



सत्यमेव जयते

आयुक्त का कार्यालय
Office of the Commissioner
केंद्रीय जीएसटी, अपील अहमदाबाद आयुक्तालय
Central GST, Appeals Ahmedabad Commissionerate
जीएसटी भवन, राजस्व मार्ग, अम्बावाड़ी, अहमदाबाद-380015
GST Bhavan, Ambawadi, Ahmedabad-380015
Phone: 079-26305065 - Fax: 079-26305136
E-Mail : commrappl1-cexamd@nic.in
Website : www.cgstappealahmedabad.gov.in



आज़ादी का
अमृत महोत्सव

By SPEED POST

DIN:- 20230364SW000016431B

(क)	फ़ाइल संख्या / File No.	GAPPL/COM/STP/2357/2022-APPEAL / 9956-60
(ख)	अपील आदेश संख्या और दिनांक / Order-In-Appeal No. and Date	AHM-EXCUS-003-APP-151/2022-23 and 24.03.2023
(ग)	पारित किया गया / Passed By	श्री अखिलेश कुमार, आयुक्त (अपील) Shri Akhilesh Kumar, Commissioner (Appeals)
(घ)	जारी करने की दिनांक / Date of issue	29.03.2023
(ङ)	Arising out of Order-In-Original No. 177/AC/DEM/MEH/ST/Ajit Builders/2021-22 dated 19.05.2022 passed by the Assistant Commissioner, CGST, Division-Mehsana, Gandhinagar Commissionerate	
(च)	अपीलकर्ता का नाम और पता / Name and Address of the Appellant	M/s Ajit Builders, 17, Samarpan Shopping Centre, Highway Road, Mehsana, Gujarat

कोई व्यक्ति इस अपील-आदेश से असंतोश अनुभव करता है तो वह इस आदेश के प्रति यथास्थिति नीचे बताए गए सक्षम अधिकारी को अपील अथवा पुनरीक्षण आवेदन प्रस्तुत कर सकता है, जैसा कि ऐसे आदेश के विरुद्ध हो 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 अतत नीचे बताए गए मामलों के बारे में पूर्वोक्त धारा को उप-धारा के प्रथम परन्तुक के अंतर्गत पुनरीक्षण आवेदन अधीन सचिव, भारत सरकार, वित्त मंत्रालय, राजस्व विभाग, चौथी मंजिल, जीवन दीप भवन, संसद मार्ग, नई दिल्ली: 110001 को की जानी चाहिए :-

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 :-

(क) यदि माल की हानि के मामले में जब ऐसी हानिकार खाने 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 से हो माल की प्रक्रिया के दौरान हुई हो।

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।

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।

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

(घ) 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।

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.

(2) 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 भीतरमूल-आदेश एवं अपील आदेश की दो-दो प्रतियों के साथ उचित आवेदन किया जाना चाहिए। उसके साथ खाता इ का मुख्य शीर्ष 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.

(3) रिविजन आवेदन के साथ जहाँ संलग्न रकम एक लाख रुपये या उससे कम होते रुपये 200/- फीस भुगतान की जाए और जहाँ संलग्नरकम 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 सेवा कर अपीलीय न्यायाधिकरण के प्रति अपील:-
Appeal to Custom, Excise, & Service Tax Appellate Tribunal.

(1) केन्द्रीय उत्पादन शुल्क अधिनियम, 1944 की धारा 35-बी/35-इ के अंतर्गत:-
Under Section 35B/ 35E of CEA, 1944 an appeal lies to :-

(2) उक्तलिखित परिच्छेद 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 2nd माला, बहुमाली भवन, असरवा, गिरधरनागर, अहमदाबाद-380004।

To the west regional bench of Customs, Excise & Service Tax Appellate Tribunal (CESTAT) at 2nd floor, Bahumali Bhawan, Asarwa, Girdhar Nagar, Ahmedabad: 380004. In case of appeals other than as mentioned above para.

The appeal to the Appellate Tribunal shall be filed in quadruplicate in form EA-8 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 मूलआदेश यथास्थिति निर्णयन प्राधिकारी के आदेश में से प्रत्येक की एक प्रतिपर रू 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 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 उत्पादन शुल्क एवं सेवाकर अपीलीय न्यायाधिकरण (सिस्टेट) एके प्रति अपील के मामले में कर्तव्यमांग (Demand) एवं दंड (Penalty) का 10% पूर्व जमा करना अनिवार्य है। हालांकि, अधिकतम पूर्व जमा 10 करोड़ रुपए है। (Section 35 F of the Central Excise Act, 1944, Section 83 & Section 86 of the Finance Act, 1994)

केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क और सेवाकर के अंतर्गत, शामिल होगा कर्तव्य की मांग (Duty Demanded)।

- (1) खंड (Section) 11D के तहत निर्धारित राशि;
- (2) लिया गलत सेनवैट क्रेडिट की राशि;
- (3) सेनवैट क्रेडिट नियमों के नियम 6 के तहत देय राशि।

यह पूर्व जमा 'लंबित अपील' में पहले पूर्व जमा की तुलना में 'अपील' दाखिल करने के लिए पूर्व शर्त बना दिया गया है।

For an appeal to be filed before the CESTAT, 10% of the Duty & Penalty confirmed by the Appellate Commissioner would have to be pre-deposited, provided that the pre-deposit amount shall not exceed Rs.10 Crores. It may be noted that the pre-deposit is a mandatory condition for filing appeal before CESTAT. (Section 35 C (2A) and 35 F of the Central Excise Act, 1944, Section 83 & Section 86 of the Finance Act, 1994).

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.

(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।

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."



अपीलिय आदेश / ORDER-IN-APPEAL

The present appeal has been filed by M/s. Ajit Builders, 17, Samarpan Shopping Centre, Highway Road, Mehsana (hereinafter referred to as "the appellant") against the Order-In-Original No.177/AC/DEM/MEH/ST/Ajit Builders/2021-22; dated 19.05.2022 (hereinafter referred as 'impugned order'), passed by the Assistant Commissioner, CGST & C.Ex., Division-Mehsana, Commissionerate-Gandhinagar [hereinafter referred to as "the adjudicating authority"].


2. Briefly stated, the facts of the case are that the appellant were holding Service Tax Registration No. AHBPS7777GSD001 for providing taxable services. As per the information received from the Income Tax department, discrepancies were observed in the total income declared in Income Tax Returns/26AS, when compared with Service Tax Returns of the appellant for the period F.Y. 2014-15. In order to verify the said discrepancies as well as to ascertain the fact whether the appellant had discharged their Service Tax liabilities during the period F.Y. 2014-15, letter / e-mail dated 19.06.2020 was issued to them by the department. The appellant failed to file any reply to the query. It was also observed by the Service Tax authorities that the appellant had not declared actual taxable value in their Service Tax Returns for the relevant period. It was also observed that the nature of services provided by the appellant were covered under the definition of 'Service' as per Section 65B(44) of the Finance Act, 1994, and their services were not covered under the 'Negative List' as per Section 66D of the Finance Act, 1994. Further, their services were not exempted vide the Mega Exemption Notification No.25/2012-S.T., dated 20.06.2012 (as amended). Hence, the services provided by the appellant during the relevant period were considered taxable.

3. In the absence of any other available data for cross-verification, the Service Tax liability of the appellant for the F.Y. 2014-15 was determined on the basis of value of difference between 'Sales of Services under Sales/Gross Receipts from Services (Value from ITR)' as provided by the Income Tax department and the 'Taxable Value' shown in the Service Tax Returns for the relevant period as per details below:

TABLE

(Amount in Rs.)

F.Y.	Taxable value as per IT data i.e. Total amount paid / credited under 194C, 194H, 194J or sales / Gross Receipts from Services [From ITR]	Taxable value declared in ST-3 Returns	Difference of value	Service Tax Rate [including EC, SHEC]	Amount of Service Tax not paid / short paid.
	(1)	(2)	(1) - (2) = (3)	(4)	(5)
2014-15	76,61,942	21,46,562	55,15,380	12.36%	6,81,700



4. Accordingly, a Show Cause Notice was issued to the appellant vide F.No. IV/16-13/TPI/PI/Batch-3C/2018-19/Gr.II/3594, dated 25.06.2020, wherein it was proposed to demand and recover:


- (i) Service Tax amount of Rs. 6,81,700/- under proviso to Section 73(1) of the Finance Act, 1994 readwith Section 68 of the Finance Act, 1994.
- (ii) Interest under Section 75 of the Finance Act, 1994 on the above amount of Service Tax.
- (iii) Penalty under Section 77C, 77(2) and 78 of the Finance Act, 1994.

5. The said Show Cause Notice was adjudicated vide *the impugned order* wherein *the adjudicating authority* has:

- (i) Confirmed the demand of Service Tax amount of Rs. 6,81,700/- under proviso to Section 73(1) of the Finance Act, 1994 readwith Section 68 of the Finance Act, 1994;
- (ii) Ordered to pay interest under Section 75 of the Finance Act, 1994 on the above demand of Service Tax.
- (iii) Imposed Penalty amounting to Rs. 6,81,700/- was imposed under Section 78 of the Finance Act, 1994 ;
- (iv) Imposed Penalty of Rs.10,000/- was imposed under Section 77(2) of the Finance Act, 1994 ;
- (v) Imposed a penalty @ Rs.200/- per day till the date of compliance or Rs.10,000/-, whichever is higher under Section 77(1)(C) of the Finance Act, 1994 was also imposed.
- (vi) Option was given for reduced penalty vide clause (ii) of the second proviso to Section 78(1) of the Finance Act, 1994.

6. Being aggrieved with the impugned order, the appellant have filed the present appeal on the following grounds:-

- The department has, while considering the income with the Income Tax Return, not considered the fact that the appellant were providing work contract service and covered under reverse charge mechanism. Hence, demand is not justifiable. The appellant have relied upon several judgments in their support.
- The appellant referred the definition of "work contract" and contended that they have been executing works contract service to *M/s Ananta Procon, M/s Ajay Protech, M/s ONGC & M/s Ravindra Gupta*. They have provided the service with goods and hence such service is covered under Works Contract Service.




- The appellant referred the provisions of Rule 2A of Service Tax (Determination of Value) Rules, 2006 related to works contract and contended that the appellant were eligible for abatement of 60% of the total value of service and thereby they were liable to pay Service Tax @40% of the total value of service.
- The appellant further referred the Notification No. 30/2012- ST, dated 20.06.2012 and contended that they were eligible for the abatement of 60% original WCT plus reverse charge 50:50 % , so effectively liable on 20% of total value as per the Notification supra.
- The appellant has submitted sales reconciliation as under :-

Particulars	Amt. [in Rs.]
Total Receipt as per ITR	76,61,942
Abatement @ 60%	45,97,165
Taxable Value @ 40%	30,64,777
Exempt under RCM @ 50%	15,32,388
Net Taxable Value	15,32,388
Value as per ST-3	21,46,562
Difference	(-) 6,14,174

The appellant contended that they were liable for Service Tax on value of Rs.15,32,388/- against which they have already shown taxable value of Rs.21,46,562/- in the ST-3 Returns of the impugned period and hence already shown excess amount of sales and there would not be any short difference in taxable value.

- The SCN is barred by limitation.
- The appellant has relied upon various case laws in support of their claim of demand being barred by limitation, imposition of penalty under Section 77 and 78, levy of interest under Section 75 etc.

7. Personal hearing in the case was held on 10.02.2023. Shri Vipul Khandhar, Chartered Accountant, as authorized representative of the appellant, appeared for the hearing. He stated that the appellant had received the OIO on 30.05.2022. Hence, the appeal has been filed in time. He reiterated the submissions made in appeal memorandum and also submitted a written submission alongwith profit & loss account and various ledgers during hearing.




8. The appellant have, in the additional submission dated 10.02.2023, further contended that the department has not considered the fact that the appellant were providing the work contract service and covered under RCM. Without considering the factual details, the department has raised the demand which is not justifiable. The appellant has relied upon various case laws in support of their claim of demand being barred by limitation, imposition of penalty under Section 77 and 78, levy of interest under Section 75 etc.

9. At the first and foremost, while dealing with the issue of delay in filing of the present appeal by 9 days, it is observed that the impugned order was issued on 19.05.2022 and appellant had stated during the hearing having it received on 30.05.2022. This appellate authority has considered the date of service of the impugned order as 30.05.2022, the date appellant have claimed as the date of communication of the impugned order. Therefore, I consider the appeal to be filed within time-limit of two months.

10. Further, I have gone through the facts of the case, submissions made in the Appeal Memorandum as well as submissions made at the time of personal hearing and the materials available on the record. The issue before me for decision is as to whether the impugned order confirming the demand of Service Tax amounting to Rs.6,81,700/-, along with interest and penalty, in the facts and circumstances of the case, is legal and proper or otherwise. The demand pertains to the period to F.Y. 2014-15.

11. It is observed that the appellant were registered with the department for providing work contract service. They were issued SCN on the basis of the data received from the Income Tax Department and the appellant were called upon to submit documents/required details in respect of the difference found in their income reported in the ST-3 returns as compared to the Income Tax Returns. However, the appellant failed to submit the required details. Therefore, the appellant were issued SCN demanding Service Tax on the differential income by considering the same as income earned from providing taxable services. The adjudicating authority had confirmed the demand of Service Tax along with interest and penalty vide the impugned order.

12. I find it pertinent to refer to Instruction dated 26.10.2021 issued by the CBIC, wherein it was directed that:




"2. In this regard, the undersigned is directed to inform that CBIC vide instructions dated 1-4-2021 and 23-4-2021 issued vide F.No. 137/472020-ST, has directed the field formations that while analysing ITR-TDS data received from Income Tax, a reconciliation statement has to be sought from the taxpayer for the difference and whether the service income earned by them for the corresponding period is attributable to any of the negative list services specified in Section 66D of the Finance Act, 1994 or exempt from payment of Service Tax, due to any reason. It was further reiterated that demand notices may not be issued indiscriminately based on the difference between the ITR-TDS taxable value and the taxable value in Service Tax Returns.

3. It is once again reiterated that instructions of the Board to issue show cause notices based on the difference in ITR-TDS data and service tax returns only after proper verification of facts may be followed diligently. Pr. Chief Commissioner/Chief Commissioner(s) may devise a suitable mechanism to monitor and prevent issue of indiscriminate show cause notices. Needless to mention that in all such cases where the notices have already been issued, adjudicating authorities are expected to pass a judicious order after proper appreciation of facts and submission of the noticee."

12.1 However, in the instant case, I find that no such exercise, as instructed by the Board has been undertaken by the adjudicating authority, and the impugned order has been issued only on the basis of the data received from the Income Tax department. The appellant were admittedly registered with the department. Further, they were registered for providing work contract service. The appellant, being partnership firm, liability for payment of service tax under reverse charge mechanism was required to be examined in the case which was not done. Therefore, I find that the impugned order has been passed without following the directions issued by the CIBC. Further, the impugned order is a non-speaking order, hence, is not legally sustainable and is liable to be set aside.


13. It is further observed that the appellant have made various submissions in their appeal memorandum and submitted documents in support of them. They have also contested the demand on limitation. In their submission, the appellant have contended that they were liable for Service Tax on the value of Rs. 15,32,388/- against which they have already shown taxable value of Rs. 21,46,562/- in the ST-3 returns of the impugned period and hence they have already shown excess amount of sales. I find that the appellant could not justify the reasons for such difference. It is further observed from Form 26AS and ST-3 submitted by the appellant that figures shown in both such returns are not tallied with each other. Thus, the appellant have failed to submit correct reconciliation of the income for the F.Y. 2014-15. I further find that the appellant have also *neither* submitted the copies of contract orders / agreements entered with their clients, to whom they



services provided during F.Y. 2014-15, before the adjudicating authority *nor* before this appellate authority. Considering the fact that the matter requires only reconciliation of data with relevant records, it would be in the interest of justice that the appellant are accorded one more opportunity to produce proper reconciliation of data of income for the relevant period, all required works contract orders and relevant documents, if any, in support their case. In view of the above, I am of the considered view that it would be in the fitness of things and in the interest of natural justice that the matter is remanded back to the adjudicating authority to consider the submissions of the appellant, made in the course of the present appeal, relied upon judgments & Notifications etc. and, thereafter, adjudicate the matter after affording the appellant the opportunity of submitting further documents in support of their contentions and give findings thereon.


14. In view of the above, the impugned order is set aside and the matter is remanded back to the adjudicating authority for adjudication afresh, after following principles of natural justice. The appellant is directed to submit their written submission to the adjudicating authority within 15 days of the receipt of this order. The appellant is also directed to appear before the adjudicating authority as and when personal hearing is fixed by the adjudicating authority. Accordingly, the impugned order is set aside and the appeal of the appellant is allowed by way of remand.

15. 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.


(Akhilesh Kumar)
Commissioner (Appeals)

Date: 24.03.2023

Attested


(Ajay Kumar Agarwal)
Assistant Commissioner [In-situ] (Appeals)
Central Tax, Ahmedabad.



BY RPAD / SPEED POST

M/s. Ajit Builders,
17, Samarpan Shopping Centre,
Highway Road, Mehsana,
Gujarat.

Copy to: -

1. The Principal Chief Commissioner, CGST & C.Ex., Ahmedabad Zone.
2. The Principal Commissioner, CGST & C.Ex., Commissionerate: Gandhinagar.
3. The Assistant Commissioner, CGST & C.Ex., Division-Mehsana, Commissionerate: Gandhinagar.
4. The Superintendent (System), CGST, Appeals, Ahmedabad. (for uploading the OIA).
5. Guard File.
6. P.A. File.

