रजिस्टर्ड डाक ए.डी. द्वारा

: आयुक्त (अपील-।) का कार्यालय केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क : सैन्टल एक्साइज भवन, सातवीं मंजिल, पौलिटैक्नीक के पास, आंबावाडी, अहमदाबाद- 380015.

2037 to 3041 फाइल संख्या : File No : V2(BAS)58/STC-III/2015-16/Appeal-J क

अपील आदेश संख्या : Order-In-Appeal No.: AHM-EXCUS-003-APP-156-16-17 ख दिनाँक Date 18.11.2016 जारी करने की तारीख Date of Issue

श्री उमाशंकर , आयुक्त (अपील-1) केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क अहमदाबाद द्वारा पारित

Passed by Shri Uma Shankar Commissioner (Appeals-I) Central Excise Ahmedabad

आयुक्त केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क, अहमदाबाद-!!! आयुक्तालय द्वारा जारी मूल आदेश सं ग से सृजित दिनाँक :

Arising out of Order-in-Original No GNR-STX-DEM-DC-57/2015 dated :29.12.2015 Issued by: Deputy Commissioner, Central Excise, Din: Gandhinagar, A'bad-III.

अपीलकर्ता / प्रतिवादी का नाम एवं पता Name & Address of The Appellants/Respondents ध

M/s. Optus Laminates Pvt. Ltd. (Formerly known as Touch laminates Pvt. Ltd.

इस अपील आदेश से असंतुष्ट कोई भी व्यक्ति उचित प्राधिकारी को अपील निम्नलिखित प्रकार से कर सकता 常:--

Any person aggrieved by this Order-in-Appeal may file an appeal to the appropriate authority in the-following way :-

सीमा शुल्क, उत्पाद शुल्क एवं सेवाकर अपीलीय न्यायाधिकरण को अपीलः--Appeal to Customs Central Excise And Service Tax Appellate Tribunal :-

वित्तीय अधिनियम, 1994 की धारा 86 के अंतर्गत अपील को निम्न के पास की जा सकती:--Under Section 86 of the Finance Act 1994 an appeal lies to :- .

पश्चिम क्षेत्रीय पीठ सीमा शुल्क, उत्पाद शुल्क एवं सेवाकर अपीलीय न्यायाधिकरण ओ.२०, न्यू मैन्टल हास्पिटल कम्पाउण्ड, मेधाणी नगर, अहमदाबाद-380016

The West Regional Bench of Customs, Excise, Service Tax Appellate Tribunal (CESTAT) at O-20, Meghani Nagar, New Mental Hospital Compound, Ahmedabad - 380 016.

अधिनियम, 1994 की धारा 86 (1) के अंतर्गत वित्तीय न्यायाधिकरण को अपीलीय (ii) सेवाकर नियमावली, 1994 के नियम 9(1)के अंतर्गत निर्धारित फार्म एस.टी– 5 में चार प्रतियों अपील में की जा सकेगी एवं उसके साथ जिस आदेश के विरूद्ध अपील की गई हो उसकी प्रतियाँ भेजी जानी चाहिए (उनमें से एक प्रमाणित प्रति होगी) और साथ में जिस स्थान में न्यायाधिकरण का न्यायपीठ स्थित है, वहाँ के नामित सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र बैंक के न्यायपीठ के सहायक रजिस्ट्रार के नाम से रेखांकित बैंक ड्राफ्ट के रूप में जहाँ सेवाकर की मांग, ब्याज की मांग ओर लगाया गया जुर्माना रूपए 5 लाख या उससे कम है वहां रूपए 1000/– फीस भेजनी होगी। जहाँ सेवाकर की मांग, ब्याज की मांग ओर लगाया गया जुर्माना रूपए 5 लाख या 50 लाख तक हो तो रूपए 5000/- फीस भेजनी होगी। जहाँ सेवाकर की मांग, ब्याज की मांग ओर लगाया गया जुर्माना रूपए 50 लाख या उससे ज्यादा है वहां रूपए 10000/- फीस भेजनी होगी।

The appeal under sub section (1) of Section 86 of the Finance Act 1994 to the Appellate (ii) 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 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.



(iii) वित्तीय अधिनियम,1994 की धारा 86 की उप–धारा (2ए) के अंतर्गत अपील सेवाकर नियमावली, 1994 के नियम 9 (2ए) के अंतर्गत निर्धारित फार्म एस.टी.7 में की जा सकेगी एवं उसके साथ आयुक्त, केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क / आयुक्त, केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क (अपील) के आदेश की प्रतियाँ (उसमें से प्रमाणित प्रति होगी) और आयुक्त, / सहायक आयुक्त अथवा उप आयुक्त, केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क, अपीलीय न्यायाधिकरण को आवेदन करने के निदेश देते हुए सीमा एवं केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क बोर्ड / आयुक्त, केन्द्रीय उत्पाद केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क, अपीलीय न्यायाधिकरण को आवेदन करने के निदेश देते हुए सीमा एवं केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क बोर्ड / आयुक्त, केन्द्रीय उत्पाद केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क, अपीलीय न्यायाधिकरण को आवेदन करने के निदेश देते हुए सीमा एवं केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क बोर्ड / आयुक्त, केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क द्वारा पारित आदेश की प्रति भेजनी होगी।

(iii) The appeal under sub section and (2A) of the section 86 the Finance Act 1994, shall be filed in For ST.7 as prescribed under Rule 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 Central Board of Excise & Customs / Commissioner or Dy. Commissioner of Central Excise to apply to the Appellate Tribunal.

2. यथासंशोधित न्यायालय शुल्क अधिनियम, 1975 की शर्तो पर अनुसूची–1 के अंतर्गत निर्धारित किए अनुसार मूल आदेश एवं स्थगन प्राधिकारी के आदेश की प्रति पर रू 6.50/– पैसे का न्यायालय शुल्क टिकट लगा होना चाहिए।

2. One copy of application or O.I.O. as the case may be, and the order of the adjuration authority shall bear a court fee stamp of Rs.6.50 paise as prescribed under Schedule-I in terms of the Court Fee Act, 1975, as amended.

3. सीमा शुल्क, उत्पाद शुल्क एवं सेवाकर अपीलीय न्यायाधिकरण (कार्यविधि) नियमावली, 1982 में चर्चित एवं अन्य संबंधित मामलों को सम्मिलित करने वाले नियमों की ओर भी ध्यान आकर्षित किया जाता है।

3. 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.

4. सीमा शुल्क, केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क एवं सेवाकर अपीलीय प्राधिकरण (सीस्तेत) के प्रति अपीलों के मामलों में केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क अधिनियम, १९४४ की धारा ३७फ के अंतर्गत वित्तीय(संख्या-२) अधिनियम २०१४(२०१४ की संख्या २७) दिनांक: ०६.०८.२०१४ जो की वित्तीय अधिनियम, १९९४ की धारा ८३ के अतर्गत सेवाकर को भी लागू की गई है, द्वारा निश्चित की गई पूर्व-राशि जमा करना अनिवार्य है, बशर्ते कि इस धारा के अंतर्गत जमा की जाने वाली अपेक्षित देय राशि दस करोड़ रूपए से अधिक न हो केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क एवं सेवाकर के अंतर्गत " माँग किए गए शुल्क " में निम्न शामिल है

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

--- आगे बशर्ते यह कि इस धारा के प्रावधान वित्तीय (सं. 2) अधिनियम, 2014 के आरम्भ से पूर्व किसी अपीलीय प्राधिकारी के समक्ष विचाराधीन स्थगन अर्ज़ी एवं अपील को लागू नहीं होगे।

4. For an appeal to be filed before the CESTAT, it is mandatory to pre-deposit an amount specified under the Finance (No. 2) Act, 2014 (No. 25 of 2014) dated 06.08.2014, 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 provided the amount of pre-deposit payable would be subject to ceiling of Rs. Ten Crores,

Under Central Excise and Service Tax, "Duty demanded" shall include:

- amount determined under Section 11 D;
- (ii) amount of erroneous Cenvat Credit taken;
- (iii) amount payable under Rule 6 of the Cenvat Credit Rules.

 \rightarrow 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.

(4)(i) ...इस आदेश के प्रति अपील प्राधिकरण के समक्ष जहाँ शुल्क अथवा शुल्क या दण्ड विवादित हो तो माँग किए गए शुल्क के

10% भुगतान पर और जहाँ केवल दण्ड विवादित हो तब दण्ड के 10% भुगतान पर की जा सकती है।

(4)(i) In view of above, 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."



F No.V2(BAS)58/ST^C-III/15-16

ORDER-IN-APPEAL

This appeal has been filed by M/S Optus Laminates Pvt Ltd (formerly-M/s Touch Laminates Pvt Ltd), Sonasan, Opp. Ceramic Zone, Himatnagar (hereinafter referred to as "the appellant") against Order-in-Original No.GNR-STX-DEM-DC-57/2015 dated 29.12.2015 (hereinafter referred to as "the impugned order) passed by the Deputy Commissioner of Service Tax Division, Gandhinagar (hereinafter referred to as "the adjudicating authority).

2. Briefly stated, the facts are that based on the audit objection, a show cause notice dated 14.05.2015 was issued to the appellant for demanding service tax amounting to Rs.1,36,392/-, on insurance premium received from their customer for facilitating the insurance benefit to the goods sold, under service category of "Support services of Business or Commerce". The adjudicating authority, vide the impugned order has confirmed the demand with interest and imposed penalty under Section 78, 77(1)(a), 77(1)(b), 77(1)(e), 77(2) of the Finance Act, 1994 and Rule 7C of Service Tax Rule, 1994.

3. Being aggrieved, the appellant has filed by the present appeal on the grounds that in the instant case they had recovered insurance charges incurred by them on the goods supplied to their customers; that they had obtained transit insurance policy for all the goods manufactured by them for the entire year; that in such activity, the question of providing any service to any other party does not arise. None of the activities mentioned in the definition of "Support service of business or commerce" has been carried by the appellant; that the amount of transit insurance recovered by them is directly related to the goods manufactured and hence not termed as service; that they have not charged any amount as consideration from their customer, other than the premium of transit insurance; that even otherwise, as per CBEC's circular No.120(a)/2/2010-ST dated 16.04.2010, reinsurance commission is not liable to service tax. No penalty is imposable in the matter as the demand is not sustainable.

4. A personal hearing in the matter was held on 19.10.2016. Shri M.H.Raval, Consultant appeared for the same on behalf of the appellant and reiterated the grounds of appeal.

5. I have carefully gone through the facts of the case and submissions made by the appellant in the appeal as well as at the time of personal hearing. In the instant case, the short point to be decided is as to whether the transit insurance charges obtained from their customers by the appellant is merit consideration for charging service tax under the category of "Support service of Business or Commerce" or otherwise.

6. At the outset, I observe that the appellant has recovered insurance charges from their customers at a rate/percentage equal to the rate of insurance premium paid by them to the insurance company for covering any damage/accident to goods before handing over and such insurance charges are collected on gross value of the goods in the invoice.



The adjudicating authority has confirmed the demand of service tax on the ground that the appellant has extended services to their customers, by collecting insurance charges against any loss or damage to manufactured goods during transportation; that the said service has been extended for the goods cleared from their factory gate i.e after transferring the ownership of the goods and such service covers under the category of "Support service of Business or Commerce".

4

7. In the impugned order, the adjudicating authority has held that the insurance charges collected by the appellant is nothing but an amount received for facilitating the insurance benefit and it was collected for providing "support service of business or commerce", hence taxable under Section 65(105)(zzzq) of the Finance Act, 1994 (FA) as per definition of the said service defined under Section 65(104 c) of the FA.

8. The definition of "Support of service of Business or Commerce", vide the section *ibid* is as under:

"Support services of business or commerce" means services provided in relation to business or commerce and includes evaluation of prospective customers, telemarketing, processing of purchase orders and fulfillment services, information and tracking of delivery schedules, managing distribution and logistics, customer relationship management services, accounting and processing of transactions, Operational or administrative assistance in any manner], formulation of customer service and pricing policies, infrastructural support services and other transaction processing."

As per definition under Section 65 (105) (zzzq) of FA, service to any person, by any other person, in relation to support services of business or commerce, in any manner is taxable. From the above definition, the essential requirement for taxability appears that the transaction should be amount to a service and the service should be in relation to support services of business or commerce.

In the instant case, I observe that the appellant takes insurance for the goods to be 9. delivered to their customers and recovering insurance charges incurred for the said goods in transit to the customer's destination. Taking insurance for their manufactured goods while in transit is a measure adopted by a manufacturer, either as per agreement or not, to ensure the safety of the goods. In para 23.4 of the impugned order, the adjudicating authority has stated that the buyer has cast the responsibility of benefit of insurance of goods so that the goods reach the buyer's destination under insurance coverage and if any damage/loss to goods occurs, the assessee pay to the buyers after recovering insurance claim from the insurance company. In the circumstances, the question arises as to whom the appellant support for business? Taking transit insurance for the goods cleared to the buyer's premises by the appellant cannot say that they support buyers business. As stated above, it is a safety measures taken by the appellant during transit. Such safety measures can also be taken themselves by the buyers instead of by the appellant. Thus, as stated by the adjudicating authority, the buyers cast their responsibility on the appellant and paid the actual insurance incurred appears for not providing any service, but for a safety measure of the goods. Further, from the fact of the case, I observe that the appellant had not received any consideration for extending such facility; that they had recovered the

F No.V2(BAS)58/ST^C-III/15-16

actual insurance charges what they have paid. Further, the adjudicating authority has also not mentioned in the impugned order that the appellant had recovered extra amount other than the insurance premium. In such situation, I do not find any service and any consideration in such activity. As per Section 65 B (44) of FA, "service" means any activity carried out by a person for another for consideration and includes a declared service. Recovery of transit insurance charges incurred by the appellant does not tantamount to provisions of any service to their customers.

10. In view of above discussion, I do not find any merit in demanding service tax on transit insurance charges recovered by the appellant from their buyers and the same is not sustainable. Since the demand is not sustainable, the penalty imposed is also not sustainable.

11. In view of above I set aside the impugned order and allow the appeal filed by the appellant. अपीलकर्ता द्वारा दर्ज की गई अपीलो का निपटारा उपरोक्त तरीके से किया जाता है। The appeal filed by the appellant stand disposed of in above terms.

VIIZim

(उमा शंकर) आयुक्त (अपील्स - I) • Date: [**g**/11/2016

<u>Attested</u>

(Mohanan

Superintendent (Appeal-I) Central Excise, Ahmedabad

<u>BY R.P.A.D.</u> To, M/s Optus Laminates Pvt Ltd (formerly-M/s Touch Laminates Pvt Ltd), Sonasan, Opp. Ceramic Zone, Himatnagar

Copy to:

1. The Chief Commissioner of Central Excise Zone, Ahmedabad.

2. The Commissioner of Central Excise, Ahmedabad-III.

3. The Additional Commissioner, (Systems) Central Excise, Ahmedabad -II I

4. The Dy./Asstt. Commissioner, Central Excise, Division Gandhinagar

5. Guard file

6. P. A. file.


