

# अायुक्त ( अपील ) का कार्यालय, Office of the Commissioner (Appeal), केंद्रीय जीएसटी, अपील आयुक्तालय, अहमदाबाद Central GST, Appeal Commissionerate, Ahmedabad जीएसटी भवन, राजस्व मार्ग, अम्बावाड़ी अहमदाबाद ३८००१५. CGST Bhavan, Revenue Marg, Ambawadi, Ahmedabad 380015 केंद्रीफैक्स07926305136



### DIN:20230364SW000000CF88

## स्पीड पोस्ट

- क फाइल संख्या : File No : GAPPL/COM/STP/3276/2022-APPEAL / 9352 5b
- ख अपील आदेश संख्या Order-In-Appeal Nos. AHM-EXCUS-002-APP-180/2022-23 दिनॉक Date : 03-03-2023 जारी करने की तारीख Date of Issue 10.03.2023

आयुक्त (अपील) द्वारा पारित Passed by Shri Akhilesh Kumar, Commissioner (Appeals)

- ग Arising out of Order-in-Original No. GST-06/D-VI/O&A/201/Kirtipal/AM/2022-23 दिनॉंक: 30.09.2022, issued by Deputy/Assistant Commissioner, CGST, Division-VI, Ahmedabad-North
- ध अपीलकर्ता का नाम एवं पता Name & Address

1. Appellant

M/s Kirtipal Navghanbhai Visana, 2, Heritage Residency, Thaltej- Shilaj Road, Thaltej, Ahmedabad-380059

2. Respondent

The Deputy/ Assistant Commissioner, CGST, Division-VI, Ahmedabad North , 7<sup>th</sup> Floor, B D Patel House, Nr. Sardar Patel Statue , Naranpura, Ahmedabad - 380014

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 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।

(i) 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 :

(), के 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 बुद्ध किसी कारखाने में या किसी भण्डागार में हो माल की प्रकिया के दौरान हुई हो।

warehouse of the goods in a warehouse or in storage whether in a factory to a processing of the goods in a warehouse or in storage whether in a factory or in a warehouse.

- (क) 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।
- (A) 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.
- (ख) यदि शुल्क का भुगतान किए बिना भारत के बाहर (नेपाल या भूटान को) निर्यात किया गया माल हो।
- (B) In case of goods exported outside India export to Nepal or Bhutan, without payment of duty.

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।

- (c) 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 दिनाँक 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 रूपये या उससे कम हो तो रूपये 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 अपीलः– 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 :-

- (क) 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 <u>(सिस्टेट)</u> की पश्चिम क्षेत्रीय पीठिका, अहमदाबाद में 2<sup>nd</sup> माला, बहुमाली भवन ,असरवा ,गिरधरनागर,अहमदाबाद –380004
- (a) 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 in para-2(i) (a) above.



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.

and the state of the

यदि इस आदेश में कई मूल आदेशों का समावेश होता है तो प्रत्येक मूल ओदश के लिए फीस का भूगतान उपर्युक्त ढंग से किया जाना चाहिए इस तथ्य के होते हुए भी कि लिखा पढी कार्य से बचने के लिए यथारिश्वति 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 १९७० यथा संशोधित की अनुसूचि-1 के अंतर्गत निर्धारित किए अनुसार उक्त आवेदन या मूल आदेश यथास्थिति निर्णयन प्राधिकारी के आदेश में से प्रत्येक की एक प्रति पर ऊ.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-l item of the court fee Act, 1975 as amended.

इन ओर संबंधित मामलों को नियंत्रण करने वाले नियमों की ओर भी ध्यान आकर्षित किया जाता है जो (5)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.

सीमा शुल्क, केन्द्रीय उत्पादन शुल्क एवं सेवाकर अपीलीय न्यायाधिकरण (सिस्टेट), के प्रति अपीलो के (7) मामले में कर्तव्य मांग (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 सेवा कर के अंतर्गत, शामिल होगा "कर्तव्य की मांग"(Duty Demanded) -

- (i) (Section) खंड 11D के तहत निर्धारित राशि;
- लिया गलत सेनवैट क्रेडिट की राशि; (ii)
- सेनवैट क्रेडिट नियमों के नियम 6 के तहत देय राशि. (iii)
- 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 atty एवं सेवाकि CESIAI. (کوریزی) کالکه دوستهمار در Of the Finance Act, 1994) کالکه دوستهمار در Optime Finance Act, 1994) CESTAT. (Section 35 C (2A) and 35 F of the Central Excise Act, 1944, Section 83 & Section 86

编hder Central Excise and Service Tax, "Duty demanded" shall include: 31हम<u>ू</u> 31हमू

amount determined under Section 11 D;

amount of erroneous Cenvat Credit taken; (ii)

(iii) amount payable under Rule 6 of the Cenvat Credit Rules.

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."

(3)

#### ORDER-IN-APPEAL

The present appeal has been filed by M/s. Kirtipal Navghanbhai Visana, 2, Heritage Residency, Thaltej-Shilaj Road, Thaltej, Ahmedabad – 380059 (hereinafter referred to as "the appellant") against Order-in-Original No. GST-06/D-VI/O&A/201/Kirtipal/AM/2022-23 dated 30.09.2022 (hereinafter referred to as "the impugned order") passed by the Assistant Commissioner, Central GST, Division VI, Ahmedabad North (hereinafter referred to as "the adjudicating authority").

2. Briefly stated, the facts of the case are that the appellant is holding PAN No. AAPLV1913A. On scrutiny of the data received from the Central Board of Direct Taxes (CBDT) for the Financial Year 2014-15, it was noticed that the appellant had earned an income of Rs. 82,55,645/- during the FY 2014-15, which was reflected under the heads "Sales / Gross Receipts from Services (Value from ITR)" or "Total amount paid / credited under Section 194C, 194I, 194H, 194J (Value from Form 26AS)" provided by the Income Tax department. Accordingly, it appeared that the appellant had earned the said substantial income by way of providing taxable services but has neither obtained Service Tax registration nor paid the applicable service tax thereon. The appellant was called upon to submit copies of Balance Sheet, Profit & Loss Account, Income Tax Return, Form 26AS, for the said period. However, the appellant had not responded to the letters issued by the department.

2.1 Subsequently, the appellant was issued a Show Cause Notice No. GST-06/04-433/O&A/Kirtipal/2020-21 dated 28.09.2020 demanding Service Tax amounting to Rs. 10,20,396/- for the period FY 2014-15, under proviso to Sub-Section (1) of Section 73 of the Finance Act, 1994. The SCN also proposed recovery of interest under Section 75 of the Finance Act, 1994; and imposition of penalties under Section 76, Section 77 & Section 78 of the Finance Act, 1994. The SCN also proposed recovery of un-quantified amount of Service Tax for the period FY 2015-16 to FY 2017-18 (up to Jun-17).

2.2 The Show Cause Notice was adjudicated vide the impugned order by the adjudicating authority wherein the demand of Service Tax amounting to Rs. 10,20,396/- was confirmed under proviso to Sub-Section (1) of Section 73 of the Finance Act, 1994 along with Interest under Section 75 of the Finance Act, 1994 for the period from FY 2014-15. Further (i) Penalty of Rs. 10,20,396/- was also imposed on the appellant under Section 78 of the Finance Act, 1994; (ii) Penalty of Rs. 10,000/- was imposed on the appellant under Section 77(1)(a) of Act, 1994.

F.No. GAPPL/COM/STP/3276/2022-Appeal

3. Being aggrieved with the impugned order, the appellant have preferred the present appeal on the following grounds:

- The appellant is a Practicing Urologist, having registration with The Gujarat Medical Council Registration No. G-15889. He is associated with different hospitals as a consulting urologist and providing his clinical services as per the requirement. His services were exempted from Service Tax vide Sr. No. 2 of the Notification No. 25/2012-ST dated 20.06.2012. As services provided by him was not covered under the purview of Service Tax, therefore, he was not required to take registration under Service Tax law.
- Their income of Rs. 82,55,645/- during the FY 2014-15 covered under the head of Medical Practice Income. All the fees received under head of Section 194J i.e. fees for technical or professional services were from medical institute and from hospitals for treating the patients. All the incomes received were for the fees for the medical profession only. He was not engaged in any other business during the relevant period.
- The appellant filed a reply to the SCN with all the required documents on 05.10.2020, which was completely overlooked by the adjudicating authority. The copy of the same submitted along with appeal memorandum.
- The appellant not received any letters for PH, however, the adjudicating authority issued the impugned order by mentioning that "Personal Hearing were fixed on 11.02.2022, 18.05.2022, 14.07.2022 and 22.08.2022, 22.09.2022, and personal hearing letters were sent by speed post at registered address of the assessee. But the assessee has not appeared for PH.", which was mere negligence of the concept of natural justice.

4. Personal hearing in the case was held on 15.02.2023. Shri Samyak Sanghvi, Chartered Accountant, appeared on behalf of the appellant for personal hearing. He reiterated submission made in appeal memorandum. He stated that he would make additional written submission in the case.

4.1 The appellant vide letter dated 23.02.2023 submitted additional written submission, wherein they, inter alia, submitted that the income of Rs. 82,55,645/- received by them was from medical practice and exempted from the service tax as per Sr. No. 2 of Notification No. 25/2012-ST dated 20.06.2012. The appellant vide letter dated 28.02.2023 also submitted and extended the process of the service tax as per Sr. No. 2 of Notification No. 25/2012-ST dated 20.06.2012. The appellant vide letter dated 28.02.2023 also submitted and extended the process of the process of the service tax as per Sr. No. 2 of Notification No. 25/2012-ST dated 20.06.2012. The appellant vide letter dated 28.02.2023 also submitted and extended the process of th

तस्त एवं से

cosmetic or plastic surgery during the FY 2014-15. They have also provided income ledger for FY 2014-15, Balance Sheet and Profit & Loss Account for the FY 2013-14 and details explaining what type of service provided by them at various hospitals.

5. I have carefully gone through the facts of the case, grounds of appeal, submissions made in the Appeal Memorandum and documents available on record. The issue to be decided in the present appeal is whether the impugned order passed by the adjudicating authority, confirming the demand against the appellant along with interest and penalty, in the facts and circumstance of the case is legal and proper or otherwise. The demand pertains to the period FY 2014-15.

6. I find that in the SCN in question, the demand has been raised for the period FY 2014-15 based on the Income Tax Returns filed by the appellant. Except for the value of "Sales of Services under Sales / Gross Receipts from Services" provided by the Income Tax Department, no other cogent reason or justification is forthcoming from the SCN for raising the demand against the appellant. It is also not specified as to under which category of service the non-levy of service tax is alleged against the appellant. Merely because the appellant had reported receipts from services, the same cannot form the basis for arriving at the conclusion that the respondent was liable to pay service tax, which was not paid by them. In this regard, I find that CBIC had, vide Instruction dated 26.10.2021, directed that:

"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."

6.1 In the present case, I find that letters were issued to the appellant seeking details and documents, which were allegedly not submitted by them. However, without any further inquiry or investigation, the SCN has been issued only on the basis of details received from the Income Tax department, without even specifying the category of service in respect of

which service tax is sought to be levied and collected. This, in my considered view, is not a valid ground for raising of demand of service tax.

6.2 The appellant also contended that they have not received any letters of personal hearing and they have filed a reply to the SCN with all the required documents on 05.10.2020, which was completely overlooked by the adjudicating authority. On verification of the copy of the letter dated 01.10.2020, which was received by the adjudicating authority on 05.10.2020, I find that the appellant submitted the reply to the SCN immediately on receipt of show cause notice. However, the adjudicating authority had not taken the same into consideration and passed impugned order ex-parte. Thus, I find that the adjudicating authority has passed the impugned order violating the principles of natural justice.

7. It is observed from the case records that the appellant is a Practicing Urologist, having registration with The Gujarat Medical Council Registration No. G-15889. He has submitted his Medical Certificate No.G-33498 dated 08.09.2003 issued by the Gujarat Medical Council, Ahmedabad, indicating his registration with the Gujarat Medical Council.

8. As regards the exemption claimed by the appellant, it is observed that as per Sr. No. 2 of the Notification No. 25/2012-ST dated 20.06.2012, Health Care Services provided by a clinical establishment or an authorized medical practitioner or para-medics, are exempted taxable services from the whole of the service tax leviable thereon under section 66B of the said Act.

7.1 As per definition of Health Care Services given in Para 2(t) of the Notification No. 25/2012-ST dated 20.06.2012, "Health Care Services" – means any service by way of diagnosis or treatment or care for illness, injury, deformity, abnormality or pregnancy in any recognized system of medicines in India and includes services by way of transportation of the patient to and from a clinical establishment, but does not include hair transplant or cosmetic or plastic surgery, except when undertaken to restore or to reconstruct anatomy or functions of body affected due to congenital defects, developmental abnormalities, injury or trauma.

7.2 Further, as per definition of Authorised Medical Practitioner given in Para 2(d) of the Notification No. 25/2012-ST dated 20.06.2012, "Authorised Medical Practitioner" means a medical practitioner registered with any of the councils of the recognized system of medicines established or recognized by law in India and includes a medical professional having the requisite qualification to practice in any recognized system of medicines in India

7.3 Further, as per definition of Clinical Establishment given in per Para 2(j) of the Notification No. 25/2012-ST dated 20.06.2012, "Clinical Establishment" means a hospital, nursing home, clinic, sanatorium or any other institution by, whatever name called, that offers services or facilities requiring diagnosis or treatment or care for illness, injury, deformity, abnormality or pregnancy in any recognized system of medicines in India, or a place established as an independent entity or a part of an establishment to carry out diagnostic or investigative services of diseases.

7.4 In view of the above, I find that the Health Care Services provided by a clinical establishment, an authorized medical practitioner or para-medics, are exempted from the whole of the service tax leviable thereon under section 66B of the said Act. In the present case, the appellant has submitted his medical registration certificate, and also submitted details of the service provided by him. As per the ledger and details provided by the appellant, I find that during the FY 2014-15, the appellant had received total income of Rs. 82,55,146/-, out of which the appellant had received Rs. 9,48,500/- from OPD income, Rs. 9,43,200/- from Operation Income, and remaining Rs. 63,63,446/- were received from providing treatment of patient at various Hospitals.

7.5 In view of the above, I am of considered opinion that the appellant during the FY 2014-15 were engaged in providing Health Care Services, which are exempted from levy of the service tax thereon under Section 66B of the Finance Act, 1994 in terms of Sr. No. 2 of Notification No. 25/2012-ST dated 20.06.2012. Thus, the income received by them during the FY 2014-15 is not liable for Service Tax as demanded under the instant Show Cause Notice. The impugned order is not legally sustainable on merits and is liable to be set aside.

8. Since the demand of service tax is not sustainable on merits, I am not delving into the aspect of natural justice raised by the appellant. When the demand fails, there does not arise any question of charging interest or imposing penalty in the case.

9. Accordingly, I set aside the impugned order and allow the appeal filed by the appellant.

10.

. 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.

LOB 10

(Akhilesh Kumar) Commissioner (Appeals)



#### F.No. GAPPL/COM/STP/3276/2022-Appeal

Date : 03.03.2023

Attested

(R. C. Maniyar) Superintendent(Appeals), CGST, Ahmedabad

### **By RPAD / SPEED POST**

To,

M/s. Kirtipal Navghanbhai Visana, 2, Heritage Residency, Thaltej-Shilaj Road, Thaltej, Ahmedabad – 380059

The Assistant Commissioner, CGST, Division-VI, Ahmedabad North

Copy to :

1) The Principal Chief Commissioner, Central GST, Ahmedabad Zone

2) The Commissioner, CGST, Ahmedabad North

3) The Assistant Commissioner, CGST, Division VI, Ahmedabad North

4) The Assistant Commissioner (HQ System), CGST, Ahmedabad North

(for uploading the OIA)

6) PA file



Appellant

Respondent

