

ADDA THERE

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 : <u>commrappl1-cexamd@nic.in</u> Website : <u>www.cgstappealahmedabad.gov.in</u>



By SPEED POST							
DIN:- 20240564SW0000888F7D							
(क)	फ़ाइल संख्या / File No.	GAPPL/COM/STP/5258/2023-APPEAL	4809-13				
(ख)	अपील आदेश संख्या और दिनांक / Order-In-Appeal No. and Date	AHM-EXCUS-003-APP-013/2024-25 and 26.04.2024					
(ग)	पारित किया गया /	श्री ज्ञानचंद जैन, आयुक्त (अपील्स)					
	Passed By	Shri Gyan Chand Jain, Commissioner (Appeals)					
(ঘ)	जारी करने की दिनांक /	01.05.2024					
	Date of issue						
	Arising out of Order-In-Original No. 40/D/GNR/YMR/2023-24 dated 30.06.2023 (Date of						
(ङ)	Issue: 11.07.2023) passed by the Deputy / Assistant Commissioner, CGST, Division -						
	Gandhinagar, Commissionerate - Gandhinagar						
(च)	अपीलकर्ता का नाम और पता / Name and Address of the Appellant	M/s Preeshe Consultancy Private Limited, A-22, Infocity Township, Infocity Gandhinagar – 382009					

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 पूवोक्त 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, 4<sup>th</sup> 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 रिवेट 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 नियम 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.

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 2<sup>nd</sup> माला, बहुमाली भवन, असरवा, गिरधरनागर, अहमदाबाद-380004।

To the west regional bench of Customs, Excise & Service Tax Appellate Tribunal (CESTAT) at 2<sup>nd</sup>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-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 त्या है।

गया है।

Ì,

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 Preeshe Consultancy Private Limited, A-22, Infocity Township, Infocity Gandhinagar – 382009 [hereinafter referred to as "the appellant"] against Order in Original No. 40/D/GNR/YMR/2023-24 dated 30.06.2023 Date of Issue : 11.07.2023 [hereinafter referred to as "the impugned order"] passed by the Assistant Commissioner, CGST, Division - Gandhinagar, Commissionerate - Gandhinagar [hereinafter referred to as "the adjudicating authority"].

2. Briefly stated, the facts of the case are that the appellant were registered under Service Tax registration no. AAHCP8377KSD001 and engaged in business activity of IT services. As per information received from the Income Tax Department, it was observed that during the period F.Y. 2016-17, the appellant had declared less the gross value of Sale of Services in ST-3 returns than the gross value of Sale of Services in Income Tax Returns / TDS Returns. Accordingly, in order to verify, letters dated 13.05.2020 & 20.05.2020 were issued through mail 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 determined the Service Tax liability for the F.Y. 2016-17 on the differential value of 'Sales of Services' under Sales/Gross Receipts from Services (Value from ITR) / Form 26AS & ST-3 as details below :

:		Period (F.Y.)	Differential Taxable Value as per Income Tax Data (in Rs.)	Rate of Service Tax incl. Cess	
	1.	2016-17	41,76,122/-	15%	6,26,418/-

3. The appellant was issued Show Cause Notice No. GEXCOM/SCN/ST/681/2021-CGST-DIV-GNR dated 19.07.2021 (in short SCN) proposing to demand and recover Service Tax amounting to Rs.6,26,418/- 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 Sections 76, 77(2), 77(3)(c), 78 of the Finance Act, 1994.

- 4. The SCN was adjudicated *ex-parte* vide the impugned order wherein :
  - Service Tax demand of Rs.6,26,418/- was confirmed under Section 73(1) of the Finance Act, 1994 alongwith interest under Section 75 of the Finance Act, 1994.



Page 4 of 7

4

 Penalty of Rs.10,000/- was imposed under Section 70 of the Finance Act, 1994 as amended read with Rule 7 of the Service Tax Rules, 1994.

5

- Penalty of Rs.10,000/- was imposed under Section 77(2) of the Finance Act, 1994.
- Penalty of Rs.6,26,418/- was imposed under Section 78 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 is engaged in export of IT Service. They submitted that they have satisfied all conditions mentioned in Rule 6A(1) of the Service Tax Rules, 1994. Hence, their service is exempted.

 $\triangleright$  They requested to consider the same and set aside the Impugned order.

6. Hearing in the case was held on 10.04.2024 virtually. Shri Ramesh Pujara, Chartered Accountant, appeared for virtual hearing on behalf of the appellant. He informed that the client is doing export of services, hence the client is not liable to pay service tax. Further, he requested time till 22<sup>nd</sup> April 2024 to submit FIRCS as a proof of remittance.

6.1 Subsequently, the appellant submitted the additional submission along with certificate of Foreign Inward Remittance issued by HDFC Bank Limited.

7. I have carefully gone through the facts of the case available on record, grounds of appeal in the appeal memorandum, oral submissions made during the hearing and additional submission, 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.6,26,418/- 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 appellant claimed that they are engaged in providing IT enable services to USA based company i.e. Meditab Software Inc., 2233 Watt Ave, Suite 360, Sacramento, CA 958 and received Rs.76,91,869/- from the said service recipient on account of export of IT service during the F.Y. 2016-17. In support of their claim, Page 5 of 7 they submitted the copy of ITR, ST-3 Return, Invoices, Bank Statement, Reconciliation Statement, P&L Account and certificate of Foreign Inward Remittance issued by HDFC Bank Limited. They also claimed that the service tax is not leviable on their provided services as they satisfy the conditions of Rule 6A(1) of the Service Tax Rules, 1994.

9. Examining the submissions made by the appellant, I find that they are engaged in the export of IT enabled services and received payment for the services in convertible foreign exchange. In support, they submitted the certificate of Foreign Inward Remittance issued by HDFC Bank Limited. I find that they contended the conditions of Rule 6A(1) of the Service Tax Rules, 1994. For better understanding, I reproduce herewith relevant portion of Service Tax Rules :

## Export of services :

As per rule 6A of service tax rules, the six essential requisites are to be fulfilled in respect to a service so as to be considered as export service:

a) It must be a service under sub-section 44 of section 65B. In other words, service shall not be covered under negative list of service provided under 66 D of the act.

b) The service provider must be located in taxable territory i.e. India

c) The service receiver is located outside India

d) The payment for such service is received by the service provider in convertible foreign exchange

e) The place of provision of the service is outside India as per the place of provision of service rules, 2012

f) The service provider and the service receiver are not merely establishment of a distinct person i.e. branches of assessee in two different tax jurisdictions.

10. From the above discussions and document available on records, I find that all the ingredients which qualify the activity to be "export of service" for the purpose of Rule 6A of Service Tax Rules 1994, are satisfied by the appellant in as much as (a) the provider is located in the taxable territory (b) the recipient of service is located outside India (c) the service is not in a negative list (d) the place of provision is outside India in the instant case as per the Rule 3 of Place of Provision of Service Rules, 2012 (e) the payment has been received by the provider of service in convertible foreign exchange (f) the provider of service and the recipient of service are different legal entities established under different laws, hence, they are not merely distinct establishment of a distinct person in accordance with Item (b) of Explanation 3 of clause (44) of section 65B of the act.

Page 6 of 7



6

11. Having considered these facts and documentary evidences available on records, I find that they are eligible for the benefit of the said provisions and not liable to pay service tax on the value of 'export of service' for the F.Y. 2016-17.

12. In view of the above, I am of the considered view that the demand of service tax amounting to Rs.6,26,418/- confirmed vide the impugned order is not sustainable and is liable to be set aside. As the demand of Service Tax is unsustainable, the question of interest and penalty does not arise.

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

14. अपील कर्ता 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.

ज्ञानचंद जैन

**आयुक्त (अपील्स)** Dated: <u>.26<sup>4</sup></u>April, 2024

सत्यापित/Attested :

रेखा नायर अधीक्षक (अपील्स) सी जी एस टी, अहमदाबाद

## By REGD/SPEED POST A/D

Τо,

a second

M/s Preeshe Consultancy Private Limited, A-22, Infocity Township, Infocity Gandhinagar – 382009.

Copy to :

- 1. The Principal Chief Commissioner, CGST and Central Excise, Ahmedabad.
- 2. The Commissioner, CGST and Central Excise, Gandhinagar.
- 3. The Assistant Commissioner, CGST & CEX, Gandhiangar Division, Gandhinagar Commissionerate.
- 4. The Superintendent (Systems), CGST, Appeals, Ahmedabad, for publication of OIA on website.

5. Guard file.

6. PA File.



7

۰. ۱