

रजिस्टर्ड डाक ए.डी. द्वारा

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

क फाइल संख्या : File No : V2(29)68/Ahd-III/2016-17/Appeal-I

ख अपील आदेश संख्या : Order-In-Appeal No.: AHM-EXCUS-003-APP-029-17-18

दिनांक Date : 26.05.2017 जारी करने की तारीख Date of Issue

श्री उमाशंकर आयुक्त (अपील-I) द्वारा पारित

Passed by Shri Uma Shanker Commissioner (Appeals-I) Ahmedabad

ग _____ आयुक्त, केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क, अहमदाबाद-III आयुक्तालय द्वारा जारी
मूल आदेश सं _____ दिनांक : _____ से सृजित

Arising out of Order-in-Original: 462/Rebate/16-17 Date: 04.07.2016 Issued by:
Deputy Commissioner, Central Excise, Din: Kadi, A'bad-III.

ध अपीलकर्ता एवं प्रतिवादी का नाम एवं पता

Name & Address of the Appellant & Respondent

M/s. Gopinath Chem-tech Ltd.

कोई व्यक्ति इस अपील आदेश से असंतोष अनुभव करता है तो वह इस आदेश के प्रति यथास्थिति नीचे बताए गए सक्षम अधिकारी को अपील या पुनरीक्षण आवेदन प्रस्तुत कर सकता है।

Any person aggrieved by this Order-In-Appeal may file an appeal or revision application, as the one may be against such order, to the appropriate authority in the following way :

भारत सरकार का पुनरीक्षण आवेदन :

Revision application to Government of India :

(1) केन्द्रीय उत्पादन शुल्क अधिनियम, 1994 की धारा अंतर्गत नीचे बताए गए मामलों के बारे में पूर्वोक्त धारा को उप-धारा के प्रथम परन्तुक के अंतर्गत पुनरीक्षण आवेदन अवर सचिव, भारत सरकार, वित्त मंत्रालय, राजस्व विभाग, चौथी मंजिल, जीवन दीप भवन, संसद मार्ग, नई दिल्ली : 110001 को की जानी चाहिए।

(i) A revision application lies to the Under Secretary, to the Govt. of India, Revision Application Unit Ministry of Finance, Department of Revenue, 4th Floor, Jeevan Deep Building, Parliament Street, New Delhi - 110 001 under Section 35EE of the CEA 1944 in respect of the following case, governed by first proviso to sub-section (1) of Section-35 ibid :

(ii) यदि माल की हानि के मामले में जब ऐसी हानि कारखाने से किसी भण्डागार या अन्य कारखाने में या किसी भण्डागार से दूसरे भण्डागार में माल ले जाते हुए मार्ग में, या किसी भण्डागार या भण्डार में चाहे वह किसी कारखाने में या किसी भण्डागार में हो माल की प्रक्रिया के दौरान हुई हो।

(ii) In case of any loss of goods where the loss occur in transit from a factory to a warehouse or to another factory or from one warehouse to another during the course of processing of the goods in a warehouse or in storage whether in a factory or in a warehouse.

(ख) भारत के बाहर किसी राष्ट्र या प्रदेश में निर्यातित माल पर या माल के विनिर्माण में उपयोग शुल्क कच्चे माल पर उत्पादन शुल्क के रिबेट के मामलों में जो भारत के बाहर किसी राष्ट्र या प्रदेश में निर्यातित है।

(b) In case of rebate of duty of excise on goods exported to any country or territory outside India of an excisable material used in the manufacture of the goods which are exported to any country or territory outside India.

(ग) यदि शुल्क का भुगतान किए बिना भारत के बाहर (नेपाल या भूटान को) निर्यात किया गया माल हो।

(c) In case of goods exported outside India export to Nepal or Bhutan, without payment of duty.

ध अंतिम उत्पादन की उत्पादन शुल्क के भुगतान के लिए जो ड्यूटी क्रेडिट मान्य की गई है और ऐसे आदेश जो इस धारा एवं नियम के मुताबिक आयुक्त, अपील के द्वारा पारित वो समय पर या बाद में वित्त अधिनियम (नं.2) 1998 धारा 109 द्वारा नियुक्त किए गए हो।

(d) 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 and such order is passed by the Commissioner (Appeals) on or after, the date appointed under Sec.109 of the Finance (No.2) Act, 1998.

(1) केन्द्रीय उत्पादन शुल्क (अपील) नियमावली, 2001 के नियम 9 के अंतर्गत विनिर्दिष्ट प्रपत्र संख्या इए-8 में दो प्रतियों में, प्रेषित आदेश के प्रति आदेश प्रेषित दिनांक से तीन मास के भीतर मूल-आदेश एवं अपील आदेश की दो-दो प्रतियों के साथ उचित आवेदन किया जाना चाहिए। उसके साथ खाता इ. का मुख्यशीर्ष के अंतर्गत धारा 35-इ में निर्धारित फी के भुगतान के सबूत के साथ टीआर-6 चालान की प्रति भी होनी 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.

(2) रिविजन आवेदन के साथ जहाँ संलग्न रकम एक लाख रुपये या उससे कम हो तो रुपये 200/- फीस भुगतान की जाए और जहाँ संलग्न रकम एक लाख से ज्यादा हो तो 1000/- की फीस भुगतान की जाए।

The revision application shall be accompanied by a fee of Rs.200/- where the amount involved is Rupees One Lac or less and Rs.1,000/- where the amount involved is more than Rupees One Lac.

सीमा शुल्क, केन्द्रीय उत्पादन शुल्क एवं सेवाकर अपीलीय न्यायाधिकरण के प्रति अपील:-
Appeal to Custom, Excise, & Service Tax Appellate Tribunal.

(1) केन्द्रीय उत्पादन शुल्क अधिनियम, 1944 की धारा 35- ण0बी/35-इ के अंतर्गत:-


Under Section 35B/ 35E of CEA, 1944 an appeal lies to :-

(क) अपीलो के मामले में सीमा शुल्क, केन्द्रीय उत्पादन शुल्क एवं सेवाकर अपीलीय न्यायाधिकरण (सिस्टेट) की पश्चिम क्षेत्रीय पीठिका, अहमदाबाद में ओ-20, न्यू मेटल हास्पिटल कम्पाउण्ड, मेघाणी नगर, अहमदाबाद-380016.

(a) To the west regional bench of Customs, Excise & Service Tax Appellate Tribunal (CESTAT) at O-20, New Metal Hospital Compound, Meghani Nagar, Ahmedabad : 380 016.

(2) केन्द्रीय उत्पादन शुल्क (अपील) नियमावली, 2001 की धारा 6 के अंतर्गत प्रपत्र इए-3 में निर्धारित किए अनुसार अपीलीय न्यायाधिकरण की गई अपील के विरुद्ध अपील किए गए आदेश की चार प्रतियाँ सहित जहाँ उत्पाद शुल्क की मांग, ब्याज की मांग और लगाया गया जुर्माना रुपए 5 लाख या उससे कम है वहाँ रुपए 1000/- फीस भेजनी होगी। जहाँ उत्पाद शुल्क की मांग, ब्याज की मांग और लगाया गया जुर्माना रुपए 5 लाख या 50 लाख तक हो तो रुपए 5000/- फीस भेजनी होगी। जहाँ उत्पाद शुल्क की मांग, ब्याज की मांग और लगाया गया जुर्माना रुपए 50 लाख या उससे ज्यादा है वहाँ रुपए 10000/- फीस भेजनी होगी। की फीस सहायक रजिस्टार के नाम से रेखांकित बैंक ड्राफ्ट के रूप में संबंध की जाये। यह ड्राफ्ट उस स्थान के किसी नामित सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र के बैंक की शाखा का हो

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.5,000/- and Rs.10,000/- where amount of duty / penalty / demand / 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 Asstt. Registrar of a branch of any nominate public sector bank of the place where the bench of any nominate public sector bank of the place where the bench of the Tribunal is situated



(3) यदि इस आदेश में कई मूल आदेशों का समावेश होता है तो प्रत्येक मूल आदेश के लिए फीस का भुगतान उपर्युक्त ढंग से किया जाना चाहिए इस तथ्य के होते हुए भी कि लिखा पढ़ी कार्य से बचने के लिए यथास्थिति अपीलीय न्यायाधिकरण को एक अपील या केन्द्रीय सरकार को एक आवेदन किया जाता है।

In case of the order covers a number 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 lacs fee of Rs.100/- for each.

(4) न्यायालय शुल्क अधिनियम 1970 यथा संशोधित की अनुसूची-1 के अंतर्गत निर्धारित किए अनुसार उक्त आवेदन या मूल आदेश यथास्थिति निर्णयन प्राधिकारी के आदेश में से प्रत्येक की एक प्रति पर रु.6.50 पैसे का न्यायालय शुल्क टिकट लगा होना चाहिए।

One copy of application or O.I.O. as the case may be, and the order of the adjournment authority shall bear a court fee stamp of Rs.6.50 paise as prescribed under scheduled-I item of the court fee Act, 1975 as amended.

(5) इन ओर संबंधित मामलों को नियंत्रण करने वाले नियमों की ओर भी ध्यान आकर्षित किया जाता है जो सीमा शुल्क, केन्द्रीय उत्पादन शुल्क एवं सेवाकर अपीलीय न्यायाधिकरण (कार्याविधि) नियम, 1982 में निहित है।

Attention is invited to the rules covering these and other related matter contended in the Customs, Excise & Service Tax Appellate Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 1982.

(6) सीमा शुल्क, केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क एवं सेवाकर अपीलीय प्राधिकरण (सीस्टेट) के प्रति अपीलों के मामलों में केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क अधिनियम, 1984 की धारा 34 के अंतर्गत वित्तीय(संख्या-2) अधिनियम 2014(2014 की संख्या 25) दिनांक: 06.08.2014 जो की वित्तीय अधिनियम, 1994 की धारा 83 के अंतर्गत 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 होंगे।


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:

- (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.

(6)(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।

(6)(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."



ORDER-IN-APPEAL

M/s Gopinath Chem Tech Limited, 470, Kunda, Ta-Kadi, Dist. Mehsana, (hereinafter referred to "the appellant") has filed this appeal against Order-in-Original No.462/Rebate/16-17 dated 04.07.2016 (hereinafter referred to as "the impugned order") passed by the Deputy Commissioner, Central Excise, Kadi Division, Ahmedabad-III, (hereinafter referred to as "the adjudicating authority").


2. The appellant had filed a rebate claim for Rs.3,01,622/- under Rule 18 of Central Excise Rules, 2002 (for short -CER) read with notification No.19/2004-CE (NT) dated 06.09.2004, on 05.04.2016. On scrutiny, it was noticed that the said claim was filed after expiry of one year from the date of export dated 25.09.2014. Therefore, a show cause notice dated 04.05.2016 was issued to the appellant for rejecting the said claim as time barred under the provisions of Section 11 B of Central Excise Act, 1944 (for short-CEA) which was later on rejected vide the impugned order.

3. Being aggrieved, the appellant has filed the present appeal on the grounds that the final assessment of shipping bill was considered by the customs authority on 22.03.2016 and on receipt of the same they had filed the claim on 05.04.2016; that without all documents, filing of rebate claim cannot be allowed under the notification ibid; that the due to non receipt of test report of the goods, the department has not processed the assessment; that in the circumstances, there is no question of rejecting the rebate as time barred as the delay was on the part of the department.

4. Personal hearing in the matter was held on 19.04.2017 and Shri Raj K Vyas. Advocate appeared for the same. He reiterated the grounds of appeal.

5. I have gone through the facts of the case and submissions made in the appeal memorandum as well as during personal hearing. In the instant case, I observe that the appellant has removed the goods vide ARE-1 No. 99/31.08.2014 which was exported on 25.09.2014 under Rule 18 of CER and filed rebate claim on 05.04.2016. The adjudicating authority has rejected the rebate claim as time barred, in terms of provisions of Section 11B of CEA. While rejecting the claim as time barred, the adjudicating authority has relied on CBEC's supplementary instructions (para 2.4 of chapter 9).

6. Section 11B stipulates that any person claiming refund of any duty of excise and interest may make an application for refund to the Assistant/Deputy Commissioner of Central Excise of Central Excise before expiry of one year from the relevant date in such form and manner as may be prescribed and that application shall be accompanied by such documentary or other evidence establishing, inter alia, the duty paid character of the goods. Explanation (A) to Section 11B specifically provides that the expression 'refund' includes rebate of duty of excise on excisable goods exported out of India or on excisable materials used in the manufacture of goods which are exported out of India. Since the statutory provision for refund in Section 11B brings within its purview, a rebate of excise duty on goods exported out of India or materials used in the manufacture of such goods.



Rule 18 cannot be read independent of the requirement of limitation prescribed in Section

11B. Explanation (B) defines the expression 'relevant date which is as under:


- (a) *in the case of goods exported out of India where a refund of excise duty paid is available in respect of the goods themselves or, as the case may be, the excisable materials used in the manufacture of such goods, -*
- (i) *if the goods are exported by sea or air, the date on which the ship or the aircraft in which such goods are loaded, leaves India, or*
- (ii) *if the goods are exported by land, the date on which such goods pass the frontier, or*
- (iii) *if the goods are exported by post, the date of despatch of goods by the Post Office concerned to a place outside India*

7. Further, in paragraph 2.4 (chapter 9) of CBEC's supplementary instructions states that "in case any document is not available for which the Central Excise or Customs Department is solely accountable, the claim be received so that the claimant is not hit by limitation". The intention of the CBEC's instruction appears to be that an assessee can submit their claim before the authority within the stipulated time which cannot be ignored by the authority.

8. In the instant case, I observe that the appellant has failed to take appropriate care to comply with the laid down statutory time limit. The undisputed facts indicate that the said claim was not filed within the statutorily prescribed time period. The appellant submits that the delay was due to delay on part of concerned departmental authority in handing over assessed shipping bill; that the said document was released by the Customs authority only on 22.03.2016 and since the rebate claim is required to be filed with all documents, they could not file the same but filed on 05.04.2016. This contention is not acceptable as per provisions of Section 11 B of CEA and CBEC's instruction as discussed above.

9. I further observe that GOI's decision in the case of M/s Vee Excel Drugs & Pharma Pvt Ltd [2012 (283) ELT 305] has upheld that *the rebate claim is required to be filed within one year of the relevant date as stipulated in Section 11B and there is no provision under Section 11 B to condone any delay*. The GCI, while pronouncing the said decision, relied on the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Collector Land Acquisition Anantnag & others V Mst.Kaji & Others [1987 (28) ELT 183] and UOI v Kirloskar Pneumatics Company [1996 (84) ELT 401]. The judgment in the case of Collector Land Acquisition Anantnag & others V Mst.Kaji & others has been held that *the delay is to be condoned when it is within the limit of the statute and when there is no such condonable limit prescribed in the statute, then there is no discretion to any authority to extend the time*. The judgment in the case of UOI v Kirloskar Pneumatics Company reads as under:

"10..... Yet the question is whether items permissible for the High Court to direct the authorities under the Act to act contrary to the aforesaid statutory provision. We do not think it is, even while acting under Article 226 of the Constitution. The power conferred by Article 226/227 is designed to effectuate the law, to enforce the Rule of law and to ensure that the several authorities and organs of the State act in accordance with law. It




cannot be invoked for directing the authorities to act contrary to law. In particular, the Customs authorities, who are the creatures of the Customs Act, cannot be directed to ignore or act contrary to Section 27, whether before or after amendment. May be the High Court or a Civil Court is not bound by the said provisions but the authorities under the Act are. Nor can there be any question of the High Court clothing the authorities with its power under Article 226 or the power of a civil court. No such delegation or conferment can ever be conceived. We are, therefore, of the opinion that the direction contained in clause (3) of the impugned order is unsustainable in law. When we expressed this view during the hearing Mr. Hidayatullah requested that in such a case the matter be remitted to the High Court and the High Court be left free to dispose of the writ petition according to law."

10. I further rely on Hon'ble High Court of Gujarat's decision in case of M/s Indian Oil Corporation Ltd [2016 (342) ELT 48-Guj], wherein it has been held that limitation for filing refund claim is not mere procedural requirement. In this regard, the Hon'ble court held that Section 11 B of the CEA is clear and there is no indication in it that limitation period of one year could be extended on sufficient cause being show.

11. In view of above discussion and following the decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case of UOI v Kirloskar Pneumatics Company supra and decision of GOI. I am bound to uphold that the rebate claim in question hits by limitation of time bar. In the circumstances, the appeal filed by the appellant is rejected.

11. 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.




(उमा शंकर)

आयुक्त (अपील्स - I)

Date: 24/05/2017

Attested


(Mohan V.V)
Superintendent (Appeal-I)
Central Excise, Ahmedabad

BY R.P.A.D.

To,
M/s Gopinath Chem Tech Limited,
470, Kundal, Ta-Kadi, Dist. Mehsana,



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 - III
4. The Dy./Asstt. Commissioner, Central Excise, Division -Kadi, Ahmedabad-III
5. Guard file
6. P. A. file.