NATION TAX MARKET

: : आयुक्त (अपील्स) का कार्यालय, वस्तु एवं सेवा करऔर 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 – 2477952/2441142Email: commrappl3-cexamd@nic.in

सत्यमेव जयते

रजिस्टर्डडाकए.डी. द्वारा :- **DIN-20230164SX0000988042**

क	अपील / फाइलसंख्या/ Appeal /File No.	मूलआदेशसं / OIO No.	दिनांक/ Date
	V2/9/RAJ/2022	**141/ST/2020-21**	**10-12-2021**

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

RAJ-EXCUS-000-APP-001-2023

आदेश का दिनांक / Date of Order:	**23.01.2023**	जारी करने की तारीख / Date of issue:	**24.01.2023**

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

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

ग अपर आयुक्त/ संयुक्त आयुक्त/ उपायुक्त/ सहायक आयुक्त, केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क/ सेवाकर/वस्तु एवंसेवाकर, राजकोट / जामनगर / गांधीधाम। द्वारा उपरलिखित जारी मूल आदेश से सृजित: /

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

घ अपीलकर्ताऔरप्रतिवादी का नाम एवं पता /Name & Address of the **Appellant** & Respondent :-

M/s. Rajkot Nagrik Sahkari Bank Ltd, Arvindbhai Maniar Nagarik Sevalay, 150 Ring Road, Nr Raiya Circle, Rajkot-360005.

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 निम्नलिखि+त जगह की जा सकती है।/

Appeal to Customs, Excise & Service Tax Appellate Tribunal under Section 35B of CEA, 1944 / Under Section 86 of the Finance Act, 1994 an appeal lies to:-

(i) वर्गीकरण मूल्यांकन से सम्बन्धित सभी मामले सीमा शुल्क, केन्द्रीय उत्पादन शुल्क एवं सेवाकर अपीलीय न्यायाधिकरण की विशेष पीठ, वेस्ट ब्लॉक नं 2, आर॰ के॰ पुरम, नई दिल्ली, को की जानी चाहिए।/

The special bench of Customs, Excise & Service Tax Appellate Tribunal of West Block No. 2, R.K. Puram, New Delhi in all matters relating to classification and valuation.

(ii) उपरोक्त परिच्छेद 1(a) में बताए गए अपीलों के अलावा शेष सभी अपीलें सीमा शुल्क,केंद्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क एवं सेवाकर अपीलीय न्यायाधिकरण (सिस्टेट) की पश्चिम क्षेत्रीय पीठिका, ,द्वितीय तल, बहुमाली भवन असावा अहमदाबाद- ३८००१६को की जानी चाहिए।/

To the West regional bench of Customs, Excise & Service Tax Appellate Tribunal (CESTAT) at, 2nd Floor, Bhaumali Bhawan, Asarwa Ahmedabad-380016in 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 माँग , ब्याज की माँग और लगाया गया जुर्माना, रुपए 5 लाख या उससे कम,5 लाख रुपए या 50 लाख रुपए तक अथवा 50 लाख रुपए से अधिक है तो क्रमश: 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 सार्वजिनक क्षेत्र के बैंक द्वारा जारी रेखांकित बैंक ड्राफ्ट द्वारा किया जाना चाहिए। संबंधित ड्राफ्ट का भुगतान, बैंक की उसे शाखा में होना चाहिए जहां संबंधित अपीलीय न्यायाधिकरण की शाखा स्थित है। स्थगन आदेश (स्टे ऑर्डर) के लिए आवेदन-पत्र के साथ 500/- रुपए का निर्धारित शुल्क जमा करना होगा।/

The appeal to the Appellate Tribunal shall be filed in quadruplicate in form EA-3 / as prescribed under Rule 6 of Central Excise (Appeal) Rules, 2001 and shall be accompanied against one which at least should be accompanied by a fee of Rs. 1,000/- Rs.5000/-, Rs.10,000/- where amount of duty demand/interest/penalty/refund is upto 5 Lac., 5 Lac to 50 Lac and above 50 Lac respectively in the form of crossed bank draft in favour of Asst. Registrar of branch of any nominated public sector bank of the place where the bench of any nominated public sector bank of the place where the bench of the Tribunal is situated. Application made for grant of stay shall be accompanied by a fee of Rs. 500/-.

(B) अपीलीय न्यायाधिकरण के समक्ष अपील, वित्त अधिनियम,1994की धारा 86(1) के अंतर्गत सेवाकर नियमवाली, 1994, के नियम 9(1) के तहत निर्धारित प्रपत्र S.T.-5में चार प्रतियों में की जा सकेगी 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 माँग , ब्याज की माँग और लगाया गया जुर्माना, रुपए 5 लाख या उससे कम,5 लाख रुपए या 50 लाख रुपए तक अथवा 50 लाख रुपए से अधिक है तो क्रमश: 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 सार्वजिनक क्षेत्र के बैंक द्वारा जारी रेखांकित बैंक ड्राफ्ट द्वारा किया जाना चाहिए। संबंधित ड्राफ्ट का भुगतान, बैंक की उस शाखा में होना चाहिए जहां संबंधित अपीलीय न्यायाधिकरण की शाखा स्थित है। स्थगन आदेश (स्टे ऑर्डर) के लिए आवेदन-पत्र के साथ 500/- रुपए का निर्धारित शुल्क जमा करना होगा।/

The appeal under sub section (1) of Section 86 of the Finance Act, 1994, to the Appellate Tribunal Shall be filed in quadruplicate in Form S.T.5 as prescribed under Rule 9(1) of the Service Tax Rules, 1994, and Shall be accompanied by a copy of the order appealed against (one of which shall be certified copy) and should be accompanied by a fees of Rs. 1000/- where the amount of service tax & interest demanded & penalty levied of Rs. 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,1994की 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 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 For 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 जुर्माना विवादित है, या जुर्माना, जब केवल जुर्माना विवादित है, का भुगतान किया जाए, बशर्ते कि इस धारा के अंतर्गत जमा कि जाने वाली अपेक्षित देय राशि दस करोड़ रुपए से अधिक न हो।
केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क एवं सेवाकर के अंतर्गत "मांग किए गए शुल्क" मे निम्न शामिल है
(i) धारा 11 डी के अंतर्गत रकम
(ii) सेनवेट जमा की ली गई गलत राशि
(iii) सेनवेट 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 समक्ष विचाराधीन स्थगन अर्ज़ी एवं अपील को लागू नहीं होगे।/
For an appeal to be filed before the CESTAT, under Section 35F of the Central Excise Act, 1944 which is also made applicable to Service Tax under Section 83 of the Finance Act, 1994, an appeal against this order shall 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 कोपुनरीक्षण आवेदन :**
Revision application to Government of India:
इस आदेश की पुनरीक्षणयाचिका निम्नलिखित मामली में,केंद्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क अधिनियम,1994 की धारा 35EE के प्रथमपुरंतुक के अंतर्गतअवर सचिव, भारत सरकार, पुनरीक्षण आवेदन ईकाई,वित्त मंत्रालय, राजस्व विभाग, चौथी मंजिल, जीवन दीप भवन, संसद मार्ग, नई दिल्ली-110001, को किया जाना चाहिए। /
A revision application lies to the Under Secretary, to the Government of India, Revision Application Unit, Ministry of Finance, Department of Revenue, 4th Floor, Jeevan Deep Building, Parliament Street, New Delhi-110001 under Section 35EE of the CEA 1944 in respect of the following case, governed by first proviso to sub-section (1) of Section-35B ibid:

(i) यदि माल के किसी नुकसान के मामले में, जहां नुकसान किसी माल को किसी कारखाने से भंडार गृह के पारगमन के दौरान या किसी अन्य कारखाने या 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 ड्यूटी क्रेडीट इस अधिनियम एवं इसके विभिन्न प्रावधानों के तहत मान्य की गई है और ऐसे आदेश जो आयुक्त (अपील) के द्वारा वित्त अधिनियम (नं॰ 2),1998 की धारा 109 के द्वारा नियत की गई तारीख अथवा समायाविधि पर या बाद में पारित किए गए है।/
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, 1944 की धारा 35-EE के तहत निर्धारित शुल्क की अदायगी के साक्ष्य के तौर पर TR-6 की प्रति संलग्न की जानी चाहिए। /
The above application shall be made in duplicate in Form No. EA-8 as specified under Rule, 9 of Central Excise (Appeals) Rules, 2001 within 3 months from the date on which the order sought to be appealed against is communicated and shall be accompanied by two copies each of the OIO and Order-In-Appeal. It should also be accompanied by a copy of TR-6 Challan evidencing payment of prescribed fee as prescribed under Section 35-EE of CEA, 1944, under Major Head of Account.

(vi) पुनरीक्षण आवेदन के साथ निम्नलिखित निर्धारित शुल्क की अदायगी की जानी चाहिए।
जहाँ संलग्न रकम एक लाख रूपये या उससे कम हो तो रूपये 200/- का भुगतान किया जाए और यदि संलग्न रकम एक लाख रूपये 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 आदेशो 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 पढ़ी कार्य से बचने के लिए यथास्थिति अपीलीय नयाधिकरण को एके अपील या केंद्रीय सरकार को एक आवेदन किया जाता है। / In case, if the order covers variousnumbers of order- in Original, fee for each O.I.O. should be paid in the aforesaid manner, notwithstanding the fact that the one appeal to the Appellant Tribunal or the one application to the Central Govt. As the case may be, is filled to avoid scriptoria work if excising Rs. 1 lakh fee of Rs. 100/- for each.

(E) यथासंशोधित न्यायालय शुल्क अधिनियम, 1975, के अनुसूची-I के अनुसार मूल आदेश एवं स्थगन आदेश की प्रति पर निर्धारित 6.50 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 संबन्धित मामलों को सम्मिलित करने वाले नियमों की ओर भी ध्यान आकर्षित किया जाता है। /
Attention is also invited to the rules covering these and other related matters contained in the Customs, Excise and Service Appellate Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 1982.

(G) उच्च अपीलीय प्राधिकारी को अपील दाखिल करने से संबंधित व्यापक, विस्तृत और नवीनतम प्रावधानों के लिए, अपीलार्थी विभागीय वेबसाइट www.cbec.gov.in को देख सकते हैं। /
For the elaborate, detailed and latest provisions relating to filing of appeal to the higher appellate authority, the appellant may refer to the Departmental website www.cbec.gov.in

ORDER IN APPEAL

1. M/s Rajkot Nagrik Sahkari Bank Ltd, Rajkot (hereinafter referred to as the appellant) has filed appeal No. V2/9/Raj/2022 against Order-in-Original No. 141/ST/2020-21 passed by the Assistant Commissioner, Central GST, Rajkot-I (hereinafter referred to as the adjudicating authority).

2. Facts of the case in brief are that the appellant has filed refund of Rs. 8,70,686/- paid towards service tax, interest and penalty confirmed on the service of locker rent charges. CESTAT by its Order No. A/11892/2019 dated 17.09.2019 has set aside the demand of service tax on locker rent charges. The appellant, later, reduced the refund claim to Rs.8,53,114/-. The adjudicating authority, though sanctioned the refund claim filed by the appellant, ordered the amount of Rs.8,53,114/- to be credited to the Consumer Welfare Fund on the premise that the appellant has failed to prove that they have not passed on the incidence of such tax to its customers.

3. Being aggrieved, the appellant filed the appeal wherein they, *inter alia*, contended that the adjudicating authority has grievously erred in refusing the grant the refund due to the appellant and to appreciate the true import of the submissions made by the appellant.

4. Chartered Accountant, Gaurang Sanghvi appeared for personal hearing on 12.01.2023 and handed over a paper book consisting of additional written submissions and other relevant documents. He reiterated the submissions contained therein and those in the appeal. He submitted that the locker rent was collected prior to levy of service tax and the service tax was not collected prior to or after levy of service tax from the customers in respect of this locker rent. The adjudicating authority has sanctioned the refund on merits but credited to Consumer Welfare Fund merely because in their Profit and Loss account the refund receivable was not shown as contingent liability due to which adjudicating authority presumed that the refund amount could possibly be passed on to the consumers indirectly by factoring in the cost of services. He submitted that this is not possible in case of nationalized banks and co-operative banks since the cost of services are regulated by Reserve Bank of India. He further submitted that about half of the refund amount was towards the penalty and interest paid by the appellant and there was no possibility to pass it on to the customers. In view of above, he requested to set aside the order-in-original and grant the refund to the appellant.

5. In the additional written submissions submitted at the time of personal hearing, the appellant, *inter alia*, submitted that: -

a. The appellant never collected service tax from its customers as the locker rent was collected by the appellant in advance prior to the date from which locker rent was brought within the service ambit. The appellant submitted that second limb of sub-section (1) to Section 11B of Central Excise Act, 1944 refers to passing on the incidence of tax burden to any other person. Provisions of Excise Act, 1944 were applicable to tangible products.

b. The appellant submitted that the adjudicating authority has presumed that the incidence has been recovered from the customers based on the solitary aspect that the appellant has debited the said tax in its profit and loss account. The appellant contended that the presumption made by the adjudicating authority is a mere empty statement in as much as to pass on the said incidence to its customers, the appellant would have to adjust the charges on its loans or interest it would pay on its deposits, which is not possible. The appellant submitted that considering the nature of the business of the appellant it would be impossible to pass on the said burden to any other person and the appellant can only recover the same from the very person to whom the said levy pertains to.

c. The appellant submitted that they have produced certificate of statutory auditors and also the affidavit of the CFO during the course of adjudication proceedings, but the same have been brushed aside by the adjudicating authority. When on facts it has not collected the said tax from its customers, the onus shifts to the adjudicating authority to bring on record as to how such incidence has been passed on by the appellant.

d. The appellant submitted that the adjudicating authority has failed to appreciate that the debit if claimed as an allowable expense, upon receipt of refund would be brought to tax as income of the appellant. As such, the contention of the adjudicating authority travels beyond the judicial parameters of Section 11B of the Central Excise Act, 1944.

e. The appellant submitted that the cardinal principle that needs to be considered is that in the case of appellant being a bank, how can it pass on the burden of the tax, interest and penalty to another person. As far as appellant is concerned, interest income and income from trading in government securities does not even fall within the ambit of service tax.

f. As regards what would tantamount to be an indirect transfer is concerned, the appellant submitted that Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of *Solar Pesticides Pvt Ltd* held that indirect paying the burden of duty would arise when such duty is added to the price of the finished goods which are then sold to a customer. In the case of appellant, it is not legally possible to do so in as much as the entire pricing of its various services is fixed and determined by way of a policy which is notified and informed to every customer.

6. I have carefully gone through the facts of the case on record and the submissions made by the appellant. The only question to be answered in the present appeal is whether the adjudicating authority was correct in deciding that the appellant has passed on the incidence of tax burden to any person because the amount has been debited to the Profit and Loss account as expenditure by the appellant.

7. As per facts on record, the appellant had paid the service tax, interest and penalty consequent to raising demand from them. The amount of tax, interest and penalty so paid were claimed as expenditure in their profit and loss account. The adjudicating authority, in the impugned order, has observed that once the said amount has been shown on the expenditure side in Profit and Loss account, the incidence of tax stands recovered indirectly from their customers. He further observed that once the amount is debited to Profit and Loss account and the benefit under Income Tax Act claimed, stake on refund of service tax paid gets surrendered and accordingly refund under Section 11B of the Central Excise Act, 1944 read with Section 93 of Finance Act, 1994 wouldn't lie. The adjudicating authority, thus, made a presumption that once the amount is debited to profit and loss account, the incidence to tax stands recovered from their customers. Per contra, the appellant contended that in case of banking service, it is not possible to pass on the incidence to tax burden to its customers unless it is charged directly from the customers as the locker rent charge is regulated by Reserve Bank of India and the service tax was levied on the said service at a later date. The appellant

also argued that the provisions of Section 11B(2) of Central Excise Act, 1944 is applicable to tangible goods only.

8. In this regard, I find that the appellant has not directly collected or recovered any amount separately from the customers towards service tax, interest and penalty paid in respect of the locker charges. There is although a deeming fiction that any incidence of tax is passed on to the customers/ consumers unless proved otherwise, there is no stipulation in the Finance Act, 1994 or in the Central Excise Act, 1944 which provides that once an amount is debited to expenditure in the Profit and Loss account, the incidence of tax stands recovered from the customers. In the present case, I observe, the appellant had produced certificate from Chartered Accountant Shri Viren L. Kothari, HJP & Co, Chartered Accountants and affidavit of Chief Financial Officer of the appellant to the effect that the bank has not passed on the incidence of tax to its customers at any later date. The adjudicating authority, however, did not consider the said certificates while deciding the issue. When the appellant had discharged the burden of proving that they have not passed on the burden of tax to any other person, the adjudicating authority should have accepted the same unless contrary proved by him. Merely because the appellant debited the amount of tax, interest and penalty paid by them in the expenditure side of Profit and Loss account, it does not prove that the appellant had passed on the incidence to the customers. Debiting the amount in expenditure side of profit and loss account only makes it clear that the appellant had born the incidence of tax on himself. As pointed out by the appellant, it would not be possible to pass on the burden to other customers of the bank and they can only recover the same from very person to whom the levy of tax pertains to. The appellant is not a manufacturer of goods so as the expenses incurred get absorbed in the costing of goods manufactured and are recovered from the buyers. The appellant is a provider of banking services and the amount claimed as refund was paid by the appellant on making demand by the department by issue of show cause notice. The certificate of Chartered Accountant produced by the appellant before adjudicating authority proved that the incidence of tax has not been passed on to any other person and the adjudicating authority has not proved it wrong by adducing any tangible evidence or any valid reason. Therefore, I hold that the impugned order to credit the sanctioned amount to Consumer Welfare Fund is not sustainable.

9. In view of the above, I allow the appeal and order to refund the amount of Rs.8,53,114/- to the appellant.

सत्यापित / Attested

Superintendent
Central GST (Appeals)
Rajkot

23.01.2023

(SHIV PRATAP SINGH)
Commissioner (Appeals)

By R.P.A.D.:

To, M/s Rajkot Nagrik Sahkari Bank Ltd, Nagrik Bhavan No.1, Dhebar bhai Road, Rajkot	सेवा मे, मेस्सेर्स राजकोट नागरिक सहकारी बैंक लिमिटेड, नागरिक भवन नो. 1, ढेबर रोड, राजकोट।

प्रतिलिपि :-

1) मुख्य आयुक्त, वस्तु एवं सेवा कर एवं केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क, गुजरात क्षेत्र, अहमदाबाद को जानकारी हेतु।

2) प्रधान आयुक्त, वस्तु एवं सेवा कर एवं केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क, राजकोट आयुक्तालय, राजकोट को आवश्यक कार्यवाही हेतु।

3) सहायक आयुक्त, वस्तु एवं सेवा कर एवं केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्कमण्डल राजकोट – I को आवश्यक कार्यवाही हेतु।

4) गार्ड फ़ाइल।