



:: 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

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



सत्यमेव जयते

रजिस्टर्ड डाक ए.डी. द्वारा :-

DIN-20220964SX0000241319

|   |   |                              |                  |
|---|---|------------------------------|------------------|
| क | अपील / फाइल संख्या /<br>Appeal / File No. | मूल आवेदन संख्या /<br>OIONo. | दिनांक /<br>Date |
|   | V2/432 to 434,<br>529 to 532/RAJ/2021     | 14/BB/AC/MRB-II/2021-22      | 22-06-2021       |

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

**RAJ-EXCUS-000-APP-285 TO 290-2022**

|                                    |                   |  |                   |
|------------------------------------|-------------------|--|-------------------|
| आदेश का दिनांक /<br>Date of Order: | <b>12.09.2022</b> | जारी करने की तारीख /<br>Date of issue: | <b>15.09.2022</b> |
|------------------------------------|-------------------|--|-------------------|

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 Coto Ceramic Pvt. Ltd., 8A National Highway, BH. Makansar, Panjarapol  
Weed, At Sartanpur,, Tal. Wankaner, Morbi-363642**

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

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

(i) वरीकरण मूल्यांकन से सम्बन्धित सभी मामलों सीमा शुल्क, केन्द्रीय उत्पादन शुल्क एवं सेवाकर अपीलीय न्यायाधिकरण की विशेष पीठ, वेस्ट ब्लॉक न 2, आर.के. पुरान, 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 वे सभी अपीलों सीमा शुल्क, केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क एवं सेवाकर अपीलीय न्यायाधिकरण (सिस्टेट) की पश्चिम क्षेत्रीय पीठिका, द्वितीय तल, बहामाली भवन असारवा 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, रुपये 5 लाख या उससे कम 5 लाख रुपये या 50 लाख रुपये तक अथवा 50 लाख रुपये से अधिक है तो क्रमशः 1,000/- रुपये, 5,000/- रुपये अथवा 10,000/- रुपये का निर्धारित जमा शुल्क की प्रति संलग्न करें। निर्धारित शुल्क का भुगतान, संबंधित अपीलीय न्यायाधिकरण की शाखा के सहायक रजिस्टार के नाम से किसी भी सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र के बैंक द्वारा जारी रेखांकित बैंक ड्राफ्ट द्वारा किया जाना चाहिए। संबंधित ड्राफ्ट का भुगतान, बैंक की उस शाखा में होना चाहिए जहां संबंधित अपीलीय न्यायाधिकरण की शाखा स्थित है। स्वयं आदेश (स्टे ऑर्डर) के लिए आवेदन-पत्र के साथ 500/- रुपये 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 और उसके साथ जितने 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, रुपये 5 लाख या उससे कम 5 लाख रुपये या 50 लाख रुपये तक अथवा 50 लाख रुपये से अधिक है तो क्रमशः 1,000/- रुपये, 5,000/- रुपये अथवा 10,000/- रुपये का निर्धारित जमा शुल्क की प्रति संलग्न करें। निर्धारित शुल्क का भुगतान, संबंधित अपीलीय न्यायाधिकरण की शाखा के सहायक रजिस्टार के नाम से किसी भी सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र के बैंक द्वारा जारी रेखांकित बैंक ड्राफ्ट द्वारा किया जाना चाहिए। संबंधित ड्राफ्ट का भुगतान, बैंक की उस शाखा में होना चाहिए जहां संबंधित अपीलीय न्यायाधिकरण की शाखा स्थित है। स्वयं आदेश (स्टे ऑर्डर) के लिए आवेदन-पत्र के साथ 500/- रुपये 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 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/-.



- (ii) 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 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.
- (iii) 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 वित्तीय अधिनियम, 1994 की धारा 83 के अंतर्गत सेवाकर की 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 आरंभ से पूर्व किसी अपीलीय प्राधिकारी के समय विचाराधीन स्थान अपील एवं अपील की 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 को पुनरीक्षण आवेदन :  
**Revision application to Government of India:**  
इस आदेश की पुनरीक्षणयाचिका निम्नलिखित मामलों में, केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क अधिनियम, 1994 की धारा 35EE के प्रथमपरंतुक के अंतर्गत बंदर 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, जहाँ नुकसान किसी माल को किसी कारखाने से भंडार गृह के पारगमन के दौरान या किसी अन्य कारखाने या फिर किसी एक भंडार गृह से दूसरे भंडार गृह पारगमन के दौरान, या किसी भंडार गृह में या भंडारण में माल के प्रसंस्करण के दौरान, किसी कारखाने या किसी भंडार गृह में माल के नुकसान के मामले में। / In case of any loss of goods, where the loss occurs in transit from a factory to a warehouse or to another factory or from one warehouse to another during the course of processing of the goods in a warehouse or in storage whether in a factory or in a warehouse  
(ii) भारत के बाहर किसी राष्ट्र या क्षेत्र को निर्यात कर रहे माल के विनिर्माण में प्रयुक्त कच्चे माल पर भरी गई केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क के छुट (रिबेट) के मामले में, जो भारत के बाहर किसी राष्ट्र या क्षेत्र को निर्यात की गयी है। / In case of rebate of duty of excise on goods exported to any country or territory outside India of 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 क्रेडिट इत 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 समायाचिधि पर या बाद में पारित किए गए हैं। / Credit of any duty allowed to be utilized towards payment of excise duty on final products under the provisions of this Act or the Rules made there under such order is passed by the Commissioner (Appeals) on or after, the date appointed under Sec. 109 of the Finance (No.2) Act, 1998.  
(v) उपरोक्त आवेदन की दो प्रतियां प्रपत्र संख्या EA-8 में, जो की केन्द्रीय उत्पादन शुल्क (अपील) नियमावली, 2001, के नियम 9 के अंतर्गत विनिर्दिष्ट है, इस आदेश के संप्रेषण के 3 माह के अंतर्गत की जानी चाहिए। उपरोक्त आवेदन के साथ मूल आदेश व अपील आदेश की दो प्रतियां संलग्न की जानी चाहिए। साथ ही केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क अधिनियम, 1994 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 O.I.O 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 रूपये 200/- का भुगतान किया जाए और यदि संलग्न रकम एक लाख रुपये से ज्यादा हो 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.  
(D) यदि इस आदेश में कई मूल आदेशों का समावेश है तो प्रत्येक मूल आदेश के लिए शुल्क का भुगतान, उपर्युक्त ढंग से किया जाना चाहिये। इस तथ्य के होते हुए भी की लिखा पत्रों कार्य से बचने के लिए यथास्थिति अपीलीय न्यायाधिकरण को एक अपील या केन्द्रीय सरकार को एक आवेदन किया जाता है। / In case, if the order covers various numbers of order- in Original, fee for each O.I.O. should be paid in the aforesaid manner, notwithstanding the fact that the one appeal to the 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 टिकिट 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.cbcc.gov.in](http://www.cbcc.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.cbcc.gov.in](http://www.cbcc.gov.in)



**ORDER-IN-APPEAL**

The below mentioned 6 appeals have been filed by the Appellants (*hereinafter referred to as "Appellant No.1 to Appellant No. 6"*, as detailed in Table below), against Order-in-Original No. 14/BB/AC/MRB-II/2021-22 dated 22.6.2021 (*hereinafter referred to as 'impugned order'*) passed by the Assistant Commissioner, Central GST, Morbi-II Division, Rajkot Commissionerate (*hereinafter referred to as 'adjudicating authority'*):- -

| Sl. No. | Appeal No.      | Appellants     | Name & Address of the Appellant   |
|---------|-----------------|----------------|---|
| 1.      | V2/433/RAJ/2021 | Appellant No.1 | M/s Coto Ceramic Pvt Ltd,<br>National Highway 8A, Behind<br>Makansar, At Sartanpar, Taluka<br>Wankaner, Dist Morbi. |
| 2.      | V2/432/RAJ/2021 | Appellant No.2 | Shri Devkaranbhai Vashrambhai<br>Bhalodiya,<br>Director, M/s Coto Ceramic Pvt<br>Ltd, District Morbi.               |
| 3.      | V2/434/RAJ/2021 | Appellant No.3 | Shri Mayank D. Bhalodiya<br>Director, M/s Coto Ceramic Pvt<br>Ltd, District Morbi.                                  |
| 4.      | V2/529/RAJ/2021 | Appellant No.4 | Shri Chandrakantbhai<br>Raghunathbhai<br>Director, M/s Coto Ceramic Pvt<br>Ltd, District Morbi.                     |
| 5.      | V2/530/RAJ/2021 | Appellant No.5 | Shri Nimish Sureshbhai Adesara,<br>Director, M/s Coto Ceramic Pvt<br>Ltd, District Morbi.                           |
| 6.      | V2/531/RAJ/2021 | Appellant No.6 | Shri Amitkumar H. Dedaniya,<br>Director, M/s Coto Ceramic Pvt<br>Ltd, District Morbi.                               |

2. The facts of the case, in brief, are that Appellant No. 1 was engaged in manufacture of Sanitary Ware items falling under Chapter 69 of the erstwhile Central Excise Tariff Act, 1985 and was holding Central Excise Registration No. AADCC6735EEM003. Intelligence gathered by the officers of Directorate General of Central Excise Intelligence, Zonal Unit, Ahmedabad (DGCEI) indicated that various Tile manufacturers of Morbi were indulged in malpractices in connivance with Shroffs / Brokers and thereby engaged in large scale evasion of Central Excise duty. Simultaneous searches were carried out on 22.12.2015 at the premises of Shroffs in Rajkot and Morbi and various incriminating documents were seized. On scrutiny of said documents and Statements tendered by the said



सत्यापित / Attested

एन. सी. गजरीया  
N. C. Gajariya  
अधीक्षक  
Superintendent

Shroffs, it was revealed that huge amounts of cash were deposited from all over India into bank accounts managed by said Shroffs and such cash amounts were passed on to said Manufacturers through Brokers/Middlemen/Cash Handlers. Subsequently, simultaneous searches were carried out on 23.12.2015 and 31.12.2015 at the premises of Brokers/Middleman/Cash Handlers engaged by the said manufacturers and certain incriminating documents were seized.

2.1 Investigation carried out revealed that the Shroffs opened bank accounts in the names of their firms and passed on the bank account details to Tile manufacturers through their Brokers/Middlemen. The Tile manufacturers further passed on the bank account details to their customers/ buyers to deposit the cash in respect of the goods sold to them without bills into these accounts. After depositing the cash, the customers used to inform the Tile manufacturers, who in turn would inform the Brokers or directly to the Shroffs. Details of such cash deposit along with the copies of pay-in-slips were communicated to the manufacturers by the Customers. The Shroffs on confirming the receipt of the cash in their bank accounts, passed on the cash to the Brokers after deducting their commission from it. The Brokers further handed over the cash to the Tile manufacturers after deducting their commission. This way the sale proceeds of an illicit transaction was routed from buyers of goods to Tile manufacturers through Shroffs and Brokers.

2.2 During scrutiny of documents seized from the office premises of M/s K.N. Brothers, Rajkot and M/s Maruti Enterprise, Rajkot, both Shroffs, and Shri Thakarshi Premji Kasundra, Broker/ Middleman, it was revealed that the said Shroffs had received total amount of Rs. 3,29,54,980/- in their bank account during the period from June, 2015 to December, 2015, which was passed on to Appellant No. 1 in cash through Shri Thakarshi Premji Kasundra, Broker/ Middleman. The said amount was alleged to be sale proceeds of goods removed clandestinely by Appellant No. 1.

3. Show Cause Notice No. DGGJ/AZU/Gr-A/36-175/2019-20 dated 26.11.2019 was issued to Appellant No. 1 calling them to show cause as to why Central Excise duty amount of Rs. 41,10,626/- should not be demanded and recovered from them under proviso to Section 11A(4) of the Central Excise Act, 1944 (*hereinafter referred to as "Act"*) along with interest under Section 11AA of the Act and also proposing imposition of penalty under Section 11AC of the Act. The Show Cause Notice also proposed imposition of penalty upon Appellant Nos. 2 to 6 under Rule 26(1) of the Central Excise Rules, 2002.

above said Show Cause Notice was adjudicated vide the impugned



सत्यापित / Attested

एन. सी. गाजरिया  
N. C. Gajarlya  
अधीक्षक  
Superintendent

order which confirmed Central Excise duty of 41,10,626/- under Section 11A(4) along with interest under Section 11AA of the Act and imposed penalty of Rs. 41,10,626/- under Section 11AC of the Act upon Appellant No. 1 with option of reduced penalty as envisaged under provisions of Section 11AC of the Act. The impugned order also imposed penalty of Rs. 2,00,000/- each upon Appellant Nos. 2 to 6 under Rule 26(1) of the Rules.

4. Being aggrieved with the impugned order, Appellant Nos. 1 to 6 have preferred appeals on various grounds, *inter alia*, as below :-

Appellant No. 1:-

- (i) The impugned order passed by the Adjudicating Authority is liable to be quashed and set aside.
- (ii) The allegation made in the impugned order about clandestine removal of goods is not true. It is a settled position of law that a serious charge of clandestine manufacture and illicit removal of excisable goods cannot be considered only on the basis of third party evidence and statement of middleman /broker or any other person. They have not committed any breach of Central Excise Act, 1944 and rules framed thereunder and therefore, proceedings initiated against them are without any justification and without authority of law.
- (iii) That it is settled position of law that the Department must adduce evidence regarding procurement of raw materials, actual production of goods in the factory, removal of goods by adducing evidence of various agencies involved in delivering goods to customers, payment made to them etc. It is a settled law that on the basis of documents like challans, books or papers containing some jottings and details, the Revenue cannot make out a case for clandestine manufacture and illicit removal of goods. Even on un-corroborative statements, charge of clandestine removal cannot be sustained.
- (iv) That in cases of clandestine removal of goods, the burden to prove that the Appellant was involved in clandestine manufacture / clearance of goods is on the Department and the Department is required to adduce sufficient evidence in order to demand duty in such cases. Merely some inculpatory statement and loose papers cannot be ground to demand duty and relied upon following case laws:

(a) Ambica Chemicals - 2002 (148) ELT 101



सत्यापित / Attested

एन. सी. गाजरिया  
N. C. Gajarlya  
अधीक्षक  
Superintendent

- (b) K. Rajgopal - 2002 (142) ELT 128  
 (c) Sangmitra Mills - 2004 (163) ELT 472  
 (d) Arya Fibres - 2014 (311) ELT 529  
 (e) Belgium Glass & Ceramics Pvt Ltd - 2017 (356) ELT 146

(v) The impugned order was issued under wrong assumption that they were engaged in the manufacture of Tiles. However, they are engaged in the manufacture of Sanitarywares and Articles falling under CETSH No. 69101000. The demand has been wrongly confirmed against them on clandestine removal of Tiles by them. During the impugned period, they had manufactured and cleared Sanitary wares and not Tiles. They do not have requisite machinery and plant to manufacture Tiles. Further, Shri Thakarshi Kasundra, broker in his statement dated 24.12.2015 has given name of Tile manufacturer as 'Koto Ceramic' whereas name of Appellant is "Coto Ceramic Pvt Ltd". The adjudicating authority confirmed demand on wrong assumption that 'Koto Ceramic' and 'Coto Ceramic Pvt Ltd' are same.

(vi) That entire case of the Department is based upon third party evidences. There is no direct evidence to show clandestine removal of goods. Nothing was found at their premises, which would show that they were engaged in illicit activity. Therefore, in compliance with the principles of natural justice, the opportunity of cross examination of the person whose statement was relied upon against them should be given in adjudication proceedings. However, the adjudicating authority has denied cross examination of persons who had given the statements. Thus, the adjudicating authority has not followed this cardinal principle of natural justice. The action of the adjudicating authority has vitiated the Show Cause Notice and thus, the impugned order is required to be dropped. The Appellant relied upon following case laws:

- (a) Andaman Timer Industries - 2015 (324) ELT 641  
 (b) Kurle Pan Products Pvt Ltd - 2014 (307) ELT 42

(vii) The demand issued by invoking extended period of limitation under Section 11A(1) of the Central Excise Act, 1944 is unauthorized. The law about invocation of extended period of limitation is well settled. Only in a case, where the assessee knew that certain information was required to be disclosed but the assessee deliberately did not disclose such information, then the case would be that of suppression of facts.

*dey*



सत्यापित/ Attested

*N. C. Gajarliya*  
 एन. सी. गार्जरिया  
 N. C. Gajarliya  
 अधीक्षक  
 Superintendent

assesse was under a bonafide impression that it was not duty bound to disclose such information, it would not be a case of suppression of facts as held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Padmini Products and Chemphar Drugs -1989 (43) ELT 195.

- (viii) As demand itself is wrongly confirmed in the impugned order, the demand of interest as well as imposition of penalty are equally wrong, illegal and incorrect. When the demand itself is not sustainable, no interest would be payable and no penalty could be imposed under Section 11AC of the Act. Thus, the impugned order deserves to be quashed and set aside.

Appellant Nos. 2 to 6 :-

(i) The entire case is mainly against the company and appellant is made a co-noticee only because he is one of the directors of the company. The company has already filed an appeal challenging the impugned order itself. If the appeal of the company is allowed, automatically present appeal of the appellant would also be allowed. All the submissions made by the company in its appeal are equally important for the purpose of this appeal. Therefore, instead of repeating all those submissions herein and burdening this reply, appellant request to kindly consider all the submissions made by the company in their appeal.

(ii) That no penalty could have been imposed on him as there are no specific allegations of personal gain by the appellant and there is no evidence of appellant's personal involvement in the alleged evasion of duty by the company and relied upon Order No. A/1624 to 1626/WZB/AHD dated 14.02.2017 of the Hon'ble CESTAT, Ahmedabad passed in the case of Gujarat Borosil Ltd V/s. CCE, Surat-II.

(iii) That it is a settled law that before imposing penalty under Rule 26, it requires to be proved that he was dealing with the goods with the knowledge that they are liable for confiscation. As there is no such evidence against him, no penalty could have been even otherwise imposed on him and relied upon following case laws:

- a. A:K. Tantia reported at 2003 (158) ELT 638
- b. ITC Ltd reported at 1998 (104) ELT 151
- c. Shri Anil Bhalla reported at 2001 (138) ELT 883.

4.1 Personal Hearing in the matter was held in virtual mode through video conferencing on 25.8.2022. Shri Chetan Dethariya, Chartered Accountant, appeared on behalf of all the Appellants. He reiterated the submissions made in



सत्यापित / Attested


एन. सी. गजरीया  
N. C. Gajarlya  
अधीक्षक  
Superintendent

appeal memorandum. He stated that SCN as well as Order-in-Original have been issued to a Tile manufacturer, whereas they are manufacturers of Sanitary ware. They have submitted various documents, along with appeal memorandum. He further submitted that the Chartered Engineer Certificate as well as electricity consumption show that they manufacture Sanitary wares and no there was no excess production. He further stated that there was a separate Koto Ceramic in the area and the code given by Shri Kasundra Kaka cannot be attributed to the appellants firm.

5. I have carefully gone through the facts of the case, the impugned order, the appeal memoranda as well as oral submissions made by the Appellants. The issue to be decided is whether the impugned order, in the facts of this case, confirming demand on Appellant No. 1 and imposing penalty on Appellants Nos. 1 to 6 is correct, legal and proper or not.

6. On perusal of records, I find that an offence case was booked by the officers of Directorate General of Central Excise Intelligence, Ahmedabad against Appellant No. 1 for clandestine removal of excisable goods. Simultaneous searches carried out at the premises of Shroffs / Brokers / Middlemen situated in Rajkot and Morbi resulted in recovery of various incriminating documents indicating huge amount of cash transactions. On the basis of investigation carried out by the DGCEI, it was alleged that various Tile manufacturers of Morbi were indulged in malpractices in connivance with Shroffs / Brokers and thereby engaged in large scale evasion of Central Excise duty. During investigation, it was revealed by the investigating officers that the Tile manufacturers sold goods without payment of duty and collected sale proceeds from their buyers in cash through said Shroff/Brokers/ middlemen. As per the *modus operandi* unearthed by the DGCEI, it was alleged that the Tile manufacturers passed on the bank account details of the Shroffs to their buyers with instructions to deposit the cash in respect of the goods sold to them without bills into these accounts. After depositing the cash, the buyers used to inform the Tile manufacturers, who in turn would inform the Brokers or directly to the Shroffs. Details of such cash deposit along with the copies of pay-in-slips were communicated to the Tile manufacturers by the Customers. The Shroffs on confirming the receipt of the cash in their bank accounts, passed on the cash to the Brokers after deducting their commission from it. The Brokers further handed over the cash to the Tile manufacturers after deducting their commission. This way the sale proceeds was routed through Shroffs/Brokers/ middlemen.

7. I find from the case records that the DGCEI had covered 4 Shroffs and 4 Brokers / middleman during investigation, which revealed that 186 manufacturers



सत्यापित / Attested

Page 8 of 22

एन. सी. गाजरीया  
N. C. Gajariya

अधीक्षक  
Superintendent



were routing sale proceeds of illicit transactions from the said Shroffs/Brokers/Middlemen. I find that the DGCEI has, *inter alia*, relied upon evidences collected from the premises of M/s K.N. Brothers, Rajkot and M/s Maruti Enterprise, Rajkot, both Shroffs, and Shri Thakarshi Premji Kasundra, Morbi, Broker / Middleman, to allege clandestine removal of goods by the Appellant herein. It is settled position of law that in the case involving clandestine removal of goods, initial burden of proof is on the Department to prove the charges. Hence, it would be pertinent to examine the said evidences gathered by the DGCEI and relied upon by the adjudicating authority in the impugned order to confirm the demand of Central Excise duty.

7.1. I find that during search carried out at the office premises of M/s K.N. Brothers, Rajkot, Shroff, on 22.12.2015, certain private records were seized. The said private records contained bank statements of various bank accounts operated by M/s K.N. Brothers, sample of which is reproduced in the Show Cause Notice. I find that the said bank statements contained details like particulars, deposit amount, initiating branch code etc. Further, it was mentioned in handwritten form the name of city from where the amount was deposited and code name of concerned middlemen/Broker to whom they had handed over the said cash amount.

7.2. I have gone through the Statement of Shri Lalit Ashumal Gangwani, Owner of M/s K.N. Brothers, Rajkot, recorded on 23.12.2015 under Section 14 of the Act. In the said statement, Shri Lalit Ashumal Gangwani, *inter alia*, deposed that,

"Q.5 Please give details about your work in M/s Ambaji Enterprise, Rajkot and M/s K.N. Brothers, Rajkot.

A.5. .... We have opened the above mentioned 9 bank accounts and give the details of these accounts to the Middlemen located in Morbi. These middle men are working on behalf of Tile Manufacturers located in Morbi. These Middlemen then gives our Bank details to the Tiles Manufacturers of Morbi who in turn further passes these details to their Tiles dealers located all over India. The Tiles dealers then deposit cash in these accounts as per the instruction of the ceramic Tiles Manufacturers who in turn inform the Middlemen. The Middlemen then inform us about the cash deposited and the name of the city from where the amount has been deposited. We check all our bank accounts through online banking system on the computer installed in our office and take out the printout of the cash amount deposited during the entire day in all the accounts and mark the details on the printouts. On the same day, latest by 15:30 hours, we do RTGS to either M/s Siddhanath Agency and or to M/s Radheyshyam Enterprises in Sakar Complex, Soni Bazar, Rajkot. In lieu of the RTGS, M/s Siddhanath Agency and or to M/s Radheyshyam Agency gives the cash amount. The said cash is then distributed to concern Middlemen.

Q.6. Please give details of persons who had deposited the amount in your



सत्यापित / Attested

एन. सी. गजरीया  
N. C. Gajarlya  
अधीक्षक  
Superintendent

A.6. We are not aware of any persons who had deposited the cash amount in our bank accounts, the ceramic Tile Manufacturers direct the said parties to deposit the amount in cash in these accounts. As already stated above, we had given our bank accounts details to the middle man who had in turn given these numbers to the Tile Manufacturers.”

7.3 I have gone through the Statement of Shri Nitinbhai Arjanbhai Chikani, actual owner of M/s Maruti Enterprise, Rajkot, recorded on 24.12.2015 under Section 14 of the Act. In the said statement, Shri Nitinbhai Arjanbhai Chikani, *inter alia*, deposed that,

“Q.5 Please give the details about your work in M/s Maruti Enterprise, Plot no. 33, Udaynagar street-1, Mavdi main Road, Rajkot, M/s India Enterprise, Plot No. 33, Udaynagar street-1, Mavdi main road, Rajkot and M/s PC Enterprise, Office No. 110, Haridarshan Arcade, 150 Ft. Ring Road, Rajkot.

A.5 Though, I am not the owner of the above mentioned firms but I looked after all the work of M/s Maruti Enterprises (now closed), M/s India enterprise and M/s PC enterprise with the help of staff. Basically, our work is to receive the cash amount in our 9 bank accounts of the aforesaid firms.

These Bank accounts were opened during the period from March 2015 to June 2015. All the bank accounts of M/s Maruti Enterprise were closed on December 2015 except one account of Bank of India.

We have opened the above mentioned 9 bank accounts and gave the details of these accounts to the middleman located in Morbi. The middleman are working on behalf of tile manufacturers located in Morbi. These middleman then gives our bank details to the tiles manufacturer of Morbi who in turn further passes these details to their tiles dealers located all over India.

The tile dealers then deposits cash in these accounts as per the instructions of the ceramic tile manufacturers who in turn inform the middleman. The middle man then inform us about the cash deposited and the name of the city from where the amount has been deposited. We check all our bank accounts through ‘online banking’ systems on the computer installed in our office and take out the printout of the cash amount deposited during the entire day in all the accounts and mark the details on the printouts. On the same day latest by 15:30 hrs, we do RTGS to M/s Siddhanth Agency in lieu of the RTGS, M/s Siddhanath Agency gives the cash amount. The said cash is then distributed to concern middleman.

Q.6 Please give the details of persons who had deposited the amount in your firms namely M/s Maruti Enterprise, M/s India Enterprise and M/s PC Enterprise ?

A.6 We are not aware of any persons who had deposited the cash amount in our bank accounts. The ceramic tile manufacturers direct the said parties to deposit the amount in cash in these accounts, As already stated above, we had given our bank account details to the middle man who had in turn given these numbers to the tile manufacturers.”

7.4 I find that search was carried out at the office premises of Shri Thakarshi Premi Kasundra, Morbi, a broker/middleman, on 23.12.2015 and certain private records were seized. As reproduced in the Show Cause Notice, the said private



सत्यापित / Attested

Page 10 of 22

एन. सी. गजरीया  
N. C. Gajariya  
अधीक्षक  
Superintendent

records contained details like name of bank, cash amount, place from where the amount was deposited in bank, name of the person / authorized representative who collected the cash from him, date on which cash was handed over and name of the beneficiary of Tiles manufacturer of Morbi.

7.3 I have gone through the Statements of Shri Thakarshi Premji Kasundra, Morbi, recorded on 24.12.2015 and 28.12.2015 under Section 14 of the Act. In the said statements, Shri Thakarshi Premji Kasundra, *inter alia*, deposed that,

Statement dated 24.12.2015:

“Q.1: Please explain the business activities of M/s. Gayatri Enterprise, Morbi.

A.1: M/s. Gayatri Enterprise, Morbi is running business as a broker since November, 2011. I am handling all the day to day work of the firm including Accounts. My firm is working as a middleman between Shroffs and my clients, who are Ceramic Tile manufacturers/Traders. In this regard, my said clients approach me and inform that their certain amount of money has been deposited by their customers in the accounts of my Shroffs. Accordingly, I approach concerned Shroff to deliver the cash amount to me for subsequent distribution to my clients. For this work, I generally charge Commission @ 0.05% of the amount, so distributed to the concerned Manufacturers/ Traders. I further explain in detail that my Shroffs have given me a bank account number and the said number was given by me to my clients. Accordingly, dealers/buyers of the tile manufacturers (who are my clients) deposit the cash amount in the said account of the Shroffs as per the instructions of the Ceramic Tile manufacturers. My clients then inform me about the cash deposited and the name of the city from where the amount has been deposited. And once the said amount is deposited in the account of my Shroffs, my work is to receive the cash from the Shroffs and deliver the same to my clients. I further state that generally Shri Nitinbhai A. Chikhani of M/s. Maruti Enterprise & M/s. India Enterprise, Rajkot, used to deliver the cash to me. My Shroffs are M/s. Maruti Enterprise and M/s. India Enterprise, Rajkot, which is operated by Shri Nitin A. Chikhani & M/s. Ambaji Enterprises and M/s K.N. Brothers, both situated at Rajkot, which is operated by Shri Lalitbhai Gangwani.

Q.3: Please produce all documents/files/diaries/registers, pertaining to aforesaid business activity of your firm namely M/s. Gayatri Enterprise, Morbi for the period from inception of the firm to till date.

A.3: I produce herewith one “Office time” make Notebook containing pages from 1 to 160. The said notebook contains the details of cash amount received from the Shroffs for distribution of the same to my clients i.e. Ceramic Tile manufacturers/Traders; for the period from 24.11.2015 to 21.12.2015. I further explain the details shown at Entry No. 1 at the left side of Page No.1 of the said Notebook as under:

2758040 shiv 23-11 TPK

The first column “2758040” represents the amount received from Shri Nitin Chikhani of M/s. India Enterprise, Rajkot (shiv). The second column “shiv” represents the code name given to Shri Nitin Chikhani. The third column “23-11” represents the date of transaction. The fourth column “TPK” represents the short abbreviation of my name.

सत्यापित / Attested

एन. सी. गाजरिया  
N. C. Gajarlya  
अधीक्षक  
Superintendent



In view of the above, I state that on 23.11.2015, I have received Rs.27,58,040/- from my shroff namely Shri Nitin Chikani.

Now, I explain the details show at entry No. 3 at the right side of Page No. 1 the said Notebook as under:

497730      Alive      Chandresh      (3)

The first column '497730' represents the amount paid to Shri Chandresh of M/s Alive Ceramics.

The second column 'Alive' represents the code name given to the Ceramic tile manufacturer

The third column 'Chandresh' represents the name of the person who collected the amount on behalf of the ceramic tile manufacturer.

The fourth column '(3)' represents the number of entries of the cash amount made by the customers of ceramic tile manufacturer.

In the same manner, the other entries have been made during the course of regular business in this notebook.

Statement dated 28.12.2015:

Q.4. Please state who has made the entries in these 28 records consisting of Diaries and why these entries have been made?

A.4. I have personally made the entries in all these 28 diaries. On some pages, the writing may be different. Those entries have been made by my son whenever I am out of station or in the office. These entries pertain to the cash received from the various Shroff and cash paid to the Ceramic Tile manufacturers.

Q.5. Two types of records are maintained by you. One in the Writing pads and other is in Pocket small diaries. Please explain what they contains?

A.5. I am first explaining the details mentioned in the Writing pads. The Writing pads contain the details received from the Ceramic Tile manufacturers. The manufacturers or his representative calls me in the morning or noon and inform the amount of cash deposited from a particular city or sometimes the amount to be deposited in cash on that day from a particular city. The amount is then entered on the respective pages in 'thousands' i.e. '000' are to be added. If the amount is in thousand and hundreds then it is differentiated with /. For example Rs. 8800/- is written as 8/8 and in that case '00' are to be added. Then the name of the city is mentioned from where the amount is to be received. Lastly the name of the account is mentioned in code word i.e. the name of the Bank and or details of the account holder or his firm's name. After that will call the respective Shroff and inform him the account name and the name of city from where the amount is to be received and when he confirms the receipt, we put a code mark viz 'Star', 'Triangle' and 'X in a circle' against that entry. Different code mark has been allotted to different Shroffs. For example "Star" has been allotted to Shri Lalit Gangwani of Rajkot, 'Triangle' has been allotted to Shri Nitin Chikani of Rajkot and 'X in a circle' has been allotted to Shri Sandeep of Jamnagar."

7.4 I have gone through the Statement of Shri Arvind Hajipara, Partner of M/s Badveshvar Mahadev Tiles, Kolkata recorded on 22.6.2019 under Section 14 of



सत्यापित / Attested

Page 12 of 22

एन. सी. गजरीया  
N. C. Gajarlya  
अधीक्षक  
Superintendent

the Act. In the said statements, Shri Arvind Hajipara, *inter alia*, deposed that,

“Q.4. What are the products dealing by your company ?

A.4. We are engaged in the trading of Ceramic Tiles and Sanitary wares since 2011.

Q-5 : Please provide names of major suppliers of your company for the F.Y. 2014-15 and 2015-16.

A.5 : We had purchased Ceramic Tiles from the following manufacturers during F.Y. 2014-15 and 2015-16 :

1. M/s Omen Vitrified Pvt Ltd, Morbi
2. M/s Saheb Ceramic Pvt Ltd, Morbi
3. M/s Coto Ceramic Pvt Ltd, Morbi
4. M/s Big Tiles, Morbi
5. M/s Wageshwar Tiles Co, Morbi
6. M/s Sunora Ceramic Pvt Ltd, Morbi

.....

Q. 7 : Please explain have you purchased Ceramic Tiles from aforesaid tile manufacturers without covering of Central Excise invoices during F.Y. 2014-15 and 2015-16 ?

A.7 : We had purchased Ceramic Tiles from the aforesaid tile manufacturers under Central Excise invoices during F.Y. 2014-15 and 2015-16. However, sometimes we had received different grade than the mentioned in the invoices from them and the payment for the differential amount is paid in the bank account numbers given by the aforesaid companies.

Q-8 : Do you know the details of bank account holders ?

A.8 : We do not know the details of bank account holders, as per the directions given by manufacturers, we had deposited the payments in the said accounts.”

8. On analyzing the documentary evidences collected during search at the office premises of M/s K.N. Brothers, Rajkot and M/s Maruti Enterprise, Rajkot, Shroffs, and Shri Thakarshi Premji Kasundra, broker/ middleman, as well as deposition made by Shri Lalit Ashumal Gangwani, owner of M/s K.N. Brothers, Shri Nitinbhai Arjanbhai Chikani, owner of M/s Maruti Enterprise and Shri Thakarshi Premji Kasundra in their respective Statements recorded under Section 14 of the Act, I find that customers of Appellant No. 1 had deposited cash amount in bank accounts of Shroffs M/s K.N. Brothers, Rajkot and M/s Maruti Enterprise, Rajkot which was converted into cash by them and handed over to Shri Thakarshi Premji Kasundra broker/Middleman, who handed over the said cash amount to Appellant No. 1. Shri Arvind Hajipara, Partner of M/s Badveshvar Mahadev Tiles, Kolkata, in his Statement recorded on 22.6.2019 under Section 14 of the Act has admitted that they had received different grade of goods from Appellant No. 1 other than those mentioned in invoices and differential amount was paid in bank account numbers given by Appellant No. 1.

सत्यापित / Attested

एन. सी. गजरीया  
N. C. Gajariya  
अधीक्षक  
Superintendent



8.1 On examining the Statements of by Shri Lalit Ashumal Gangwani, owner of M/s K.N. Brothers, Shri Nitinbhai Arjanbhai Chikani of M/s Maruti Enterprise, and of Shri Thakarshi Premji Kasundra, it is apparent that the said Statements contained plethora of the facts, which are in the knowledge of the deponents only. For example, Shri Thakarshi Premji Kasundra deciphered the meaning of each and every entry written in the private records seized from his premises. He also gave details of when and how much cash was delivered to which Tile manufacturer and even concerned person who had received cash amount. It is not the case that the said Statements were recorded under duress or threat. Further, said Statements of Shri Lalit Ashumal Gangwani, Shri Nitinbhai Arjanbhai Chikani and Shri Thakarshi Premji Kasundra have not been retracted. So, veracity of deposition made in said Statements is not under dispute.

8.2 I find that the Appellant No. 1 had devised such a *modus operandi* that it was almost impossible to identify buyers of goods or transporters who transported the goods. The Appellant No. 1 used to inform M/s K.N. Brothers, Rajkot, M/s Maruti Enterprise, Rajkot or Shri Thakarshi Premji Kasundra, broker/Middleman, about deposit of cash in bank accounts of Shroffs on receipt of communication from their buyers and such cash amount would reach to them through middleman/broker. When cash amount was deposited by buyers of goods in bank accounts of Shroff, the same was not reflected in bank statements, as emerging from the records. So, there was no details of buyers available who had deposited cash amount in bank accounts of Shroff. This way the Appellant No. 1 was able to hide the identity of buyers of illicitly removed goods. It is a basic common sense that no person will maintain authentic records of the illegal activities or manufacture being done by it. It is also not possible to unearth all evidences involved in the case. The adjudicating authority is required to examine the evidences on record and decide the case. The Hon'ble High Court in the case of International Cylinders Pvt Ltd reported at 2010(255) ELT68(H.P.) has held that once the Department proves that something illegal had been done by the manufacturer which *prima facie* shows that illegal activities were being carried, the burden would shift to the manufacturer.

8.3 It is also pertinent to mention that the adjudicating authority was not conducting a trial of a criminal case, but was adjudicating a Show Cause Notice as to whether there has been clandestine removal of excisable goods without payment of excise duty. In such cases, preponderance of probabilities would be sufficient and case is not required to be proved beyond reasonable doubt. I rely on the Order passed by the Hon'ble CESTAT, Bangalore passed in the case of Ramachandra Rexins Pvt. Ltd. reported as 2013 (295) E.L.T. 116 (Tri. - Bang.),



सत्यापित / Attested

प्र. सी. गजरीया  
N. C. Gajariya  
अधीक्षक  
Superintendent

wherein it has been held that:

"7.2 In a case of clandestine activity involving suppression of production and clandestine removal, it is not expected that such evasion has to be established by the Department in a mathematical precision. After all, a person indulging in clandestine activity takes sufficient precaution to hide/destroy the evidence. The evidence available shall be those left in spite of the best care taken by the persons involved in such clandestine activity. In such a situation, the entire facts and circumstances of the case have to be looked into and a decision has to be arrived at on the yardstick of 'preponderance of probability' and not on the yardstick of 'beyond reasonable doubt', as the decision is being rendered in quasi-judicial proceedings."

8.4 I also rely on the Order passed by the Hon'ble Tribunal in the case of A.N. Guha & Co. reported in 1996 (86) E.L.T. 333(Tri.), wherein it has been held that,

"In all such cases of clandestine removal, it is not possible for the Department to prove the same with mathematical precision. The Department is deemed to have discharged their burden if they place so much of evidence which, prima facie, shows that there was a clandestine removal if such evidence is produced by the Department. Then the onus shifts on to the Appellants to prove that there was no clandestine removal".

9. After careful examination of evidences available on record in the form of documentary evidences as well as oral evidence, I am of the considered opinion that the Department has discharged initial burden of proof for alleging clandestine removal of goods and the burden of proof shifts to the assessee to establish by independent evidence that there was no clandestine removal and the assessee cannot escape from the rigour of law by picking loopholes in the evidences placed by the Department. I rely on the decision rendered by the Hon'ble Madras High Court in the case of Lawn Textile Mills Pvt. Ltd. reported as 2018 (362) E.L.T. 559 (Mad.), wherein it has been held that,

"30. The above facts will clearly show that the allegation is one of clandestine removal. It may be true that the burden of proving such an allegation is on the Department. However, clandestine removal with an intention to evade payment of duty is always done in a secret manner and not as an open transaction for the Department to immediately detect the same. Therefore, in case of clandestine removal, where secrecies involved, there may be cases where direct documentary evidence will not be available. However, based on the seized records, if the Department is able to *prima facie* establish the case of clandestine removal and the assessee is not able to give

सत्यापित/ Attested

Page 15 of 22



एन. सी. गंजरीया  
N. C. Gajarliya  
अधीक्षक  
Superintendent

any plausible explanation for the same, then the allegation of clandestine removal has to be held to be proved. In other words, the standard and degree of proof, which is required in such cases, may not be the same, as in other cases where there is no allegation of clandestine removal.”

10. The Appellant has contended that entire case of the Department is based upon third party evidences and there is no direct evidence to show clandestine removal of goods. Therefore, in compliance with the principles of natural justice, the opportunity of cross examination of the person whose statement was relied upon against them should be given in adjudication proceedings. However, the adjudicating authority has denied cross examination of persons who had given the statements. Thus, the adjudicating authority has not followed this cardinal principle of natural justice. The action of the adjudicating authority has vitiated the Show Cause Notice. In this regard, I find that the Appellant had sought cross examination of Shri Satish Patel, Morbi during the course of adjudication. The adjudicating authority denied the request of cross examination by observing in the impugned order, *inter alia*, as under:

“17.3 Further, as discussed above, all the witnesses have admitted their respective role in this case, under Section 14 of the Central Excise Act, 1944, voluntarily, which is binding on them and relied upon in the case of the noticee. Further, I find that all the witnesses have not retracted their statement. Therefore, the same are legal and valid pieces of evidence in the eyes of law. It is a settled legal position that cross examination is not required to be allowed in all cases. The denial of opportunity of cross-examination does not vitiate the adjudication proceedings. The adjudicating authority was not conducting a trial of a criminal case, but was adjudicating a SCN as to whether there has been clandestine removal of excisable goods without payment of duty. I find that the Noticee has not provided any independent evidence to show that there was no clandestine removal. In this regard, I place reliance upon the judgement of Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the case of Commissioner of Central Excise Salem Vs M/s Erode Annai Spinning Mills (Pvt.) Ltd, reported at 2019 (366) ELT647, wherein it was held that where opportunity of cross examination was not allowed, the entire proceedings will not be vitiated. ....”

10.1 Apart from above, I find that none of the Statements of Shroff/ Middleman/Broker recorded during investigation have been retracted nor there any allegation of duress or threat during recording of Statements. Further, Shroff/Middleman/broker have no reason to depose before the investigating officer anything which is contrary to facts. It is also pertinent to mention that



सत्यापित/ Attested

एन. सी. गजरिया  
N. C. Gajaria  
अधीक्षक  
Superintendent



the present case was not one off case involving clandestine removal of goods by Tile manufacturers of Morbi. It is on record that DGCEI had simultaneously booked offence cases against 186 such manufacturers for evasion of Central Excise duty who had adopted similar *modus operandi* by routing sale proceeds of illicitly cleared finished goods through Shroffs / Middleman/brokers. It is also on records that out of said 186 manufacturers, 61 had admitted and had also paid duty evaded by them. So, the documentary evidences gathered by the investigating officers from the premises of Shroffs / middleman contained trails of illicitly removed goods and preponderance of probability is certainly against Appellant No. 1. It has been consistently held by the higher appellate fora that cross examination is not mandatory and it depends on facts of each and every case. I rely on the decision rendered by the Hon'ble Bombay High Court in the case of Patel Engineering Ltd reported as 2014 (307) E.L.T. 862 (Bom.), wherein it has been held that,

“23. Therefore, we are of the opinion that it will not be correct to hold that irrespective of the facts and circumstances and in all inquiries, the right of cross examination can be asserted. Further, as held above which rule or principle of natural justice must be applied and followed depends upon several factors and as enumerated above. Even if there is denial of the request to cross examine the witnesses in an inquiry, without anything more, by such denial alone, it will not be enough to conclude that principles of natural justice have been violated. Therefore, the judgments relied upon by Shri Kantawala must be seen in the factual backdrop and peculiar circumstances of the assessee's ease before this Court.”

10.2 By following the above decision and considering the facts of the case, I hold that the adjudicating authority has not erred by not acceding request for cross examination of the witness, as sought by the Appellant.

11. Appellant No. 1 has contended that in cases of clandestine removal of goods, the burden to prove that the Appellant was involved in clandestine manufacture / clearance of goods is on the Department and the Department is required to adduce sufficient evidence in order to demand duty in such cases. It is further contended that the Department must adduce evidence regarding procurement of raw materials, actual production of goods in the factory, removal of goods by adducing evidence of various agencies involved in delivering goods to customers, payment made to them etc. to allege clandestine removal of goods, without which the charge of clandestine removal cannot sustain.

सत्यापित / Attested



एन. सी. गजरीया  
N. C. Gajariya  
अधीक्षक  
Superintendent

11.1 I find that the investigating officers gathered evidences from the premises of M/s K.N. Brothers, Rajkot and M/s Maruti Enterprise, Rajkot, Shroffs, or Shri Thakarshi Premji Kasundra, Middleman, which indicted that Appellant No. 1 routed sales proceeds of illicitly removed goods through the said Shroff and Middleman/Broker. The said evidences were corroborated by the depositions made by Shri Lalit Ashumal Gangwani, owner of M/s K.N. Brothers, Rajkot, Shri Nitinbhai Arjanbhai Chikani, owner of M/s Maruti Enterprise, Rajkot and Shri Thakarshi Premji Kasundra, Morbi during the course of adjudication. It is also observed that Shri Arvind Hajipara, Partner of M/s Badveshvar Mahadev Tiles, Kolkata in his Statement recorded on 22.6.2019 under Section 14 of the Act has admitted that they had received different grade of goods from Appellant No. 1 than mentioned in invoices and differential amount was paid in bank account numbers given by Appellant No. 1. Further, as discussed supra, Appellant No. 1 had devised such a *modus operandi* that it was difficult to identify all buyers of goods or transporters who transported the goods. In catena of decisions, it has been held that in cases of clandestine removal, it is not possible to unearth all the evidences and Department is not required to prove the case with mathematical precision. I rely on the Order passed by the Hon'ble CESTAT, Ahmedabad in the case of Apurva Aluminium Corporation reported at 1996 (261) E.L.T. 515(Tri. Ahmd.), wherein at Para 5.1 of the order, the Tribunal has held that,

“Once again the onus of proving that they have accounted for all the goods produced, shifts to the appellants and they have failed to discharge this burden. They want the department to show challanwise details of goods transported or not transported. There are several decisions of Hon'ble Supreme Court and High Courts wherein it has been held that in such clandestine activities, only the person who indulges in such activities knows all the details and it would not be possible for any investigating officer to unearth all the evidences required and prove with mathematical precision, the evasion or the other illegal activities”.

12. Appellant No. 1 has contended that Shri Thakarshi Kasundra, broker in his statement dated 24.12.2015 has given name of Tile manufacturer as 'Koto Ceramic' whereas name of Appellant is "Coto Ceramic Pvt Ltd". The adjudicating authority confirmed demand on wrong assumption that 'Koto Ceramic' and 'Coto Ceramic Pvt Ltd' are same. In this regard, it is observed that the Appellant had raised this plea before the adjudicating authority in reply to Show Cause Notice. The adjudicating authority has recorded his findings at Para 18.17 of the impugned order, which is reproduced as under:



सत्यापित / Attested


एन. सी. गार्जरिया  
N. C. Gajariya -  
अधीक्षक  
Superintendent

“18.17. The Noticee in their written submissions have argued that, there could be possibility that at various places with the same name of “Koto Ceramic”, firm or company might be existing one or more and that during internet search, they have also found that there is another company having name Koto Ceramic are available. The Noticee has simply assumed that, there is possibility of existence of another firm / company in the name of Koto Ceramic to whom the instant investigation may pertain and that the investigation agency has erroneously issued demand to their firm i.e. Coto Ceramic. In this regard, I find that, the Noticee has not submitted any concrete evidence such as copy of registration certificate, constitution of the firm, photographs of the factory of Koto Ceramic, etc. to justify the existence of another firm in the name of Koto Ceramic. They have argued that during internet search, they have found that there is another company having name Koto Ceramic. I have also seen the same and found that, the location of the firms in the name of Koto Ceramic and Coto Ceramic is at common place i.e. at Sartanpar, Wankaner. Further, the business in which they deal is also common i.e. ceramic tiles, products. Thus, it can be believed that, Koto Ceramic and Coto Ceramic are one and the same and it may be a grammatical error while preparing the statement.”

12.2 It is observed from Para 3 of Show Cause Notice that summons was issued by the investigating officers to Appellant No. 1 on 21.9.2016 for causing inquiry for alleged evasion of Central Excise duty, directing them to submit certain documents like Sales Register, cash register, electricity bills etc, which they complied with. More summons were issued to them on 8.3.2018, 21.3.2018 and 24.1.2019 to submit certain additional documents. Further, Central Excise Registration No. and GST No. of Appellant No. 1 have also been mentioned in Para 1 of the Show Cause Notice. Apart from this, Shri Arvind Hajipara, Partner of M/s Badveshvar Mahadev Tiles, Kolkata in his Statement recorded on 22.6.2019 under Section 14 of the Act has admitted that they had received different grade of goods from M/s Coto Ceramic Pvt Ltd i.e. Appellant No. 1 herein, more than those mentioned in invoices and differential amount was paid in bank account numbers given by Appellant No. 1. Thus, it is not under dispute that inquiry was being conducted against Appellant No. 1. As regards, ‘Koto Ceramic’ appearing in Statement dated 24.12.2015 of Shri Thakarshi Kasundra, Middleman, it is more likely to be a typographical error, as rightly held by the adjudicating authority. I, therefore, discard this contention as not sustainable.



सत्यापित / Attested

  
 एन. सी. गजरीया  
 N. C. Gajarlya  
 अधीक्षक  
 Superintendent

13. Appellant No. 1 has contended that they were engaged in the manufacture of Sanitarywares falling under CETSH No. 69101000 but the demand was wrongly confirmed against them for clandestine removal of Tiles on wrong assumption that they were engaged in the manufacture of Tiles. In this regard, it is observed from the investigation report annexed with Show Cause Notice that common investigation was conducted against 186 manufacturing units involving same *modus operandi* and majority of the said units were engaged in the manufacture of Tiles. This may be a reason for mentioning in the Show Cause Notice that Appellant No. 1 was engaged in the manufacture of Tiles. However, as discussed above, evidences gathered from the premises of M/s K.N. Brothers, Rajkot and M/s Maruti Enterprise, Rajkot, Shroffs and Shri Thakarshi Premji Kasundra, Middleman indicted that Appellant No. 1 was engaged in clandestine removal of goods and had routed sales proceeds of illicitly removed goods through the said Shroff and Middleman/Broker. So, wrong mentioning of product will not vitiate the entire proceedings. I, therefore, discard this contention as not sustainable.

14. In view of above, the various contentions raised by Appellant No. 1 are of no help to them and they have failed to discharge the burden cast on them that they had not indulged in clandestine removal of goods. On the other hand, the Department has adduced sufficient oral and documentary corroborative evidences to demonstrate that Appellant No.1 indulged in clandestine removal of goods and evaded payment of Central Excise duty. I, therefore, hold that confirmation of demand of Central Excise duty amount of Rs. 41,10,626/- by the adjudicating authority is correct, legal and proper. Since demand is confirmed, it is natural consequence that the confirmed demand is required to be paid along with interest at applicable rate under Section 11AA of the Act. I, therefore, uphold order to pay interest on confirmed demand.

15. I find that Appellant No. 1 was found indulging in clandestine removal of goods and routed the cash through Shroff/Middleman/Broker. The *modus operandi* adopted by Appellant No. 1 was unearthed during investigation carried out against them by DGCEI, Ahmedabad. Thus, this is a clear case of suppression of facts with intent to evade payment of duty. The adjudicating authority was justified in invoking extended period of limitation on the grounds of suppression of facts. Since extended period of limitation on the grounds of suppression of facts was correctly invoked, penalty under Section 11AC of the Act is mandatory, as has been held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Rajasthan Spinning & Weaving Mills reported as 2009 (238) E.L.T. 3 (S.C.), wherein it is held that

When there are ingredients for invoking extended period of limitation for



सत्यापित / Attested

एन. सी. गजरीया  
N. C. Gajariya  
अधीक्षक  
Superintendent

demand of duty, imposition of penalty under Section 11AC is mandatory. The ratio of the said judgment applies to the facts of the present case. I, therefore, uphold penalty of Rs. 41,10,626/- imposed under Section 11AC of the Act.

16. Regarding penalty imposed upon Appellant Nos. 2 to 6 under Rule 26 of the Rules, I find that Appellant Nos. 2 to 6 were Directors of Appellant No. 1 and were looking after day-to-day affairs of Appellant No.1 and were the key persons of Appellant No. 1 and were directly involved in clandestine removal of the goods manufactured by Appellant No. 1 without payment of Central Excise duty and without cover of Central Excise Invoices. They were found concerned in clandestine manufacture and removal of such goods and hence, they were knowing and had reason to believe that the said goods were liable to confiscation under the Act and the Rules. I, therefore, find that imposition of penalty of Rs. 2,00,000/- each upon Appellant Nos. 2 to 6 under Rule 26(1) of the Rules is correct and legal.

17. In view of above, I uphold the impugned order and reject appeals of Appellants Nos. 1 to 6.

18. अपीलकर्ताओं द्वारा दर्ज की गई अपीलों का निपटारा उपरोक्त तरीके से किया जाता है।

18. The appeals filed by the Appellants are disposed off as above.

सत्यापित / Attested

  
एन. सी. गाजरिया  
N. C. Gajariya  
अधीक्षक  
Superintendent

  
(AKHILESH KUMAR)  
Commissioner (Appeals)

By R.P.A.D.

| To,  | सेवा में,   |
|--|---|
| 1. M/s Coto Ceramic Pvt Ltd,<br>National Highway 8A, Behind<br>Makansar, At Sartanpar, Taluka<br>Wankaner, District Morbi.   | मैसर्स कोटो सिरेमिक प्राइवेट लिमिटेड,<br>राष्ट्रीय राजमार्ग 8ए, मकनसर के पीछे,<br>सरतनपर, तालुका वांकानेर, जिला मोरबी ।   |
| 2. Shri Devkaranbhai Vashrambhai<br>Bhalodiya, Director of M/s Coto<br>Ceramic Pvt Ltd, National Highway<br>8A, Behind Makansar, At Sartanpar,<br>Taluka Wankaner, District Morbi. | श्री देवकरनभाई वाशरंभाई भालोदिया,<br>निदेशक,<br>मैसर्स कोटो सिरेमिक प्राइवेट लिमिटेड,<br>राष्ट्रीय राजमार्ग 8ए, मकनसर के पीछे,<br>सरतनपर, तालुका वांकानेर, जिला मोरबी । |
| 3. Shri Mayank D. Bhalodiya<br>Director of M/s Coto Ceramic Pvt<br>Ltd, National Highway 8A, Behind<br>Makansar, At Sartanpar, Taluka<br>Wankaner, District Morbi.                 | श्री मयंक डी. भालोदिया,<br>निदेशक,<br>मैसर्स कोटो सिरेमिक प्राइवेट लिमिटेड,<br>राष्ट्रीय राजमार्ग 8ए, मकनसर के पीछे,<br>सरतनपर, तालुका वांकानेर, जिला मोरबी ।           |



|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>4. Shri Chandrakantbhai Raghunathbhai,<br/>Director of M/s Coto Ceramic Pvt Ltd, National Highway 8A, Behind Makansar, At Sartanpar, Taluka Wankaner, District Morbi.</p> | <p>श्री चंद्रकांतभाई रघुनाथभाई,<br/>निदेशक,<br/>मैसर्स कोटो सिरेमिक प्राइवेट लिमिटेड,<br/>राष्ट्रीय राजमार्ग 8ए, मकनसर के पीछे,<br/>सरतनपर, तालुका वांकानेर, जिला मोरबी ।</p> |
| <p>5. Shri Nimish Sureshbhai Adesara,<br/>Director of M/s Coto Ceramic Pvt Ltd, National Highway 8A, Behind Makansar, At Sartanpar, Taluka Wankaner, District Morbi.</p>     | <p>श्री निमिष सुरेशभाई अडेसर,<br/>निदेशक,<br/>मैसर्स कोटो सिरेमिक प्राइवेट लिमिटेड,<br/>राष्ट्रीय राजमार्ग 8ए, मकनसर के पीछे,<br/>सरतनपर, तालुका वांकानेर, जिला मोरबी ।</p>   |
| <p>6. Shri Amitkumar H. Dedaniya<br/>Director of M/s Coto Ceramic Pvt Ltd, National Highway 8A, Behind Makansar, At Sartanpar, Taluka Wankaner, District Morbi.</p>          | <p>श्री अमितकुमार एच. ददानिया<br/>निदेशक,<br/>मैसर्स कोटो सिरेमिक प्राइवेट लिमिटेड,<br/>राष्ट्रीय राजमार्ग 8ए, मकनसर के पीछे,<br/>सरतनपर, तालुका वांकानेर, जिला मोरबी ।</p>   |

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 मण्डल मोरबी-II, राजकोट को आवश्यक कार्यवाही हेतु।
- 4) गार्ड फ़ाइल।

