ Escort charges collected by them during the Financial year 2006-07 to 2011-12 and based on the said data, the Service Tax liability of the Appellant was calculated at Rs. 2,12,777/-. A corrigendum to show cause notice was issued vide F. No. V/15-8/ST/DIB/2012-13 dated 16.05.2014, wherein Service Tax amounting to Rs. 2,12,777/- on the taxable value of Rs. 20,65,793/- was quantified and demanded for the period from October-2006 to March-2012.

2.2 The adjudicating authority vide the impugned order confirmed Service Tax demand of Rs. 2,12,777/- under Section 73(2) along with interest under Section 75 of the Act and imposed penalty of Rs. 2,12,777/- under Section 78 of the Act and Rs. 10,000/- or Rs. 200/- for every day whichever is higher under Section 77 of the Act.



[Signature]

3. Being aggrieved, the Appellant has preferred the present appeal on 08.02.2022 on various grounds as under:

(a) They had not any malafide intention not to follow the procedure as set forth with regard to deciding a quasi judicial procedure raised by Show Cause Notice dated 16.04.2012. They are government concerned department working under the Police Department constituted under Constitution of India. The services provide by them were only and only in the interest of the welfare of the people residing within Gujarat. The government has also awarded such discharging services separately to safe guard private prosperities either own by the State Government, Nationalized Bank, P&T Department and sometime well known private concern unit to avoid any attempt to theft, damage etc. Whatever the amount collected from the users, no such extra amount is required to be collected either from the users or not required to be paid by them.

(b) They are not falling under purview of activity relating to Industry, commerce or any other business profession but are police staff to implement law and order by following statutory orders/instructions issued by the higher authorities which includes deployment of police staff for safe guarding the properties owned by government and/or private parties etc. For providing the services to the users, they charge fees as specified by the Government and credited to the Government account. Their services are linked up in the nature of government duties. There is no concept of commercial service/ businesses and hence the issue raised by the Department is not free from any doubt for levy of such Service Tax.

(c) They had applied for SVLDRS, 2019 and an amount of Rs. 85,110.50 was required to be paid on or before 31.03.2020 but due to Corona-19 pandemic, they could not deposit the same. They have no intention of not to pay up the determined amount under the SVLDRS but the same was not deposited due to the genuine reasons which were not under their control. They placed reliance in the case of Honest Facility Vs. Union of India reported as 2021 (52) G.S.T.L. 267 (Bom.) which is squarely applicable to the facts of the present case.

4. The personal hearing in the matter was held on 29.11.2022. Shri N. K. Maru, Shri U. H. Qureshi, Consultants and Shri S. S. Sarvaiya, Sr. Clerk of the Appellant appeared for personal hearing and reiterated the submissions made in the appeal. They submitted that though the service of security was provided under sovereign function, they had applied for SVLDRS scheme to put an end to the dispute. However, due to COVID pandemic they could not deposit the tax determined within the stipulated time. He submitted that the Appellant is willing to deposit the determined tax and requested to permit the same.



5. I find that the Appellant has contested the impugned order on merits. They have also stated that they could not deposit the amount determined under the scheme of SVLDRS due to genuine reasons, which were not under their control. I find that Government vide THE TAXATION AND OTHER LAWS (RELAXATION OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS) ORDINANCE, 2020 dated 31.03.2020 has extended the due date for payment upto 30.06.2020. However, Hon'ble Apex Court vide order dated 10.01.2022 in Miscellaneous Application No. 21 of 2022, has ordered that:

"I. The order dated 23.03.2020 is restored and in continuation of the subsequent orders dated 08.03.2021, 27.04.2021 and 23.09.2021, it is directed that the period from 15.03.2020 till 28.02.2022 shall stand excluded for the purposes of limitation as may be prescribed under any general or special laws in respect of all judicial or quasijudicial proceedings.

IV. It is further clarified that the period from 15.03.2020 till 28.02.2022 shall also stand excluded in computing the periods prescribed under Sections 23 (4) and 29A of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, Section 12A of the Commercial Courts Act, 2015 and provisos (b) and (c) of Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 and any other laws, which prescribe period(s) of limitation for instituting proceedings, outer limits (within which the court or tribunal can condone delay) and termination of proceedings."

Thus, the dead-line for payment was extended upto 28.02.2022 and Appellant could have been deposited the same upto 28.02.2022, instead of filing of present appeal on 08.02.2022. However, the same was not done by them. Thus, their plea that they could not deposit the amount determined under SVLDRS due to reasons beyond their control is unacceptable.

6. I find that the impugned order was issued on 24.12.2014 by the adjudicating authority. As per appeal memorandum, the date of communication of the impugned order has not been mentioned by the Appellant. The Appellant in the statement of facts of the Appeal memorandum stated that the impugned order was received by them on 15.01.2015. (Para 7). The Appellant has also filed application for condonation of delay by stating that the period was lapsed in collecting the statistical data for taking appropriate action and taking permission from higher authority of the Police Department. The Appellant stated that they also filed SVLDRS-Form No. 1 and Acknowledgement receipt bearing No. LD3012190015843 dated 30.12.2019 to avail the benefit of the scheme. The mandate form was generated under the Scheme for due payment of Rs. 85,110.50 which was required to be paid by the Appellant on or before 31.03.2020 which they failed to pay. They could have made payment during extended period upto 28.02.2022, as per order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, on account of COVID pandemic. However, the Appellant failed to do so despite repeated opportunities of extension during COVID. It is pertinent to note here



that this authority is not empowered to decide any dispute arising out the SVLDRS, 2019, hence, no findings can be recorded in this regard at this juncture.


6.1 The Appellant was required to file appeal under Section 85 of the Finance Act, 1994 within 2 months from the receipt of the impugned order i.e. on or before 15.03.2015, as stipulated under Section 85(3A) of the Act. However, the Appellant has filed Appeal on 08.02.2022, i.e. after almost 6 years and 11 months from due date. As per proviso to Section 85(3A) *ibid*, this appellate authority has powers to condone delay of one month in filing of appeal, over and above two months mentioned above, if sufficient cause is shown. I find that there is a delay of 6 years 11 months in filing the appeal over and above the normal period of 2 months. Thus, appeal filed beyond the time limit prescribed under Section 85 *ibid* cannot be entertained.

7. This appellate authority is a creature of the Statute and has to act as per the provisions contained in the Finance Act, 1994. This appellate authority has no powers to extend deadlines provided under SVLDRS and therefore, cannot condone delay in filing of Appeal beyond the period permissible under the Finance Act, 1994. When the legislature has intended the appellate authority to entertain the appeal by condoning further delay of only one month, this appellate authority cannot go beyond the power vested by the legislature. My views are supported by the following case laws:

(i) The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Singh Enterprises reported as 2008 (221) E.L.T. 163 (S.C.) has held as under:

"8. ...The proviso to sub-section (1) of Section 35 makes the position crystal clear that the appellate authority has no power to allow the appeal to be presented beyond the period of 30 days. The language used makes the position clear that the legislature intended the appellate authority to entertain the appeal by condoning delay only upto 30 days after the expiry of 60 days which is the normal period for preferring appeal. Therefore, there is complete exclusion of Section 5 of the Limitation Act. The Commissioner and the High Court were therefore justified in holding that there was no power to condone the delay after the expiry of 30 days period.

(ii) In the case of Makjai Laboratories Pvt Ltd reported as 2011 (274) E.L.T. 48 (Bom.), the Hon'ble Bombay High Court held that the Commissioner (Appeals) cannot condone delay beyond further period of 30 days from initial period of 60 days and that provisions of Limitation Act, 1963 is not applicable in such cases as Commissioner (Appeals) is not a Court.



(iii) The Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in the case of Delta Impex reported as 2004 (173) E.L.T. 449 (Del) held that the Appellate authority has no jurisdiction to extend limitation even in a "suitable" case for a further period of more than thirty days.

8. I find that the provisions of Section 85 of the Finance Act, 1994 are *pari materia* with the provisions of Section 35 of the Central Excise Act, 1944 and hence, the above judgements would be squarely applicable to the present appeal also.

9. By respectfully following the above judgements, I hold that this appellate authority cannot condone delay beyond further period of one month as prescribed under proviso to Section 85(3A) of the Act. Thus, the appeal filed by the Appellant is required to be dismissed on the grounds of limitation. Even if the appeal was to be admitted, this authority is not empowered to extend time limit under SVLDRS, as requested by the Appellant. I, accordingly, dismiss the appeal.

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


10. The appeal filed by Appellant is disposed off as above.

सत्यापित / Attested



Superintendent
Central GST (Appeals)

By R.P.A.D. Rajkot



(शिव प्रताप सिंह)/(Shiv Pratap Singh),

आयुक्त (अपील)/Commissioner (Appeals)

To, M/s The Superintendent of Police, Chital road, Amreli	सेवा में, मे.पुलिस अधीक्षक, चीतल रोड, अमरेली।
---	--

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, भावनगर आयुक्तालय, भावनगर को आवश्यक कार्यवाही हेतु।
- 3) अपर आयुक्त, वस्तु एवं सेवा कर एवं केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क, भावनगर को आवश्यक कार्यवाही हेतु।
- 4) सहायक आयुक्त, वस्तु एवं सेवा कर एवं केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क, भावनगर मण्डल-3 को आवश्यक कार्यवाही हेतु।
- 5) गार्ड फाइल।

