
 सत्यमेव जयते	केंद्रीय कर आयुक्त (अपील) O/O THE COMMISSIONER (APPEALS), CENTRAL TAX, वस्तु एवं सेवा GST Building, 7 th Floor, कर भवन Near Polytechnic सातवीं मंजिल पॉलिटेक्निक के पास Ambavadi, Ahmedabad- आम्बावाडी, अहमदाबाद-380015 380015	 टेलीफैक्स : 079-26305136
	079-26305065	

9144709148

क फाइल संख्या : File No : **V2/14/RA/GNR/2018-19**

ख अपील आदेश संख्या : Order-In-Appeal No.: **AHM-EXCUS-003-APP-173-18-19**

दिनांक Date : **16-01-2019** जारी करने की तारीख Date of Issue:

25/1/2019

श्री उमाशंकर आयुक्त (अपील) द्वारा पारित

Passed by **Shri Uma Shanker** Commissioner (Appeals) Ahmedabad

G. Jile

ग अपर आयुक्त, केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क, अहमदाबाद-III आयुक्तालय द्वारा जारी मूल आदेश :
160/Ref/S.Tax/AC/2017-18 दिनांक : **20-02-2018** से सृजित

Arising out of Order-in-Original: **160/Ref/S.Tax/AC/2017-18**, Date: **20-02-2018** Issued by:
 Assistant Commissioner, CGST, Div: Mehsana, Gandhinagar Commissionerate,
 Ahmedabad.

घ अपीलकर्ता एवं प्रतिवादी का नाम एवं पता

Name & Address of the **Appellant** & Respondent

M/s. Vinod H Patel

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।

I. Any person aggrieved by this Order-In-Appeal issued under the Central Excise Act 1944, 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 on 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- ए0बी/35-इ के अंतर्गत:-

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

उक्तलिखित परिच्छेद 2 (1) क में बताए अनुसार के अलावा की अपील, अपीलो के मामले में सीमा शुल्क, केन्द्रीय उत्पादन शुल्क एवं सेवाकर अपीलीय न्यायाधिकरण (सिस्टेट) की पश्चिम क्षेत्रीय पीठिका, अहमदाबाद में दूसरा मंजिल, बहूमाली भवन, असारवा, अहमदाबाद, गुजरात 380016

To the west regional bench of Customs, Excise & Service Tax Appellate Tribunal (CESTAT) at 2nd floor, Bahumali Bhavan, Asarwa, Ahmedabad-380016 in case of appeals other than as mentioned in para-2(i) (a) above.

(2) केन्द्रीय उत्पादन शुल्क (अपील) नियमावली, 2001 की धारा 6 के अंतर्गत प्रपत्र इ.ए-3 में निर्धारित किए अनुसार अपीलीय न्यायाधिकरणों 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 रूपए 5 लाख या उससे कम है वहां रूपए 1000/- फीस भेजनी होगी। जहाँ उत्पाद शुल्क की मांग, ब्याज की मांग और लगाया गया जुर्माना रूपए 5 लाख या 50 लाख तक हो तो रूपए 5000/- फीस भेजनी होगी। जहाँ उत्पाद शुल्क की मांग, ब्याज की मांग और लगाया गया जुर्माना रूपए 50 लाख या उससे ज्यादा है वहां रूपए 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 पढी 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 (सीस्तेत) के प्रति अपीलों के मामलों में केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क अधिनियम, 1984 की धारा 34फ के अंतर्गत वित्तीय(संख्या-2) अधिनियम 2014(2014 की संख्या 24) दिनांक: 06.08.2014 जो की वित्तीय अधिनियम, 1994 की धारा 23 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 हैं

- (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 होगा।

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."

II. Any person aggrieved by an Order-in-Appeal issued under the Central Goods and Services Tax Act, 2017/Integrated Goods and Services Tax Act, 2017/Goods and Services Tax (Compensation to States) Act, 2017, may file an appeal before the appropriate authority.

ORDER IN APPEAL

The Assistant Commissioner, Central G.S.T., Division Mehsana, Commissionerate Gandhinagar (*hereinafter referred to as 'appellant'*) has filed the present appeal against the Order-in-Original number 160/REF/S.TAX/AC/2017-18 dated 20.02.2018 (*hereinafter referred to as 'impugned order'*) passed in the matter of refund claim filed by M/s. Vinod H Patel, registered at Perfect Plaza, F-21, Radhanpur Cross Road, Mehsana (*hereinafter referred to as 'respondent'*).

2. The facts of the case, in brief, are that the respondent was engaged in providing services under the category of 'Construction Services' and 'Works Contract Service' and held Service Tax registration number ABHPP5552ESD001. The respondent had filed a refund claim of ₹ 17,27,306/- on 07.03.2017 under Section 102 of the Finance Act, 2016 read with the Finance Act, 1994 and rules made there under, before the Assistant Commissioner, CGST, Div- Mehsana (*hereinafter referred to as 'adjudicating authority'*). During scrutiny of the claim, it was noticed that a part of the claim was time barred. Thus, the adjudicating authority, vide the impugned order, rejected the amount of ₹ 14,75,137/-, being time barred and sanctioned rest of the refund amount of ₹ 2,52,169/-.

3. The impugned order was reviewed by the Commissioner of Central Goods & Service Tax, Ahmedabad and issued Review Order No. 03/2018-19 dated 31.05.2018 for filing an appeal under section 84(1) of the Finance Act, 1994 on the ground that the adjudicating authority has wrongly sanctioned adjusted refund amount of ₹ 2,52,169/- under Section 102 of the Finance Act, 2016 as the adjudicating authority did not examine the aspect of unjust enrichment.

4. Personal hearing in the case was granted to the respondent on 23.07.2018, 28.08.2018, 10.10.2018 and 19.11.2018 but no one, on behalf of the respondent appeared before me nor was any letter, for adjournment of personal hearing, submitted to me.

5. I have carefully gone through the facts of the case on records and grounds of appeal in the Appeal Memorandums. I find that the respondent has been granted enough chance of personal hearing for representing their case before me. However, as they failed to avail the benefit of personal hearing, I hereby, take up the matter *ex parte*, purely on the basis of merit and available documents.

6. On going through the appeal memorandum, I find that the appellant has alleged that the adjudicating authority has not examined the aspect of unjust enrichment while deciding the refund claim. Refund mechanism is based on the basic principle of unjust enrichment. This principle ensures eradication of claim of same benefit more than once. Hon'ble Supreme Court in the judgment of Union of India Vs. Solar Pesticides Pvt. Ltd. held that the refund sanctioning authority has to satisfy himself that the amount of duty claimed as refund has neither been included in the cost nor the cenvat credit has been claimed. The doctrine of unjust enrichment is applicable for purpose of grant of refund. The assessee having passed on the incidence of duty/tax to his customers has no *locus standii* to claim refund of duty having wrongly paid. However, going through paragraph 9.7 of the impugned order, I find that the adjudicating authority has verified the issue of unjust enrichment before sanctioning the claim. I produce below the observation of the adjudicating authority, verbatim, as mentioned in the said paragraph;

"9.7 Further, as far as the principle of the doctrine of unjust enrichment concerned, I have found that this office had also written letter to service receiver i.e. Gujarat Council of Elementary Education, Sarva Siksha Abhiyan Mission (SSAM), Gandhinagar on 14.11.2017 and 08.12.2017 requested to inform whether the said service provider has charged any service tax to them or not. Further, The State project Office, Sarva Siksha Abhiyan, Gujarat Council of Elementary Education, Gandhinagar vide letter no SSAM/2017/Acct./2017/48983 dated 21.12.2017 has informed that they have not paid any service tax to the said assessee. Hence, it is clear that the said claimant has paid the service tax from his own pocket and burden of service tax has not been passed to others. Thus, the said refund does not hit the bar of unjust enrichment."

Going through the observation, mentioned in the pre page, it is quite clear the adjudicating authority had verified the aspect of unjust enrichment and after being satisfied that the burden of tax was not passed on by the respondent to the service receiver, the former had sanctioned the claim. I have failed to understand as to how the appellant has presumed that the respondent has failed to clear the hurdle of unjust enrichment, when the service receiver (which is an undertaking of the Education Department of the Government of Gujarat) has confirmed the fact, vide letter number SSAM/2017/Acct./2017/48983 dated 21.12.2017, that the respondent has not passed the burden of tax on them. The allegation of the appellant is not based on any confirmed fact but on pure assumption and presumption which has no relevance under the eye of law. Any allegation, on the part of the appellant, must accompany valid and legal supporting evidence. Mere allegation that the adjudicating authority has failed to verify the aspect of

unjust enrichment, does not suffice the basic purpose as the appellant could not prove any documentary evidence to negate the confirmation of M/s. Gujarat Council of Elementary Education, Gandhinagar.

7. Therefore, as per the discussion held above, I do not find any reason to interfere with the impugned order and accordingly, I up held the impugned order passed by the adjudicating authority and reject the appeal filed by the appellant.

8. अपीलकर्ता द्वारा दर्ज की गई अपील का निपटारा उपरोक्त तरीके से किया जाता है।

8. The appeal filed by the appellant stands disposed off in above terms.

उमा शंकर

(उमा शंकर)

CENTRAL TAX (Appeals),
AHMEDABAD.

ATTESTED

S. DUTTA
(S. DUTTA) 250119

SUPERINTENDENT,
CENTRAL TAX (APPEALS), AHMEDABAD.

To,
M/s. M/s. Vinod H Patel,
Perfect Plaza, F-21,
Radhanpur Cross Road,
Mehsana

Copy to:

- 1) The Chief Commissioner, Central Tax, Ahmedabad Zone.
- 2) The Commissioner, Central Tax, Gandhinagar.
- 3) The Asst. Commissioner, Central Tax, Division-Mehsana, Gandhinagar.
- 4) The Asst. Commissioner (System), Central Tax, Gandhinagar.
- 5) Guard File.
- 6) P.A. File.