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

सत्यमेव जयते

आज़ादी का अमृत महोत्सव

By SPEED POST

DIN:- 20231264SW000000F479

(क)	फ़ाइल संख्या / File No.	GAPPL/COM/STP/4577/2023-APPEAL /9611-CS
(ख)	अपील आदेश संख्या और दिनांक / Order-In-Appeal No. and Date	AHM-EXCUS-003-APP-162/2023-24 and 21.12.2023
(ग)	पारित किया गया / Passed By	श्री ज्ञानचंद जैन, आयुक्त (अपील्स) Shri Gyan Chand Jain, Commissioner (Appeals)
(घ)	जारी करने की दिनांक / Date of issue	21.12.2023
(ङ)	Arising out of Order-In-Original No. PLN-AC-ADJ-STX-102/2023-24 dated 28.06.2023 passed by the Assistant Commissioner, CGST, Division - Palanpur, Commissionerate - Gandhinagar	
(च)	अपीलकर्ता का नाम और पता / Name and Address of the Appellant	M/s Shaileshkumar Hiralal Thakker, krushnakunj Chali, Harij, Patan- 384240

कोई व्यक्ति इस अपील-आदेश से असंतोष 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 मे हो माल की प्रकिया 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 मामलें 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 डयूटी केडिट 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 नियमं 9 के अंतर्गत विनिर्दिष्ट प्रपत्र संख्या इए-8 में दो प्रतियों में, प्रेषित आदेश के प्रति आदेश प्रेषित दिनाँक 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 रूपये या उससे कम होतो रूपये 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 अपीलः-
Appeal to Custom, Excise, & Service Tax Appellate Tribunal.

(1) केन्द्रीय उत्पादन शुल्क अधिनियम, 1944 की धारा 35-बी/35-इ के अंतर्गतः-
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 2ndfloor, 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-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. Registar 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 ओदश 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 हैं।

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 संषोधित 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 in 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 अपीलो 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 राशिय;
(3) सेनवैट क्रेडिट नियमों के नियम 6 के तहत देय राशि।

यह पूर्व जमा ' लंबित अपील' में पहले पूर्व जमा की तुलना मेंए 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 Shaileshkumar Hiralal Thakker, krushnakunj Chali, Harij, Patan- 384240 [hereinafter referred to as "the appellant"] against Order in Original No. PLN-AC-ADJ-STX-102/2023-24 dated 28.06.2023 [hereinafter referred to as "the impugned order"] passed by the Assistant Commissioner, CGST, Division -Palanpur, Commissionerate - Gandhinagar [hereinafter referred to as "the adjudicating authority"].

2. Briefly stated, the facts of the case are that the appellant were not registered under Service Tax and were holding PAN No. AARPT7711Q. As per information received from the Income Tax Department, it was observed that during the period F.Y. 2016-17, the appellant had earned substantial service income by way of providing taxable services, but had neither obtain Service Tax Registration nor paid Service Tax thereon. Accordingly, in order to seek information, letter dated 14.10.2021 was issued to the appellant calling for the details of services provided during the period. But they didn't submit any reply. Further, the jurisdictional officers considering the services provided by the appellant as taxable under Section 65 B (44) of the Finance Act, 1994 determined the Service Tax liability on the basis of value of 'Sales of Services' under Sales/Gross Receipts from Services (Value from ITR) and Form 26AS for the F.Y. 2016-17, as per details below :

Sr. No.	Period (F.Y.)	Differential Taxable Value as per Income Tax Data (in Rs.)	Rate of Service Tax incl. Cess	Service Tax liability to be demanded (in Rs.)
1.	2016-17	14,68,400/-	15%	2,20,260/-

3. The appellant was issued Show Cause Notice No. GEXCOM/SCN/ST/9856/2021-CGST-DIV-PLN-COMMRTE-GANDHINAGAR dated 20.10.2021 (in short SCN) proposing to demand and recover Service Tax amounting to Rs.2,20,260/- under proviso to Section 73 (1) of Finance Act, 1994 along with interest under Section 75 of the Act. The SCN also proposed imposition of penalty under Section 77(1)(a), Section 77(1)(b), Section 77(1)(c)(i), Section 77(1)(c)(ii), Section 77(2) and Section 78 of the Finance Act, 1994. It was also proposed that Service Tax liability not paid during the F.Y. 2017-18 (upto June 2017), ascertained in future due to non-availability of pertaining data.

4. The SCN was adjudicated *ex-parte* vide the impugned order wherein :

- Service Tax demand of Rs.2,20,260/- was confirmed on considering the taxable value of Rs.14,68,400/- for the period F.Y. 2016-17 under Section 73(1) of the Finance Act, 1994 alongwith interest under Section 75 of the Finance Act, 1994.
- Service Tax demand was confirmed but not ascertained due to non-availability of pertaining data for the period F.Y. 2017-18 (upto June 2017) under Section 73(1) of the Finance Act, 1994 alongwith interest under Section 75 of the Finance Act, 1994.
- Penalty of Rs.10,000/- was imposed under Section 77(1)(a) of the Finance Act, 1994.
- Penalty of Rs.20,000/- was imposed under Section 70 of the Finance Act, 1994.
- Penalty of Rs.10,000/- was imposed under Section 77(1)(b) of the Finance Act, 1994.
- Penalty of Rs.10,000/- or two hundred rupees for every day during which such failure continues, whichever is higher, starting with the first day after the due date till the date of actual compliance, was imposed under Section 77(1)(c)(i) & Section 77(1)(c)(ii) of the Finance Act, 1994.
- Penalty of Rs.10,000/- was imposed under Section 77(2) of the Finance Act, 1994.
- Penalty of Rs.2,20,260/- was imposed under Section 78(1) of the Finance Act,1994 with option for reduced penalty in terms of clause (ii).

5. Aggrieved by the impugned order, the appellant has preferred this appeal on following grounds:

- The appellant submitted that they were engaged in providing services of transportation of goods as an individual truck owner, which is evident from the Nature of Services disclosed in Income Tax Return of F.Y. 2016-17 and purchase documents of Truck & Driving License.

- The adjudicating authority invoked Section 73(1) of the Finance Act, 1994without considering the merits of the case. Section 73(1) of the Finance Act, 1994 permits the invocation of the extended period of limitation whereby the SCN seeking the demand of tax up to 5 years can be issued if the said tax has not been paid on account of "fraud or

collusion or wilful misstatement; or suppression of facts; or contravention of any of the provisions with intent to evade payment of service tax". If an extended period of limitation cannot be invoked, then the normal period of limitation shall be thirty months and hence the SCN seeking to demand the tax for FY 2016-17 issued in October, 2021 will be considered to have been issued beyond the normal period of limitation and hence the same shall not be valid.

- Appellant contends that figures reflected in Income Tax Return are already available with the department from the concerned year itself as the same is based on the filings done under Income Tax Act. Therefore, the said information has never been suppressed by the concerned taxpayer from the department. Further, it is also contended that the taxpayer has also not indulged in any fraud or collusion or wilful misstatement as the given figures reported in Income Tax Return basis which SCN has been issued and have been submitted by the counterparties and not the taxpayer and the said information is available for department's perusal right from the year in question. Hence it can be said that in such facts and circumstances, the invocation of the extended period may not be in accordance with the law and hence the SCN in question is required to be vacated. They relied upon the following judgement of the Hon'ble Tribunal in case of Pappu Crane Service v. Commissioner (Service Tax Appeal No.70707 of 2018-[DB]).

- The SCN also seeks to base itself on the provisions contained u/s 72 of the Finance Act, 1994 with respect to the best judgement assessment. Perusal of the said provisions will reveal that it only provides for the determination of the value of taxable services in question and not for the determination of the nature of service involved as well as the aspects of limitation. They relied upon the following judgement of the Hon'ble Courts & Tribunal in case of :

  - Shubham Electricals v. CCE 2015 (40) S.T.R. 1034 (Tri. – Del.) affirmed by Hon'ble Delhi High Court (2016 (45) S.T.R. J314 (Del.)]
  - Deltax Enterprises v. CCE 2018 (10) G.S.T.L. 392 (Tri. – Del.)

- (2016 (45) S.T.R. 33 (Del.))
- Creative Travel Pvt. Ltd. v. CCE 2016 (41) S.T.R. 134 (Tri. – Del.) as affirmed by Hon'ble Delhi High Court 2016 (45) S.T.R. 33 (Del.)
- Kush Constructions v. CGST NACIN 2019 (24) G.S.T.L. 606 (Tri. – All.)

➢ Even if the show cause notice was issued in due course of time, the Appellant had no liability for the registration and hence for the payment of service tax. The same is evident from the nature of services i.e., "Transporters" as specified in the Income Tax Return.

➢ The appellant was engaged in the provision of transportation services of goods as it is evident from three things: -

i. The Appellant was the owner of Truck as evident from Income Tax Return and Financial Statements;

ii. The Appellant has claimed depreciation in the Income Tax Return for the same in F.Y. 2016-17;

iii. The Appellant was not a goods transport agency because he had not issued any consignment note. Hence the Services provisioned by Appellant falls under Section 66D(p)(i) of Negative List inserted in Finance Act, 1994 by Finance Act, 2012 and has been notified to be effective from 1st July 2012 vide Notification No. 19/2012-ST dated 5 June 2012.

➢ Section 66D(p)(i) of Negative List: -

Services by way of transportation of goods by road except the services of–
(A) a goods transportation agency (GTA); or
(B) a courier agency;

Goods Transport Agency is defined under Section 65B(26) of the Finance Act, 1994; "*Goods Transport Agency means any person who provides service in relation to transport of goods by road and issues consignment note, by whatever name called*".

Therefore, issue of Consignment Note (C/N) is integral and mandatory requirement before any road transport can be said to be GTA.

- Consignment Note is not defined in the Act. As per Explanation to Rule 4B of Service Tax Rules, 1994; consignment note means a document, issued by a goods transport agency against the receipt of goods for the purpose of transport of goods by road in a goods carriage, which is serially numbered, and contains the name of the consignor and consignee, registration number of the goods carriage in which the goods are transported, details of the goods transported, details of the place of origin and destination, person liable for paying service tax whether consignor, consignee or the goods transport agency.

- Hence the appellant satisfies the all the Conditions of Section 66D(p)(i) of Negative List wherein The appellant transported the goods by his own carriage and already disclosed the income in his Income Tax Return.

- Further Section 69- Registration states that —

  "*Every person liable to pay the service tax under Chapter V of the Finance Act, 1994 or the rules made thereunder shall, within such time and in such manner and in such form as may be prescribed, make an application for registration to the Superintendent of Central Excise.*"

  Since the services of the appellant falls under Section 66D Negative List, he is not liable to registration under Service Tax Act.

- Further Section 68- Payment of service tax states that —

  "*Every person providing taxable service to any person shall pay service tax at the rate specified in section[66B] in such manner and within such period as may be prescribed.*"

  Since the services of the appellant falls under Section 66D Negative List, he is not liable to pay Service Tax under the Act.

- Further, they relied upon the various judgement of the Hon'ble Courts & Tribunals in the matter of imposition of penalty and levy of interest.

- It is a settled principle of law that in cases where the original demand is not sustainable, interest & penalty cannot be levied. In view of the aforesaid submissions, it is clear that the demand itself is not sustainable and hence, the question of imposing interest & penalty does not arise. Hence, the demand of interest & penalty by the impugned Order is liable to be dropped.

6. Personal Hearing in the case was held on 15.12.2023. Shri Tirth Patel, Chartered Accountant, appeared for personal hearing on behalf of the appellant. He reiterated the contents of the written submission. He stated that his client is self driving truck owner, was engaged in transport of goods locally. Hence, the appellant is not liable for Service Tax. He requested to allow the appeal. Further, he requested to give two days time to submit additional documents.

6.1 Subsequently, the appellant submitted a CA's Certificate dated 15.12.2023 via mail, wherein their Chartered Accountant, Shri Tirth Patel, Membership No. 620406, certified as below:

> *"Based on the documents and records placed before us by Shaileshkumar Hiralal Thakker to certify the sales of transportation services by transporting the goods in self-owned vehicle for the Financial Year 2016-17.*
>
> *We hereby verify that Shaileshkumar Hiralal Thakker during the Financial Year 2016-17 made the sales of Rs. 14,68,400 as declared in Income Tax Return.*
>
> *We further state that since the assessee is engaged purely in transport of goods locally no consignment note and other invoices were available to classify them as goods transport agency under the Section 65B(26) of the Finance Act, 1994*
>
> *Hence the assessee was not liable to pay Service Tax and not liable for registration under Service Tax Act."*

7. I have carefully gone through the facts of the case available on record, grounds of appeal in the appeal memorandum, oral submissions & additional submissions made during personal hearing, the impugned order passed by the adjudicating authority and other case records. The issue before me for decision in the present appeal is whether the demand of service tax amounting to Rs.2,20,260/- confirmed under proviso to Section 73 (1) of Finance Act, 1994 alongwith interest, and penalties vide the impugned order passed by the adjudicating authority in the facts and circumstances of the case is legal and proper or otherwise. The demand pertains to the period of F.Y. 2016-17.

8. I find that the impugned order has been ***ex-parte.***

9. I find that the appellant claimed that they were individual local Transporter & truck owner and had received freight of Rs. 14,68,400/- on transportation of goods by road during the period of F.Y. 2016-17. They strongly contended that these services cannot be considered as 'Goods Transport agency Service' and merit exemption from

Service Tax in terms of Section 66D of the Finance Act, 1994. The relevant portion of the Section is reproduced as below:

> *Section 66D: The negative list shall comprise of the following services, namely:*
>
> ...
>
> ***(p) services by way of transportation of goods***
>
> ***(i) by road*** *except the services of*
>
> *(A) a goods transportation agency; or*
>
> *(B) a courier agency;*

10. Examining the above provisions with the facts of the case, I find that the services provided by the appellant by way of transportation of Goods by road without issuing any consignment note, merits exemption from leviability of Service tax in terms of Section 66D(p)(i) of the Finance Act, 1994.

11. In view of above discussions & findings, I am of the considered view that the income of the appellant of Rs.14,68,400/- during the relevant period is not to be considered as a taxable value under Service Tax. Therefore, the demand of Service Tax amounting to Rs.2,20,260/- confirmed vide the impugned order fails to sustain on merit. As the demand of service tax fails to sustain, question of interest and penalty does not arise.

12. Accordingly, the impugned order is set aside and the appeal filed by the appellant is allowed.

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

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

ज्ञानचंद जैन

आयुक्त (अपील्स)

सत्यापित/Attested :

Dated: 31st December, 2023

रेखा नायर

अधीक्षक (अपील्स)

सी जी एस टी, अहमदाबाद

By REGD/SPEED POST A/D

To,
M/s Shaileshkumar Hiralal Thakker,
Krushnakunj Chali, Harij, Patan- 384240.

Copy to :

1. The Principal Chief Commissioner, CGST and Central Excise, Ahmedabad.
2. The Commissioner, CGST and Central Excise, Gandhinagar.
3. The Assistant Commisisoner, CGST & CEX, Palanpur Division, Gandhinagar Commissionerate.
4. The Superintendent (Systems), CGST, Appeals, Ahmedabad, for publication of OIA on website.
5. Guard file.
6. PA File.