

<u>रजिस्टर डाक ए.डी.दारा</u>

- फाइल संख्या (File No.): V2(73)55 /Ahd-II/Appeals-II/ 2015-16 / 3 9 48 10 3402 क स्थगन आवेदन संख्या(Stay App. No.):
- अपील आदेश संख्या (Order-In-Appeal No.): AHM-EXCUS-002-APP- 067-16-17 ख दिनांक (Date): 30.11.2016, जारी करने की तारीख (Date of issue): 06/12/20 श्री उमा शंकर, आयुक्त (अपील-II) द्वारा पारित Passed by Shri Uma Shanker, Commissioner (Appeals-II)
- . आयुक्त, केंद्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क, (मंडल-II), अहमदाबाद- ॥, आयुक्तालय द्वारा जारी ਗ ं से सृजित दिनांक मूल आदेश सं Arising out of Order-In-Original No. MP/14/Dem/AC/2015/AP Dated: 29-06-2015 issued by: AssistantCentral Excise (Div-II), Ahmedabad-II
- अपीलकर्ता/प्रतिवादी का नाम एवम पता (Name & Address of the Appellant/Respondent) घ

M/s Gujarat Techno Castings Pvt. Ltd.

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 an 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) (क) (i) केंद्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क अधिनियम 1994 की धरा अतत नीचे बताए गए मामलों के बारे में पूर्वोक्त धारा को उप-धारा के प्रथम परंतुक 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 Government of India, Revision Application Unit, Ministry of Finance, Department of Revenue, 4th Floor, Jeevan Deep Building, Parliament Street, New Delhi-110001, 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:

यदि माल की हानि के मामले में जब हानि कारखाने से किसी भंडारगार या अन्य कारखाने में या किसी (ii) भंडारगार से दूसरे भंडारगार में माल ले जाते हुए मार्ग में, या किसी भंडारगार या भंडार में चाहे वह किसी कारखाने में या किसी भंडारगार में 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

भारत के बाहर किसी राष्ट्र या प्रदेश में निर्यातित माल पर या माल के विनिर्माण में उपयोग शुल्क (ख) कच्चे माल पर उत्पादन शुल्क के रिबेट के मामले में जो भारत के बाहर किसी राष्ट्र या प्रदेश में निर्यातित है |

h.file



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।

- (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.100 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, ∴nder 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 अंतर्गतः—

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

- (क) वर्गीकरण मूल्यांकन से संबंधित सभी मामले सीमा शुल्क, केन्द्रीय उत्पादन शुल्क एवं सेवाकर अपीलीय न्यायाधिकरण की विशेष पीठिका वेस्ट ब्लाँक नं. 3. आर. के. पुरम, नई दिल्ली को एवं
- (a) the special bench of Custom, Excise & Service Tax Appellate Tribunal of West Hock No.2, R.K. Puram, New Delhi-1 in all matters relating to classification valuation and.
- (ख) उक्तलिखित परिच्छेद २ (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 ओ–20, न्यू मैन्टल हास्पिटल कम्पाउण्ड, मेघाणी नगर, अहमदाबाद–380016.
- (b) To the west regional bench of Customs, Excise & Service Tax Appellate Tribunal (CESTAT) at O-20, New Metal Hospital Compound, Meghani Nagar, Ahmedabad : 380 016. 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 न्यायाधिकरणें की गई अपील के विरुद्व अपील किए गए आदेश की चार प्रतियाँ सहित जहाँ उत्पाद शुल्क की मांग, ब्याज की मांग ओर लगाया गया जुर्माना रूपए 5 लाख या उससे कम है वहां रूपए 1000/– फीस भेजनी की मांग, ब्याज की मांग ओर लगाया गया जुर्माना रूपए 5 लाख या उससे कम है वहां रूपए 1000/– फीस भेजनी होगी। जहाँ उत्पाद शुल्क की मांग, ब्याज की मांग ओर 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 ओर लगाया गया जुर्माना रूपए 50 लाख या उससे ज्यादा है वहां रूपए 10000/– फीस भेजनी होगी। की फीस सहायक रजिस्टार के नाम सिल्क आयुक रेखाकित बैंक ड्राफ्ट के रूप में संबंध की जाये। यह ड्राफ्ट उस स्थान के किसी नामित सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र के शाखा का हो जहाँ उक्त न्यायाधिकरण की पीठ स्थित है।

अहमदाबाद

C

(C)

रेखाकित बैंक ड्राफ्ट के रूप में संबंध की जाये। यह ड्राफ्ट उस र्ख्यान के किसी नामित सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र के बैंक की शाखा का हो जहाँ उक्त न्यायाधिकरण की पीठ स्थित है।

.

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.1,00/-, 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 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 not withstanding 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 अनुसूचि–1 के अंतर्गत निर्धारित किए अनुसार उक्त आवेदन या मूल आदेश यथास्थिति निर्णयन प्राधिकारी के आदेश में से प्रत्येक की एक प्रति पर 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 <u>(सिस्टेट)</u>, के प्रति अपीलो के मामले में कर्तव्य मांग (Demand) एवं दंड (Penalty) का 10% पूर्व जमा करना अनिवार्य है। हालांकि, अधिकतम पूर्व जमा 10 करोड़ रुपए है I(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;
- (ii) लिया गलत सेनवैट क्रेडिट की राशि;

1

- (iii) 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. 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.

इस सन्दर्भ में 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."



Order in appeal

- 4-

The subject appeal is filed by M/s. Gujarat Techno castings Pvt. Ltd. near G.D. High school, Saijpur Bogha, Ahmedabad (hereinafter referred to as 'the appellant') against the Order in Original No.MP/14/DEM/AC/2015/AP (hereinafter referred to as 'the impugned order') passed by the Assistant Commissioner, Central Excise,Div-II, Ahmedabad-II (hereinafter referred to as 'the adjudicating authority'). The appellant is engaged in the manufacture of cast article of iron or steel falling under Chapter 73 of the Central Excise Tariff Act 1985.

The facts in brief of the case is, that the appellant had utilized the patterns, 2. supplied free of cost by the buyers during manufacturing of the final products i.e. CI Casting and cleared finished goods without including the cost of such patterns in the assessable value of finished goods. as per Explanation to Rule 6 of the Central Excise Valuation (Determination of Price of Excisable Goods) Rules, 2000 cost of such patterns, supplied free of cost by the buyer should form part of assessable in view of section 4(1)(b) of Central Excise Act, 1944 read with Rule 6 of Central Excise Valuation (Determination of Price of Excisable Goods) Rules, 2000. Further, the appellant submitted a report of valuation for the period from March-2010 to March- 2014, came to the tune of Rs.19,84,025/-and Excise duty of Rs.2,14,054/. The appellant has contravened the provisions of the Rule 4 of the Central Excise Rules, 2002, as they failed to pay correct amount of duty with intent to evade payment of duty; and all the contraventions by way of suppression of facts, and liable for penal action under provisions of Section 11AC of the Central Excise Act, 1944 read with Rule 25 ibid. SCN was issued demanding duty of Rs.2,14,054/- with interest and penalty. Said SCN was decided vide above order and confirmed the demand.

3. Being aggrieved by the impugned order, the present appeal has been filed by the appellant on the following main grounds:

As per Section 4(1)(a) of Central Excise Act 1944 duty of excise is chargeable on the value of goods sold at the time and place of removal where price is the sole consideration and the assessee and the buyers are not related. In the present case the buyers are not related and the department has not adduced any evidence that the buyers are related.

They had actually included the cost of patterns supplied by the buyers in the assessable value of finished goods in all the invoices. They also submitted certificate from Cost Accountant .They rely on the case of *Machino Plastics Ltd*-2013 (296) E.L.T. 356 (Tn. - Del.) The demand for the period prior to 17.03.2014 is hit by limitation under Section 11A . The appellant unit was audited in August 2010 and July 2012 when the records were audited, but no objection was raised by the department. Further the payment of duty on the value inclusive of the cost of patterns is mentioned in the invoices and reflected in ER-1 returns. They rely on the case laws of 1. PAHWA CHEMICALS PRIVATE LIMITED reported at 2005 (189) ELT.257 (S.C) 2. ESCORTS LIMITED (TED), FARIDABAD2009(235) E.L.T.55 (P&H) .



F.NO.V2[73]55/Ahd-II/Appeal-II/15-16

That they had not withheld any information from the department or not provided any false information with intent to evade payment of service tax, hence the penalty under Section 11AC should not imposed. they relied upon the following decisions case of :- 1. Continental Foundations Jt. Venture- 2007(216)E.L.T.177(S.C.) 2. Mysore Kirloskar Ltd. 2008(226)E.L.T.161(S.C.) 3. Cosmic Dye Chemical 1995(75)E.L.T.721(S.C.)

Personal hearing in the case was held on 14.09.2016. Shri M.H.Raval, 4. Consultant; appeared on behalf of the appellant, and reiterated the contents of the written submission. I have carefully gone through the case records, written submission and submissions made during the personal hearing. The issue before me is whether the finished goods i.e. CI casting cleared by the appellant has been properly valued in the context of patterns supplied by customers free of cost. I find that, There is no dispute that the apportioned cost of moulds for the period under dispute comes to Rs. 19,84,025/-, as per valuation report prepared by their Chartered Engineer. The appellant has submitted that the cost of pattern has formed part of the assessable value and submitted copies of some invoices wherein it is mentioned that PATN, COST INCL. IN RATE'. i.e bill value is collected from the customer. However no addition for apportioned cost of pattern is found to be made in the invoices to arrive at the assessable value. When no such addition is explicitly made and a remark would only prove that the rate per unit of quantity shown in invoice is the rate charged when pattern are supplied by the buyer free of cost and this cost is not borne by the appellant. Only cost borne by the seller out of the transaction value can be said to have formed part of assessable value. The submission of the appellant that Cost Accountant has certified that cost of patterns has been included in assessable value is far from the facts as no such Certificate of Cost Accountant is submitted by them in response to the subject SCN. Only Certificate submitted by the appellant pertains to valuation of patterns and amortised cost attributable to the clearances made during the period under question. he has not certified anything in relation to inclusion of amortized cost to arrive at the assessable value.

5. I find that, In terms of Section 4(1)(a) of the Central Excise Act, 1944, duty of excise is chargeable on value of goods (*be the transaction value*) sold at the time and place of removal where *the price is the sole consideration* and the assessee and the buyers are not related person. However in the present case the patterns were supplied free of cost by the buyers and hence transaction value is to be determined u/s 4(1) (b) read with Rule 6 of Central Excise Valuation (Determination of Price of Excisable Goods) Rules,2000 which reads as under :-

RULE 6. Where the excisable goods are sold in the circumstances specified in clause (a) of sub section (1) of section 4 of the Act except the circumstance where the price is not the sole consideration for sale, the value of such goods shall be deemed to be the aggregate of such transaction value and the amount of money value of any additional consideration flowing directly or indirectly from the buyer to the assessee.



H

F.NO.V2[73]55/Ahd-II/Appeal-II/15-16

Explanation 1 - For removal of doubts, it is hereby clarified that the value, apportioned as appropriate, of the following goods and services, whether supplied directly or indirectly by the buyer free of charge or at reduced cost for use in connection with the production and sale of such goods, to the extent that such value has not been included in the price actually paid or payable, shall be treated to be the amount of money value of additional consideration flowing directly or indirectly from the buyer to the assessee in relation to sale of the goods being valued and aggregated accordingly, namely -

value of materials, components, parts and similar items relatable to Isuch goods:

value of tools, dies, moulds, drawings, blue prints, technical maps and charts and similar items used in the production of such goods;

value of material consumed, including packaging materials, in the production of such goods;

value of engineering, development, art work, design work and plans and sketches undertaken elsewhere than in the factory of production and necessary for the production of such goods.

6. I find that, In the present case, it is evident that the customers of the appellant has supplied patterns free of cost for manufacturing of CI Casting, however, the appellant has not included the amortised cost of dies and failed to determine the correct transaction value of the goods sold to such buyers who have supplied the Patterns/Moulds etc. I find that the appellant is registered with Central Excise Department and they are aware of the Rules/ Laws of the Department. The appellant is working under Self Removal Procedure and they are clearing their goods on self-assessment basis without physical verification or valuation by the transaction value. In spite of the same they had not included the pattern cost in the final assessable value. Thus, I find that, the appellant had contravened the provisions of the Rule 4 of Cenvat Credit Rules, 2004.Therfore; they are liable to pay differential duty along with interest as applicable.

7. Regarding the issue of imposition of penalty, I find that appellant has taken registration with the department and they have suppressed the material facts of the Activity of manufacture and clearance of goods and the facts of their non including the cost of patterns in the assessable value. As there was fraud, suppression, willful misstatement and intention to evade duty involved in this case; demand of duty invoking larger period of limitation is legal. Therefore, I find that the adjudicating Authority has correctly imposed the penalty.

8. In view of the foregoing discussion and findings, I uphold the impugned order and disallow the appeal filed by the appellant.

9. अपीलकर्ता द्वारा दर्ज की गई अपीलो का निपटारा उपरोक्त तरीके से किया जाता है।

The appeals filed by the appellant stand disposed off in above terms. 24121

आयुक्त (अपील्स - II)

(उमा शंकर)

लक आर

Attested

TOP 00

[K.K.Parmar) Superintendent (Appeals-II) Central excise, Ahmedabad.

By Regd. Post Ad.

M/s. Gujarat Techno castings Pvt. Ltd. Near G.D. High school, Saijpur Bogha, Ahmedabad - 382345

Copy to :

<u>1</u>.The Chief Commissioner, Central Excise, Ahmedabad.
The Commissioner, Central Excise, Ahmedabad-II.

3. The Asstt. Commissioner, Central Excise, Div-II, AhmedabadII

4.The Asstt.Commissioner (Systems), Central Excise, Ahmedabad-II.

5.Guard file.

б. PA file.



/ ,

