



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:- 20240164SW000000FC88

(क)	फ़ाइल संख्या / File No.	GAPPL/COM/STP/2442/2023 / 506-80
(ख)	अपील आदेश संख्या और दिनांक / Order-In -Appeal and date	AHM-EXCUS-002-APP-165/23-24 and 21.12.2023
(ग)	पारित किया गया / Passed By	श्री ग्यानचंद जैन, आयुक्त (अपील) Shri Gyan Chand Jain, Commissioner (Appeals)
(घ)	जारी करने की दिनांक / Date of Issue	03.01.2024
(ङ)	Arising out of Order-In-Original No. CGST/WT07/HG/829/2022-23 dated 27.1.2023 passed by The The Assistant Commissioner, CGST Division-VII, Ahmedabad North	
(च)	अपीलकर्ता का नाम और पता / Name and Address of the Appellant	Anjana Sumarkumar Barot D-10, Divine HilandScience City Road, Sola Ahmedabad - 380060

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 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 मामले 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 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 रुपये या उससे कम होतो रुपये 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 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 पढ़ी 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. Anjana Sumarkumar Barot, D-10, Divine Hiland, Science City Road, Sola, Ahmedabad - 380060 (hereinafter referred to as "the appellant") against Order-in-Original No. CGST/WT07/HG/829/2022-23 dated 27.01.2023 (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 were holding Service Tax Registration No. ABWPB4428LSD001. On scrutiny of the data received from the Central Board of Direct Taxes (CBDT) for the Financial Year 2015-16, it was noticed that there is difference of value of service amounting to Rs. 7,50,000/- between the gross value of service provided in the said ITR data and the gross value of service shown in Service Tax return filed by the appellant for the FY 2015-16. The appellant were called upon to submit clarification for difference along with supporting documents, 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. CGST/AR-III/Div-VII/A'bad North/TPD-UR/53/20-21 dated 26.09.2020 demanding Service Tax amounting to Rs. 1,08,750/- for the period FY 2015-16, 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 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. 1,08,750/- 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 2015-16. Further, (i) Penalty of Rs. 1,08,750/- was imposed on the appellant under Section 78 of the Finance Act, 1994. (ii) Penalty of Rs. 1,000/- 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. 1,000/- 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 are engaged in the business of Consulting Engineering Services, Renting of Immovable Property Services, Works Contract Services and Legal Consultancy Services. They have started their business in FY 2015-16 itself and by the end of October-2015, their total value of taxable services (i.e. Renting of Immovable Property for commercial purpose and income by way of Legal Consultancy Services) was crossing the threshold of Rs. 9,00,000/- as defined under Service Tax Act, 1994 and hence, they have applied for and obtained Service Tax Registration as on 26.11.2015
- They have collected and paid the service tax to the government once their income crossed Rs. 9,00,000/-. Bifurcation of taxable supplied made and shown in Service Tax Return is as under:

Sr. No.	Particulars	Amount (in Rs.)
1	Turnover prior to 31.10.2015	7,50,000/-
2	Turnover from 31.10.2015 to 31.03.2016 (As reported in ST-3)	24,00,000/-
	Total (As appearing in 26AS and as reported in ITR)	31,50,000/-

- The said income was reported in Income Tax Return for FY 2015-16 as follows:

Sr. No.	Particulars	Amount (in Rs.)	Head of income reported in ITR
1	Rent Income	16,50,000/-	Income from House Property
2	Professional Income	15,00,000/-	Income from Business Profession (Gross Sale of Services)
	Total	31,50,000/-	

- They have submitted ITR, Form 26AS, Sales Register for the FY 2015-16 along with appeal memorandum.
- The appellant submitted that in as above, there is no short payment of service tax. They have not received the Show Cause Notice dated 26.09.2020 or any letter for personal hearing issued on 09.01.2023, 16.01.2023 and 23.01.2023 as mentioned in impugned order as and when issued as all of them were communicated on the address as is available in service tax records, but, they had shifted from there. The appellant



further prayed that the appeal may be accepted and the OIO may be set aside in light of the above.

4. Personal hearing in the case was held on 25.09.2023. Shri Arjun Patel, Chartered Accountant, appeared on behalf of the appellant for personal hearing. He reiterated submissions made in appeal memorandum. He further submitted that the appellant had income of 15 Lakhs from renting of immovable property. The appellant has taken ST registration in 2015-16 after crossing receipt of Rs. 9 lakhs. the appellant has paid service tax on total 24 lakhs for the F.Y. 2015-16. There is no short payment of service tax and the OIO is passed erroneously and requested to set aside the same.


Further, due to change in the appellate authority, Personal hearing in the case was again held on dated 11.12.2023. Ms. Ritu Mehta appeared on behalf of the appellant for personal hearing and reiterated the earlier submission made in the appeal. She stated that in the previous F.Y. 2014-15, their service turnover was only 9,45,000/- and ITR for the F.Y. 2014-15 is furnished in support of the claim. Further she stated that for the F.Y. 2015-16, their client has paid S. Tax on total taxable value Rs. 24 Lakhs while total income as per 26AS is 31.5 lakhs. The difference is Rs. 7.5 Lakhs on which S tax is demanded. In this regard she stated that they are eligible to get threshold exemption as per notification 33/2012-ST dated 20.06.2012 and no service tax liability is upon their client. She requested to allow the appeal.

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 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. As per appellant submission, I find that letters were issued to the appellant seeking details and documents, which couldn't be delivered to them due to change in the address. The appellant failed to file their submission and the adjudicating authority passed the impugned order ex-parte.

It is observed that main contention of the appellant is that they have paid required Service Tax as per reconciliation submitted by them and there is no short payment of the service tax as they are eligible to avail benefit of threshold exemption as per notification 33/2012-ST dated 20.06.2012.

7. From the submission it can be seen that the appellant were providing taxable services during FY 2015-16 and they have crossed the threshold of Rs. 9,00,000/- in October-2015 and



obtained Service Tax Registration as on 26.11.2015. The appellant had total income of Rs. 31,50,000/- during the FY 2015-16, out of which Rs. 16,50,000/- was received from Renting of Immovable Property and income of Rs. 15,00,000/- was received from Legal Consultancy Services. As they have filed their ST-3 Return for October-2015 to March-2016 showing the taxable value of Rs. 24,00,000/- and claiming threshold exemption against the taxable value Rs. 7.5 Lakhs. as per notification 33/2012-ST dated 20.06.2012 and the same appears to be available to them as the turnover of the preceding F.Y. 2014-15 was below than 10 Lakhs as per the ITR furnished.

8. In view of the above it appears that the appellant has paid the required Service Tax and shown the same in their ST-3 Return filed for the period from October-2015 to March-2016 and there was no short payment of service tax as alleged in the Show Cause Notice. Therefore, the impugned order confirming demand of service tax is not legally correct. Since the demand of service tax is not sustainable on merits, there does not arise any question of charging interest or imposing penalties in the case.

9. In view of above, I hold that the impugned order passed by the adjudicating authority confirming demand of Service Tax on the income received by the appellant during the FY 2015-16, is not legal and proper and deserve to be set aside. 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.

Attested

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

By RPAD / SPEED POST

To,

M/s. Anjana Sumarkumar Barot,
D-10, Divine Hiland,
Science City Road, Sola,
Ahmedabad - 380060

[Signature]
21.12.23
(ज्ञानचंद जैन)
आयुक्त (अपील)



Appellant

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

Respondent

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

