



:: 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: commrappl3-cexamd@nic.in

सत्यमेव जयते

रजिस्टर्ड डाक ए.डी. द्वारा :-

DIN-20220864SX000000419698

क अपील / फाइल संख्या/
Appeal / File No.

V2/379/RAJ/2021

मूल आदेश संख्या /
OIONo.

DC/JAM-ICEX/02/2021-22

दिनांक/
Date

30-06-2021

1755, 1756, 394393

EGO 29 21 9728 IN

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

RAJ-EXCUS-000-APP-238-2022

आदेश का दिनांक/
Date of Order:

16.08.2022

जारी करने की तारीख /
Date of issue:

18.08.2022

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 / 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. Pattani Impex, Plot No. 4013, 4014, 4037 & 4038, GIDC Phase-3,
Dared, Jamnagar - 361009,**

इस आदेश (अपील) से व्यथित कोई व्यक्ति निम्नलिखित तरीके में उपयुक्त प्राधिकारी / प्राधिकरण के समक्ष अपील दाखल 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) बर्गीकरण मूल्यांकन से सम्बन्धित सभी मामलों 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 (सिस्टट) की पश्चिम क्षेत्रीय पीठिका, द्वितीय तल, बहुमाली भवन असावा 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 मांग, ब्याज की मांग और सजाया 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। स्वयं 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 demanded/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 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 सजाया 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। स्वयं 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 upto 5 Lakhs or less, Rs.5000/- 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 प्रामाणिक 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 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 रुपये से अधिक न हो।

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

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

- बशर्ते यह कि इस धारा के प्रावधान वित्तीय (सं-2) अधिनियम 2014 के अंतर्भूत से पूर्व किसी अपीलीय प्राधिकारी के समक्ष विचारणीय स्थगन नहीं 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 कोपरीक्षण आवेदन :
Revision application to Government of India:
इस आदेश की पुनरीक्षणवाचिका निम्नलिखित मामलों में केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क अधिनियम, 1994 की धारा 35EE के प्रथमपरंतुक के अंतर्गत अवर 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 sub-section (1) of Section-35B ibid:

(i) यदि गान 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 occur : 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 चर्दी 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.

(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 अटी केबीट 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 निर्यात की गई टारीफ अथवा समयावधि 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 उत्पाद शुल्क (अपील) नियमावली, 2001, के नियम 9 के अंतर्गत विनिर्दिष्ट है, इस आदेश के संश्लेषण 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 Chalan 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 आवेदों का समावेश है तो प्रत्येक मूल आवेद के लिए शुल्क का भुगतान, उपरोक्त हंग से किया जाना चाहिए। इस तथ्य के होते हुए भी की लिखा पट्टी 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- n Original, fee for each O.I.O. should be paid in the aforesaid manner, notwithstanding the fact that the one appeal to the Appellate Tribunal or the one application to the Central Govt. As the case may be, is filed 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 निर्णयों 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, अपीलाधी 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 Pattani Impex, Jamnagar has filed Appeal No. V2/379/RAJ/2021 (*hereinafter referred to as "Appellant"*) against Order-in-Original No. DC/JAM-1/CEX/2/2021-22 dated 9.7.2021 (*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 an offence case was booked against the Appellant for clandestine removal of Brass Ingots falling under CETH No. 7403 of the Central Excise Tariff Act, 1985. During search carried out by the officers of the Anti-Evasion Wing of erstwhile Central Excise, Rajkot Commissionerate at factory premises of the Appellant on 18.12.2013, certain incriminating documents were recovered indicating clandestine removal of goods without obtaining Central Excise registration and without cover of invoices. Shri Hussain Juma Khafi, Proprietor of the Appellant, in his statements recorded under Section 14 of the Central Excise Act, 1944 (*hereinafter referred to as "Act"*) on 18.12.2013, 5.10.2015 and 26.3.2016 admitted that the Appellant had manufactured and sold Brass Ingots from imported Brass Scrap without obtaining Central Excise registration and without preparing invoices and without payment of duty. The investigation was extended to M/s Jayshree Metal Corporation, Jamnagar, and M/s Super Impex, Jamnagar, buyers of finished goods, who also admitted to have purchased finished goods from the Appellant without cover of invoices.

2.1 Show Cause Notice No. V.74/AR-JMR/ADC(BKS)/1/2016-17 dated 12.4.2016 was issued to the Appellant calling them to show cause as to why Central Excise duty amount of Rs. 39,16,776/- should not be demanded and recovered from them under Section 11A(4) of the Act along with interest under Section 11AA and also proposing imposition of penalty under Section 11AC read with Rule 25 of the Central Excise Rules, 2002 (*hereinafter referred to as 'Rules'*). The notice also proposed imposition of penalty upon M/s Jayshree Metal Corporation, Jamnagar and M/s Super Impex, Jamnagar under Rule 26 *ibid*.

2.2 The above Show Cause Notice was adjudicated vide Order-in-Original No. DC/JAM/24/2016-17 dated 15.2.2017 which, *inter alia*, confirmed Central Excise duty demand of Rs. 39,16,776/- under Section 11A(4) of the Act along with interest under Section 11AA *ibid* and penalty of Rs. 39,16,776/- was imposed under Section 11AC of the Act upon the Appellant and penalty under Rule 26 was imposed



upon M/s Jayshree Metal Corporation, Jamnagar and M/s Super Impex, Jamnagar under Rule 26 *ibid*. Being aggrieved with the impugned order, the Appellant preferred appeal before the then Commissioner (Appeals), Rajkot who vide Order-in-Appeal No. RAJ-EXCUS-000-APP-6 TO 8/2018-19 dated 9.4.2018 upheld the impugned order and rejected the appeal.

2.3 Being aggrieved, the Appellant filed appeal before the Hon'ble CESTAT, Ahmedabad who vide its Order No. A/11965-11967/2019 dated 4.10.2019 remanded the matter to the adjudicating authority with a direction to pass fresh order after granting cross examination of the alleged buyers of the goods.

2.4 In *de novo* adjudication, the adjudicating authority vide the impugned order confirmed Central Excise duty of Rs. 39,16,776/- under Section 11A(4) of the Act along with interest under Section 11AA *ibid* and penalty of Rs. 39,16,776/- was imposed under Section 11AC of the Act upon the Appellant. Penalty was also imposed upon M/s Jayshree Metal Corporation, Jamnagar and M/s Super Impex, Jamnagar under Rule 26 *ibid*.

3. Being aggrieved with the impugned order, the Appellant has preferred the present appeal on various grounds, *inter alia*, as under:-

(i) The adjudicating authority has erred in confirming the demand of Rs. 39,16,776/- on the ground as mentioned in the order on the dead person. The Proceedings under the law cannot continue in view of the settled law and hence the order under consideration is liable to be set aside. The Honorable Apex Court as also the Appellate authority in various cases has settled the law that on dead person the proceedings cannot continue or no recovery can be made. Some of the decisions are reported in 2015 (322) ELT-372, 2009 (233) ELT 498, 2016 (336) ELT93, 2016 (45) STR141, 2019 (367) ELT 292, 2018 (363) ELT 258 & 2017 (358) ELT 1014.

(ii) That the impugned order without allowing cross examination of the witnesses is bad in law and is in clear violation of principles of natural justice as also direction of the Honorable CESTAT, Ahmedabad. The decisions referred by the applicant clearly spells out the settled law and therefore the order under consideration is liable to be set aside and declared in violation of principles of natural justice.



(iii) The adjudicating authority has erred in confirming the demand without considering the fact that the documents relied upon were not impounded from the premises of the applicant but were impounded from the premises of third party and in view of the settled law, no part of demand can be confirmed on the basis of the documents impounded from third party.

(iv) The adjudicating authority has erred in confirming the demand ignoring the fact that the documents relied upon are the computer print outs and unless the criteria laid down under the provisions of Section 36B of Central Excise Act, 1944 are complied with, no documents can be relied upon and no demand can be confirmed on such document. The department has grossly failed in producing any evidence to prove that the condition laid down under the provisions of Section 36B are complied with and therefore the demand raised is liable to be set aside.

(v) The adjudicating authority has erred in imposing the penalty of Rs. 39,16,776/- on the ground as mentioned in the order as also on the ground raised for setting aside the demand. The adjudicating authority has also erred in confirming interest on the ground as mentioned in the order as also on the ground raised for setting aside the demand. The ground raised for setting aside the demand may be treated as part of ground raised for setting aside the penalty and interest.

4. Personal Hearing in the matter was scheduled in virtual mode through video conferencing on 28.7.2022. Shri Paresh Sheth, Advocate, appeared on behalf of the Appellant. He reiterated the submissions made in appeal memorandum. He stated that the order was passed ex-parte without giving cross examination of witnesses, which is in violation of directions of the Hon'ble Tribunal. He further stated that the proprietor of firm has expired and hence proceedings may be abated as per the judgement of various Courts.

5. I have carefully gone through the facts of the case, the impugned order, the appeal memorandum and oral submissions made by the Appellant. The issue to be decided in the present case is whether the impugned order confirming demand of Rs. 39,16,776/- and imposing penalty of Rs. 39,16,776/- on the Appellant is correct, legal and proper or not.



6. On perusal of records, it is observed that an offence case was booked against the Appellant for clandestine removal of Brass Ingots. The adjudicating authority confirmed demand of Rs. 39,16,776/- under Section 11A(4) of the Act and imposed penalty of Rs. 39,16,776/- under Section 11AC of the Act.

6.1 The Appellant has, *inter alia*, contended that proceedings against dead person cannot continue under the law in view of the settled position of law and hence the order under consideration is liable to be set aside.

7. I have gone through Affidavit dated 2.8.2021 filed by Shri Akabar Khafi, son of Shri Hussain Khafi, Proprietor of Appellant, contained in Appeal Memorandum. In the said affidavit, it has been stated that Shri Hussain Khafi, Proprietor, has expired on 29.4.2021 and submitted copy of Death Certificate dated 17.6.2021 issued by the Sub Registrar (Birth & Death), Jamnagar.

7.1 As recorded in the impugned order, the Appellant was a proprietary concern and Shri Hussain Khafi being proprietor of the firm. I find that there is no machinery provisions for proceedings against dead proprietor of a proprietorship firm in the Act or Rules made thereunder and this situation is not similar to a case where a company is dissolved. I am, therefore, of the opinion that when proprietor of a proprietorship firm expires, it is not permissible to continue with recovery proceedings. I rely on the judgement passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Shabina Abraham reported as 2015 (322) ELT 372 (S.C.), wherein it has been held that,

"25. A reading of the ratio of the majority decision contained in Murarilal's case (supra) would lead to the conclusion that the necessary machinery provisions were already contained in the Bombay Sales Tax Act, 1953 which were good enough to bring into the tax net persons who wished to evade taxes by the expedient of dissolving a partnership firm. The fact situation in the present case is entirely different. In the present case an individual proprietor has died through natural causes and it is nobody's case that he has maneuvered his own death in order to evade excise duty. Interestingly, in the written submissions filed by revenue, revenue has argued as follows :-

"It is pertinent to mention that in the present case, Shri George Varghese (predecessor in interest of the appellants herein) was doing business in the name of manufacturing unit namely M/s. Kerala Tyre & Rubber Company and after the death of Shri George Varghese, his legal representatives (appellants herein) might have been in possession of the plant, machinery, stock, etc., and continuing the same business, but might be in some other name in order to avoid the excise duty chargeable to the previous manufacturing unit."

26. It is clear on a reading of the aforesaid paragraph that what revenue is asking us to do is to stretch the machinery provisions of the Central Excises and Salt Act, 1944 on the basis of surmises and conjectures. This we are afraid is not possible. Before leaving the judgment in Murarilal's case (supra), we wish to add that so far as partnership firms are



concerned, the Income Tax Act contains a specific provision in Section 189(1) which introduces a fiction qua dissolved firms. It states that where a firm is dissolved, the Assessing Officer shall make an assessment of the total income of the firm as if no such dissolution had taken place and all the provisions of the Income Tax Act would apply to assessment of such dissolved firm. Interestingly enough, this provision is referred to only in the minority judgment in *M/s. Murarilal's case* (supra).

27. The argument that Section 11A of the Central Excises and Salt Act is a machinery provision which must be construed to make it workable can be met by stating that there is no charge to excise duty under the main charging provision of a dead person, which has been referred to while discussing Section 11A read with the definition of "assessee" earlier in this judgment.

28. Learned counsel for the revenue also relied upon the definition of a "person" under the General Clauses Act, 1897. Section 3(42) of the said Act defines "person" as under :-

"(42) "Person" shall include any company or association or body of individuals whether incorporated or not."

It will be noticed that this definition does not take us any further as it does not include legal representatives of persons who are since deceased. Equally, Section 6 of the Central Excises Act, which prescribes a procedure for registration of certain persons who are engaged in the process of production or manufacture of any specified goods mentioned in the schedule to the said Act does not throw any light on the question at hand as it says nothing about how a dead person's assessment is to continue after his death in respect of excise duty that may have escaped assessment. Also, the judgments cited on behalf of revenue, namely, *Yeshwantrao v. The Commissioner of Wealth Tax, Bangalore*, AIR 1967 SC 135 at pages 140, 141 para 18 : (1966) Suppl. SCR 419 at 429 A-B, C.A. *Abraham v. The Income-Tax Officer, Kottayam & Another*, AIR 1961 SC 609 at 612 para 6 : (1961) 2 SCR 765 at page 771, *The State of Tamil Nadu v. M.K. Kandaswami & Others*, AIR 1975 SC 1871 (para 26) : (1975) 4 SCC 745 (para 26), *Commissioner of Sales Tax, Delhi & Others v. Shri Krishna Engineering Co. & Others*, (2005) 2 SCC 695, page 702, 703 paras 19 to 23, all enunciate principles dealing with tax evasion in the context of construing provisions which are designed to prevent tax evasion. The question at hand is very different - it only deals with whether the Central Excises and Salt Act contains the necessary provisions to continue assessment proceedings against a dead man in respect of excise duty payable by him after his death, which is a question which has no relation to the construction of provisions designed to prevent tax evasion."

(Emphasis supplied)

7.2 I also find that in a similar case, the Hon'ble CESTAT, Chandigarh in the case of *M. K. Enterprises* reported as 2016 (45) S.T.R. 141 (Tri. - Chan.), has held as detailed below:

"6. Further, I find that the issue has already been settled in the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of *Shabina Abraham* (supra) which has been followed by this Tribunal in the case of *Sagar Engineering Works and Bharti Mulchand Cheeda* (supra) wherein this Tribunal has observed as under :

6. We find that the learned Commissioner was aware of the fact while passing the impugned order that the proprietor of *M/s. Canan Domestic Appliances* had already expired (on 12-11-2003 whereas the impugned order was passed on 29-9-2006. In fact this case was remanded by the Tribunal vide its order dated 15-2-2005 setting aside the order of the Commissioner of Central Excise and remanding the matter for de novo-adjudication. Even at that time the proprietor was no more, but in



spite of this, the learned Commissioner passed the impugned order against the dead person who was the sole proprietor of M/s. Canan and Domestic Appliances, which is against the settled position of law as held by various decisions of the Tribunal cited above. We are of the considered opinion that once the factum of death of the sole proprietor has come to the knowledge of the learned commissioner, the learned commissioner should have dropped the proceedings rather than passing the impugned order, but he chose to pass the impugned order against the dead person, which is not sustainable in law.

7. Therefore, I hold that no proceedings are sustainable against the appellant in the light of the above judicial pronouncement. In these circumstances, the appeal filed by the appellant is disposed of with consequential relief, if any."

(Emphasis supplied)

8. By respectfully following the above said case laws, I hold that proceedings against the Appellant stand abated on account of death of late Shri Hussain Khafi. Accordingly, I allow the appeal of the Appellant and set aside the impugned order so far as it relates to the proceedings against the Appellant.

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

9. The appeal filed by the Appellant stand disposed off in above terms.

सत्यापित,



विशुल शिंह

अधीक्षक (अपील)

Akhil Kumar
16th August 2021
(AKHILESH KUMAR)
Commissioner (Appeals)

By RPAD

To, M/s Pattani Impex, Plot No. 4013-4014, 4037-4038, GIDC Phase-III, Dared, Jamangar.	सेवा में, मेसर्स पट्टनी इम्पेक्स, प्लॉट नंबर 4013-4014, 4037-4038, जीआईडीसी चरण- III, जामनगर।
--	---

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) ऊप आयुक्त, वस्तु एवं सेवा कर एवं केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क, जामनगर- I मंडल, राजकोट आयुक्तालय, राजकोट को आवश्यक कार्यवाही हेतु।
- 4) फाई फ़ाइल।

