

आयक्त (अपील) का कार्यालय.



## -2-F.No. : GAPPI

### Brief Facts of the Case :

M/s. Tarum Kumar Industries, Legal Name: Vinod Kumar Gokaldas Prajapati, Piot No. 132, Goaaria GIDC, Dist. Mehsana, Gujarat-382825 (hereinanther referred to as 'the appellant'), holding GST Number 24ABJP9767D129 has filed appeal against Order-In-Original No. OZA/C/DEM/MBH/GST/Tarux Numar Industries/2023-24, dated 31.07.2023 (hereinafter referred to as the "impugned order") passed by the Assistant Commissioners (Destination of the Case, Division- Mehsana, Gandhinagar Commissioners (Destination of the State State

2(i). The facts leading to this case are that the appellant is engaged in manufacturing of Sulphates; Alums; Persulphates) Peroxosulphates - other sulphates of copper. An investigation was conducted in the case of M/s. Ankur Trading, Ahmedabad (GST No.24BHCPA3520K1ZW) by the Officers of CGST Ahmedabad South Commissionerate, wherein, it was revealed that no such firm was functioning at the given premises, which indicates that M/s. Ankur Trading was operating only on paper and had issued sales invoices without supplying of goods with an intent to pass illegal input tax credit. The said firm was fictitiously floated on the base of forged documents by Shri Mohd Ashraf Abdul Sheikh and all the sales invoices issued by M/s. Ankur Trading, Ahmedabad are bogus and involve invalid ITC, which have been availed and suized by various firms, without actual movement of goods. Further, the ig Inhedabad South Commissionerate vide their said letter dated 30.01.2020 iso forwarded the Panchnama dated 17.12.19 drawn at the registered premises of M/s. Ankur Trading and the recorded statement of Shri Mohd Ashraf Abdul Sheikh, who resides on the registered address of M/s. Ankur Trading under section 70 of CGST Act, 2017.

2(ii). On further investigation, it is revealed that the appellant had availed ITC on the strength of the fake invoices generated by M/s. Ankur Trading. The detail is as under:-

Invoice No. & Date	Value in Rs.	CGST + SGST	Total invoice value
AG095, 29.06.2018	63,86,160	11,49,510	75,35,669
AG097, 30.06.2018	68,24,900	12,28,482	80,53,382
Total		23,77,992	

The appellant had received inward supply of goods worth Rs.1,32,11,060/- in the month of June 2018 with the involvement of total tax of Rs. 23,77,992/-(COST amounting Rs.11,88,996/- and SOST amounting Rs. 11,88,996/-) on the fake involves generated by M/s. Ankur Trading. Further, an inquiry was

#### -3-F.No.: GAPPL/ADC/GSTP/2874/2023-APPEAL

initiated against the appellant during the course of investigation. Shri Anil Kumar Somabhai Patel manager of appellant firm and Shri Vinodbhai Gokaldas Prajapati proprietor of appellant firm agreed to reverse/pay the said ineligible ITC availed on the basis of invoices issued by M/s Ankur Trading along with applicable interest and penalty as applicable within 15 days from the date of panchnama i.e. 24.02.2020. Shri Vinodbhai Gokaldas Prajapati proprietor of appellant firm has submitted letter dated 25.02.2020, wherein, the said appellant requested that out of ineligible ITC Rs. 23,77,992/- they paid Rs. 50,000/- vide DRC debit entry no. DI2402200537890 dated 25.02.2020, and also requested that they will pay the outstanding amount within one year. Further, the statement of Shri Vinodbhai Gokaldas Prajapati proprietor of appellant firm was recorded under Section 70 of the Central Goods and Services Tax Act, 2017 on 01.06.2020 before the Superintendent of Central Goods and Services Tax Hqrs. (Anti-Evasion) Gandhinagar Commissionerate. In the statement of Shri Vinodbhai Gokaldas Prajapati, recorded under Section 70 of the Central Goods and Services Tax Act, 2017, had stated interalia that he is the proprietor of Tarun Kumar industries; that the said firm is engaged in the manufacturing and trading of Copper Sulphate and for the same purpose the firm was registered under Central GST under registration no. 24ABJPP9767DIZ9; that the Copper scrap purchased from M/s Ankur Trading through Mr. Manoj shah (sgent- 9726229292); that he has been ghown letter F.No.IV/FI-I/250/Fake/Ankur/2019-20 dated 30.01.2020 from Additional Commissioner(Preventive), COST & C.Ex. Ahmedabad South minissionerate. Thereafter, Shri Vinodbhai Gokaldas Prajapati stated that it ts that M/s Ankur Trading is engaged in issuing of fake invoices, hence doesn't want to enter into any legal litigation, So he voluntarily agreed to pay the outstanding dues along-with interest and penalty as applicable. Accordingly, the appellant has paid up the amount of tax vide DRC-03.

2(iii). Further due to short payment of interest the jurisdiction officer issued a show cause notice u/s. 74(1) of COST Act 2017, for short payment of interest. The appellant further paid the short amount of interest of Ra. 4,24,280/ on 26,07.2023. The adjudicating authority has not consider the 15% penalty as per provision u/s 74(8) of the COST Act, 2017 due to the appellant has not paid the full amount of interest, therefore passed an order to puy 100% penalty on tax u/s. 74(1) of the COST Act, 2017, due to short payment of interest of Rs. 1,93,633/. In view of the above the appellant is inable to pay penalty of Rs. 20,21,292/. (COST Rs. 10,10,646/-) end SOST Rs. 10,10,646/-) in terms of Section 74(1) of the COST Act, 2017.

#### F.No.: GAPPL/ADC/GSTP/2874/2023-APPEAL

3. Accordingly, the appellant was issued Show Cause Notice. The impugned Show Cause Notice has been adjudicated by the adjudicating authority vide the impugned order dated 31.07.2023. The adjudicating authority has passed the impugned order on the following grounds:

- the taxpayer has himself admitted the fact that input Tax Credit has been availed and utilized on the strength of fake invoices issued by M/s Ankur Trading Co. Therefore, there is no need to prove it again on the part of department;
- that the Taxpayer has suppressed the facts with an intention to avail indimissible and irregular IIC credit of COST and SOST amounting to Rs.23,77,992/- in a fraudulent manner without actual receipt of goods during the months of June 2018;
- the Taxpayer has deposited the amount of Rs.23,77,992/- vide various DRC-03. The same is required to be appropriated under Section 74(5) of the CGST Act, 2017;
- that the Tazpayer has deposited Rs.6,42,060/- vide DRC-03 dated 30.32020 and Rs.2,42,890/- vide DRC-03 dated.267.2023. The same is required to be appropriated under the provision of section.50(3) of CGST Act/SOST Act, 201 7;

that the Taxpayer has deposited the amount of Re. 3,56,700/- towards penalty vide DRC-03 dated 30.3.2020. The same is required to be appropriated under the provisions of Section 122(1)(vii) read with Section 74(1) of the CGST Act, 2017;

the Tarpayer has paid Ra.23,77,992/as Tack, Ra.6,42,060/-(as interest) and Ra.3,56,700/- (as 15% penalty) on 30.3.2020 whereas the Tarpayer uas required to pay interest of Re.8,35,563/, Arenform, the condition of payment of interest has not been fulfilled by them. Accordingly, I find that request for concluding the notice as provided under Section 74(5) is not legally correct and sustainable in the eyes of flaw.

 Being aggrieved with the impugned order, the appellant preferred this appeal on 22.09.2023 on the following grounds:-

- The appellant has paid the tax with interest (Rs.193633/- short) and 15% penalty before issuing show cause notice and difference amount of interest of Rs.2,42,890/- before issuing the order.
- The appellant is regular tax payer and faced the problem due to bogus billing carried out by the agent or suppliers, the appellant has paid the tax to the suppliers and again to the GST department also.



### F.No.: GAPPL/ADC/GSTP/2874/2023-APPEAL

- The appellant intention was not malafide and he could not check the genuineness of the suppliers but it's a routine business activity and the transaction were carried out with not a bad intention.
- When the mount paid as per the assertainment of the assesses folls short, the proper officer shall issue a SCM for the amount of short fall under Section 74(1) of the COST Act, 2017. Therefore, the Proper office shall issue a notice under section 74(1) of the COST Act, 2017 for the short fall amount ontu.
- The appellant has point the tax interest and 15% penalty u/e 7463 and short payment of interest is due to a simple calculation mistake and it's a human mistake and when the appellant come to know the calculation mistake he has paid the difference amount, therefore the appellant should not be penalted for 100% penalty u/a 741/3 of the GST Act 2017.

In the advessid ground the appellant pergy for Penalty of Re.32,77,992,/COST and SGST) u/s 74(1) of CGST Act-2017 to be waived and it should be Rs.365,700.- u/s 74(5) of the CGST Act, 2017 as the appellant has already paid. The appellant pergy to give the relief from huge penalty and it will disturb the business of the appellant. Appellant hereby request you to give us a chance Showin person before taking any decision.

# REONAL HEARING:

Schwarz and serious in the matter was held on 19.10.2023. Shri Nærodmi Singh Shnichia, Tax Practioner, Authorized Representative appeared in person to obhalf of the appellant in the present.appeal. During P.H. he has submitted that no DRC-01A has been issued. Taxes alongwith interest and 15% penalty under Section 74(5) has been paid. Only some part of interest not paid due to accluation error. Department has not informed at any ppint of time other that SCN. The difference in interest is also paid before issue of Order in Original. In view of above requested to allow appeal. Also submitted documents during P.H. showing averant details

### Discussion and Findings:

6. I have carefully gone through the facto of the case available on record and grounds of appeal in the Appeal Memorandum as well as the oral uturnisations maked by the appellant at the time of heating. The issues to be decided in the present appeal are whether the appellant is liable to pay penalty of Ra. 30.21.292/ (COST Ra. 10,10,464/- and SOST Ra. 10,10,646/-) in terms of Section 7410 the COST Act, 2017

-5-

## F.No.: GAPPL/ADC/GSTP/2874/2023-APPEAL

7(4). In the instant case, it is observed that the appellant had scaled ITC on the strength of the fake invoices generated by M/a. Ankur Trading. So they voluntarily agreed to pay the outstanding dues along-with interest and panelity as applicable. Accordingly, the appellant has paid up the amount of tax of Rs. 23,77,992/-, interest of Rs. 6,42,060/- and 15% penalty i.e. Rs. 3,66,700/- [15 % of tax amount of Rs. 23,77,992/-) vide DRC-03 before the issue of SCM dated 31.03.2023.

7(II). Further it is observed that the appellant has been issued DRC-01A on 25.03.2022 and also requested to conclude the proceedings initiated against them as they had deposited the samount of tax along with interest and penalty prior to issuance of show cause notice it. on 31.3.2022. In this regard I observe that as per provisions of sub-Section (5) and sub-Section (6) of Section 74 of the COST Act, 2017 provides as under:

(5) The person chargeable with tax may, before service of notice under subsection (1), pay the amount of tax along with interest payable under section. S0 and a penalty equivalent to fifteen per cent. of such tax on the basis of his own ascertainment of such tax or the tax as essectimated by the proper officer and inform the proper officer in writing of such payment."

The proper officer, on receipt of such information, shall not serve any notice we sub-section (1), in respect of the tax so paid or any penalty payable under provisions of this Act or the rules made thereunder.\*

In the instant case, it is observed that the appellant has paid Re.33,77992/- (as Tax) by 27.10.2020, Rs.6,42,060/-(as interest) on 30.03.2020 and R.3.56,700/- (as 15% penality) on 30.3.2020 whereas the appellant was required to pay total interest of Rs. 8,35,693/-, hence made abort payment of interest of Rs. 1,93,633/- (Rs. 8,35,693/-, minus Rs. 6,42,060/-). However it is observed that in the instant case the appellant had already made payment of tax, penalty and interest of Rs. 6,42,060/- before issue of SCN. The appellant has only made short payment of interest of Rs.1,93,633/- due to a simple calculation mistake and when they came to know the calculation mistake they had paid the difference amount before the issue of Order in Original.

5(i). In view of above it is observed that the appellant had pid the Tux vide DRC No. D12402200537890, dated 25.02.0200, DRC No. D1240620034956, dated 40.62.0200, DRC No. D12407200471968, dated 24.07.2020, DRC No. D12408200219111, dated 18.08.2020, DRC No. D1240920097048, dated 90.09.2020, DRC No. D1240920027879, dated 05.10.2020and DRC No. Dc21020462859, dated 27.10.2020 penalty vide

#### .7. F.No.: GAPPL/ADC/GSTP/2874/2023-APPEAL

DRC No. DI2403220310661, dated 30.03.2020 and interest (Rs.6,42,060/- out of Rs. 8,35,693/-) vide DRC No. DI2403220310661, dated 30.03.2020 before the issue of DRC-01A dated 25.03.2022 and Show Cause Notice dated 31.032022. This shows bonafide intention of the appellant and as submitted by appellant that they could not check the genuineness of the supplier but it's a routine business activity. The appellant has only made short payment of interest of Rs.1,93,633/- due to a calculation mistake and it came to notice of the appellant only after issue to Show Cause Notice and when they came to know the calculation mistake they had paid the difference amount of interest also vide DRC No. DC2407230481263 and DC2407230481263, dated 26.07.2023 before the issue of Order in Original dated 31.07.2023. In view of above the appellant is eligible for benefit of provisions of Section 74(5) of CGST Act, 2017.

In view of foregoing discussions, the impugned order passed by the 9. adjudicating authority is set aside and accordingly, I allow the appeal of the 'Appellant'.

अपीलकर्ता द्वारा दर्ज की गई अपील का निपटारा उपरोक्त तरीके से किया जाता है। The appeal filed by the appellant stands disposed of in above terms.

(Adesh Kumar Jain)

Joint Commissioner (Appeals) Date: 20.11.2023

Attested

(Sandheer Kumar) Superintendent (Appeals)

By R.P.A.D. M/s. Tarun Kumar Industries, Legal Name: Vinod Kumar Gokaldas Praiapati. Plot No. 132, Gozaria GIDC, Dist: Mehsana, Gujarat-382825

Copy to:

- The Principal Chief Commissioner of Central Tax, Ahmedabad Zone.
- The Commissioner, CGST & C. Ex., Appeals, Ahmedabad.
- The Commissioner, CGST & C. Ex., Gandhinagar Commissionerate. з.
- The Deputy/Asstt. Commssioner, CGST, Division- Mehsana, Gandhinagar 4. Commissionerate.

GST Appeals, Ahmedabad. The Superintendent (

- Guard File.
- P.A. File.





