



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:- 20231264SW0000813143

(क)	फ़ाइल संख्या / File No.	GAPPL/COM/STP/2233/2023/9962-66
(ख)	अपील आदेश संख्या और दिनांक / Order-In -Appeal and date	AHM-EXCUS-002-APP-161/23-24 and 18.12.2023
(ग)	पारित किया गया / Passed By	श्री ज्ञानचंद जैन, आयुक्त (अपील) Shri Gyan Chand Jain, Commissioner (Appeals)
(घ)	जारी करने की दिनांक / Date of Issue	28.12.2023
(ङ)	Arising out of Order-In-Original No. CGST/WT07/HG/668/2022-23 dated 9.12.2022 passed by The The Assistant Commissioner, CGST Division-VII, Ahmedabad North	
(च)	अपीलकर्ता का नाम और पता / Name and Address of the Appellant	Sumitra Gopal Jayswal 10, Hanuman Nagar, Nr. Prerna High School Bh. Janta Nagar, Chandkheda Ahmedabad - 382424

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 में 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 भीतर मूल-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 होतो रुपये 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 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-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. 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 रु 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.



ORDER-IN-APPEAL

The present appeal has been filed by M/s. Sumitra Gopal Jayswal, 10, Hanuman Nagar, Near Prerna High School, Behind Janta Nagar, Chandkheda, Ahmedabad - 382424 (hereinafter referred to as "the appellant") against Order-in-Original No. CGST/WT07/HG/668/2022-23 dated 09.12.2022 (hereinafter referred to as "the impugned order") passed by the Assistant Commissioner, Central GST, Division VII, Ahmedabad North (hereinafter referred to as "the adjudicating authority").

2. Briefly stated, the facts of the case are that the appellant are holding PAN No. AUUPJ8498H. On scrutiny of the data received from the Central Board of Direct Taxes (CBDT) for the FY 2015-16, it was noticed that the appellant had earned an income of Rs. 10,05,250/- during the FY 2015-16, which was reflected under the heads "Sales / Gross Receipts from Services (Value from ITR)" filed with 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 were 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 were issued a Show Cause Notice No. CGST/A'bad-North/Div-VII/AR-IV/TPD/UNREG 15-16/151/20-21 dated 23.12.2020 demanding Service Tax amounting to Rs. 1,45,761/- for the period FY 2015-16, under provisions of Section 73(1) 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 77(1)(a), Section 77(1)(c), Section 77(2) and Section 78 of the Finance Act, 1994. The SCN also proposed recovery of un-quantified amount of Service Tax for the period FY 2016-17 & FY 2017-18 (up to Jun-17).

2.2 The Show Cause Notice was adjudicated, ex-parte, vide the impugned order by the adjudicating authority wherein the demand of Service Tax amounting to Rs. 1,45,761/- 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 FY 2015-16. Further, (i) Penalty of Rs. 1,45,761/- was imposed on the appellant under Section 78 of the Finance Act, 1994; (ii) Penalty of Rs. 3,000/- was imposed on the appellant under Section 77(1)(a) and Section 77(1)(c) of the Finance Act, 1994; and (iii) Penalty of Rs. 3,000/- was imposed on the appellant under Section 77(2) of the Finance Act, 1994 for not submitting documents to the department, when called for.



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

- The appellant received the Impugned OIA on dated 02.01.2023 and the appeal was required to be filed on or before 01.03.2023.however, the appellant met with an accident and failed to supply the documents to tax consultant . They also faced the problem during the pre-deposit payment process. Therefore there was a delay in filing appeal of 16 days. The applicant has requested to consider the cause of delay.
- The appellant is an individual and engaged in the business of manufacturing of Iron & Metal items in the name of 'Ashutosh Welding Works'. They are providing iron products like windows, doors, gates, balcony coverings, etc.
- The appellant also files Income Tax Returns regularly from which it can be seen that they have shown the respective income from the business of Ashutosh Welding Works since long back. The income showing in Income Tax Return is nothing but the income generated from such manufacturing activity. These services cannot be attributable to Service Tax as per the Notification No. 25/2012-ST dated 20.06.2012.
- The adjudicating authority failed to appreciate that Service Tax liability cannot be determined merely relying upon the data received from CBDT in Income Tax Return. The impugned order was passed without looking into the facts and legal provisions.
- The demand for the FY 2015-16 is time barred and therefore the same is not sustainable.
- The adjudicating authority ought to have applied concessional rates of taxes considering the nomenclature of work executed by the appellant.
- The adjudicating authority has not been extended the benefit of cum duty price as per Section 67(2) of the Finance Act, 1994.
- The appellant may granted the basic exemption of Rs. 10,00,000/- while working out the amount of chargeable services.



- The adjudicating authority has failed to appreciate that penalty can be levied only if there is fraud, collusion, willful misstatement, suppression of facts or contravention of any provisions with intent to evade payment of service tax. The adjudicating authority has not found any of such intent in the impugned order passed by him. Further, The appellant prayed that the appeal may be accepted and the OIO may be set aside in light of the above.

4. Personal hearing in the matter was held on dated 05.12.2023. Shri Vivek N Chavda, Advocate, appeared on behalf of the appellant. He reiterated the written submission and stated his client does fabrication which is manufacturing activity, therefore not liable to service tax and requested to allow their appeal.

5. On going through the appeal memorandum, it is noticed that the impugned order was issued on 09.12.2022 and received by the appellant on 02.01.2023. However, the present appeal, in terms of Section 85 of the Finance Act, 1994 was filed on 17.03.2022, i.e. after a delay of 16 days. The appellant have along with appeal memorandum also filed an Application seeking condonation of delay stating that the appellant after receipt of impugned order met with an accident and could not furnish papers to the appellate tax consultant. Moreover, the website of CBIC was also not responding properly after generating pre-deposit payment mandate. The reason for delay is that the portal of CBIC through which the appellant was supposed to download the challan was erroneous and the appellant was unable to download it. Despite, their best efforts, they were unable to obtain the challan within the given time frame due to the technical issue on the portal. This has cause a delay in filing the appeal.

6. Before taking up the issue on merits, I proceed to decide the application filed seeking condonation of delay. As per Section 85 of the Finance Act, 1994, an appeal should be filed within a period of 2 months from the dates of receipt of the decision or order passed by the adjudicating authority. Under the proviso appended to sub-section (3A) of Section 85 of the Finance Act, 1994, the Commissioner (Appeals) is empowered to condone the delay or to allow the filing of an appeal within a further period of one month thereafter if, he is satisfied that the appellant was prevented by sufficient cause from presenting the appeal within the period of two months. Considering the cause of delay given in application as genuine, I condone the delay of 16 days and take up the appeal for decision on merits.

7. 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 of service tax 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 2015-16.


6. I find that in the SCN in question, the demand has been raised for the period FY 2015-16 based on the Income Tax Returns filed by the appellant. Except for the value of "Sales of Services" provided by the Income Tax Department, no other reason or justification is seen in the SCN for raising the demand against the appellant. As the appellant has shown their income from "Sales of Services" in their ITR filed for the F.Y 2015-16 and failed to get registered with the service tax department and filing ST-3 returns, the demand was raised. As the appellant couldn't submit the relevant document and failed to reply the SCN, the adjudicating authority confirmed the demand.

7 Now, as the written and verbal submission by the appellant has been made before me . As per submission filed by the appellant, the appellant was engaged in manufacturing and selling of iron & metal items i.e. windows, doors, gates, balcony coverings etc. in the name of "Ashutosh Welding Works". The Income shown in the ITR for the F.Y. 2015-16, of Rs. 10,05,250/- was received against the same. While going through the submission it couldn't be established that the income is earned from the any manufacturing activity as they have not furnished any sale / purchase invoice and no opening and closing stock in the ITR was shown.

Further, ITR for the previous F. year 2014-15 is also furnished in which the total income Rs. 9,45,000/- is also shown against "Sale of service". The appellant is contending that they are eligible to SSI exemption of Rs. 10 Lakhs as per Noti 33/2012-ST dated 20.06.2012 which appears to be available to them. Accordingly, the benefit of the SSI exemption may be extended to them and the service tax may be demanded on the remaining amount Rs. 5,250/- (10,05,250-10,00,000).

8. In view of the above discussion, I am of the considered view that the activity carried out by the appellant are liable to pay Service Tax during the FY 2015-16. Since the benefit of SSI exemption is available to them and the service tax Rs 761/- on the taxable value Rs. 5,250/- is required to be recovered along with the applicable interest.

9. I uphold the penalty equal to service tax Rs. 761/- on the service provider under section 78 of the Finance Act.



10. I uphold the penalty of Rs. 3,000/-on the said service provider under section 77(1)(a) & 77(1)(c) of the Finance Act.

11. I uphold the penalty of Rs. 3,000/-on the said service provider under section 77(1)(a) & 77(2) of the Finance Act.

12. 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.

Attested

(Manish Kumar)
Superintendent(Appeals),
CGST, Ahmedabad

By RPAD / SPEED POST

To,

M/s. Sumitra Gopal Jayswal,
10, Hanuman Nagar, Near Prerna High School,
Behind Janta Nagar, Chandkheda,
Ahmedabad - 382424

The Assistant Commissioner,
CGST, Division-VII,
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 VII, Ahmedabad North
 - 4) The Assistant Commissioner (HQ System), CGST, Ahmedabad North
- (for uploading the OIA)


5) Guard File

6) PA file

G.C.J.
18.12.23
(ज्ञानचंद जैन)

आयुक्त (अपील्स)

Date: 18.12.23



Appellant

Respondent