



सत्यमेव जयते

केंद्रीय कर आयुक्त (अपील)

O/O THE COMMISSIONER (APPEALS), CENTRAL TAX,

केंद्रीय कर भवन,

7th Floor, GST Building,

Near Polytechnic,

सातवीं मंजिल, पोलिटेकनिक के पास,

Ambavadi, Ahmedabad-380015

आम्बावाडी, अहमदाबाद-380015

☎ : 079-26305065

टेलिफैक्स : 079 - 26305136



रजिस्टर्ड डाक ए.डी. द्वारा

क फाइल संख्या : File No : V2(84)/133/Ahd-I/2017-18
Stay Appl.No. NA/2017-18

1147/01/18

ख अपील आदेश संख्या Order-In-Appeal Nos. AHM-EXCUS-001-APP-319-2017-18
दिनांक Date : 12-02-2018 जारी करने की तारीख Date of Issue

20/2/2018

श्री उमा शंकर आयुक्त (अपील) द्वारा पारित

Passed by Shri. Uma Shanker, Commissioner (Appeals)

ग Arising out of Order-in-Original No. CGST-VI/REF-27/CARBOGEN/17-18 दिनांक: 06.09.2017
issued by Assistant Commissioner, Central Tax, Ahmedabad-South

घ अपीलकर्ता का नाम एवं पता Name & Address of the Appellant / Respondent
Carbogen Amics
Ahmedabad

कोई व्यक्ति इस अपील आदेश से असंतोष अनुभव करता है तो वह इस आदेश के प्रति यथार्थिथि 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 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, रांसद 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, 4th Floor, Jævan 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 :


(ii) 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 वह किसी कारखाने में या किसी भण्डागार में हों माल की प्रक्रिया के दौरान हुई हो।

(ii) 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.

(b) 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।

... 2 ...



(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 हैं।

(b) 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।

(c) 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 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।

(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.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 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 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 रुपये या उससे कम हो तो 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 सेवाकर 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 :-

(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 (सिस्टेट) की पश्चिम क्षेत्रीय पीटिका, अहमदाबाद में ओ-20, न्यू मैटल हॉस्पिटल कम्पाउण्ड, मेघाणी नगर, अहमदाबाद-380016

(a) 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.



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 Appellate 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 मूल आदेश यथास्थिति निर्णयन प्राधिकारी के आदेश में से प्रत्येक की एक प्रति पर 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), के प्रति अपील के 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;
- (ii) लिया गलत सेनवैट क्रेडिट की राशि;
- (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, 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.

इस 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

This order arises on account of an appeal filed by M/s. Carbogen Amcis (India) Ltd., Bhadra-Raj Chambers, Swastik Cross Road, Navrangpura, Ahmedabad (hereinafter referred to as the '*the appellants*' for the sake of brevity) against Order-in-Original No. CGST-VI/REF-27/CARBOGEN/17-18 dated 06.09.2017 (hereinafter referred to as the '*impugned order*' for the sake of brevity) passed by the Assistant Commissioner, CGST, Division-VI (Vastrapur), Ahmedabad (South) (hereinafter referred to as the '*adjudicating authority*' for the sake of brevity).

2. Briefly facts of the case are that the appellants were registered with the Service Tax Department under the category of "Technical Testing and Analysis Service" and holding registration number AADCC1254ESD001. The appellants are engaged in providing the above mentioned service (export service) to M/s. Carbogen Amcis AG, Switzerland (hereinafter referred to as '*Carbogen Amcis*' for the sake of brevity). As the appellants do not have R & D laboratory, they approached M/s. Dishman Pharmaceuticals and Chemicals Ltd. (hereinafter referred to as '*Dishman Pharma*' for the sake of brevity) for the use of Dishman Pharma's R & D laboratory to render the said service. The appellants claimed that the service received from Dishman Pharma as input service for the export. Accordingly, they filed a refund claim of ₹ 37,11,956/- on 25.05.2017 for the period January 2017 to March 2017 under Notification number 27/2012-C.E.(NT) dated 18.06.2012 (hereinafter referred to as '*the said Notification*' for the sake of brevity) before the proper authority in prescribed format. The adjudicating authority, vide the impugned order, rejected the refund of ₹ 37,11,956/- in terms of Notification number 27/2012-C.E.(NT) dated 18.06.2012 issued under Rule 5 of the Cenvat Credit Rules, 2004 read with Section 11B of the Central Excise Act, 1944 as made applicable to the Service Tax matter vide Section 83 of the Finance Act, 1994 on the ground that the service received by the appellants from Dishman Pharma is not input service and rather, it should be treated as output service. Also, as the service was provided by Dishman Pharma to the appellants in the taxable territory of India, same cannot be treated as export of service as the place of provision of service was in India.

3. Being aggrieved with the impugned order, the appellants filed the present appeal on the grounds that the impugned order was passed on the basis of assumptions, presumptions, conjectures and surmises and without proper consideration of facts, records and submissions made before the adjudicating authority. They submitted that the impugned order was passed without giving them the benefit of personal hearing and thus denied the appellants the opportunity being heard in person. They argued that they had received the service from Dishman Pharma and had done value addition in accordance with the contract. They further argued that sub-contracting of services is a well accepted and standard transaction in service industry and is recognized under the Service Tax laws.




4. Personal hearing in the case was granted on 31.01.2018 wherein Shri Vikash Agarwal represented the appellants and reiterated the contents of the appeal memorandum. He claimed that earlier order of the appellants with the same issue has been remanded back for issue of speaking order.

5. I have carefully gone through the facts of the case on records, grounds of the Appeal Memorandum, and oral submissions made by the appellant at the time of personal hearing. I find that adjudicating authority has rejected the refund claim on the sole ground that the service received by the appellants from Dishman Pharma is not input service and rather, it should be treated as output service. Also, as the service was provided by Dishman Pharma to the appellants in the taxable territory of India, same cannot be treated as export of service as the place of provision of service was in India.

6. In this regard, I find that the appellants have contended the on two issues viz; (i) the main issue i.e. the adjudicating authority has considered the input service to be output service and (ii) the appellants were not given the opportunity to be heard in person.

7. Regarding the first issue, I reiterate my view which has been proclaimed in my previous order number AHM-EXCUS-002-APP-95-96-17-18 dated 28.09.2017 pertaining to the same appellants and the same issue. I consider that even if the appellants had exported the input service as such, he had carried out an activity for the foreign client in whatever manner under an agreement and for a consideration. I further consider that the appellants have provided a service and the Technical Testing and Analysis Service outsourced for this purpose has to be treated as an input service. The testing had been conducted for the purpose of developing some new molecule of the sample drugs/ materials as received by the appellants. Thus, the said drugs or substance received for testing ceased to exist in the form it was received by the appellants. Therefore, Rule 4 of the Place of Provision of Service Rules, 2012 would not be applicable in view of Mumbai Tribunal's decision in the case of Principal Commissioner of Central Excise vs. Advinus Therapeutics Ltd., Pune [2017(51) STR 298(Tri.-Mumbai)].

8. Regarding the second issue that the appellants were not given any opportunity to present their case personally as per the principle of natural justice; I consider that the adjudication proceedings shall be conducted by observing principles of natural justice. The principles of natural justice must be followed by the authorities at all levels in all proceedings under the Act or Rules and the order passed in violation of the principles of natural justice is liable to be set aside by Appellate Authority. Natural justice is the essence of fair adjudication, deeply rooted in tradition and conscience, to be ranked as fundamental. The purpose of following the principles of natural justice is the prevention of miscarriage of justice. Natural justice has certain cardinal principles, which must be followed in every proceeding. Judicial and quasi-judicial authorities should exercise their powers fairly, reasonably and impartially in a just manner and they should not decide a matter on the basis of an enquiry unknown to the party, but




should decide on the basis of material and evidence on record. Their decisions should not be biased arbitrary or based on mere conjectures and surmises. The first and foremost principle is what is commonly known as *audi alteram partem* rule. It says that no one should be condemned unheard. The Supreme Court in the case of S.N. Mukherjee vs Union of India [(1990) 4 SCC 594], while referring to the practice adopted and insistence placed by the Courts in United States, emphasized the importance of recording of reasons for decisions by the administrative authorities and tribunals. It said "administrative process will best be vindicated by clarity in its exercise". The Hon'ble Supreme Court has further elaborated the legal position in the case of Siemens Engineering and Manufacturing Co. of India Ltd. v. Union of India and Anr. [AIR 1976 SC 1785], as under;

".....If courts of law are to be replaced by administrative authorities and tribunals, as indeed, in some kinds of cases, with the proliferation of Administrative Law, they may have to be so replaced, it is essential that administrative authorities and tribunals should accord fair and proper hearing to the persons sought to be affected by their orders and give sufficiently clear and explicit reasons in support of the orders made by them. Then alone administrative authorities and tribunals exercising quasi-judicial function will be able to justify their existence and carry credibility with the people by inspiring confidence in the adjudicatory process. The rule requiring reasons to be given in support of an order is, like the principle of audi alteram partem, a basic principle of natural justice which must inform every quasi-judicial process and this rule must be observed in its proper spirit and mere pretence of compliance with it would not satisfy the requirement of law."

The adjudicating authority should, therefore, bear in mind that no material should be relied in the adjudication order to support a finding against the interests of the party unless the party has been given an opportunity to rebut that material. Whenever an order is struck down as invalid being in violation of principles of natural justice, there is no final decision of the case and fresh proceedings are left upon. All that is done is to vacate the order assailed by virtue of its inherent defect, but the proceedings are not terminated.

9. In light of the above discussion, I remand back the matter to the adjudicating authority to decide the case afresh following the principle of natural justice. The adjudicating authority is further instructed to pass an order in light of the merit of the documents submitted by the appellants and my observations/discussions as narrated above in paragraph 7 of this order and paragraphs 5.2 to 5.5 of my previous order number AHM-EXCUS-002-APP-95-96-17-18 dated 28.09.2017. The appellants are also directed to provide all sort of assistance to the adjudicating authority by providing all required documents during the proceeding for which the case is remanded back.

10. अपीलकर्ता द्वारा दर्ज की गई अपील का निपटारा उपरोक्त तरीके से किया जाता है।



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

U. Shankar

(उमा शंकर)

CENTRAL TAX (Appeals),

AHMEDABAD.

ATTESTED

S. Dutta
(S. DUTTA) 2009/8

SUPERINTENDENT,

CENTRAL TAX (APPEALS),

AHMEDABAD.

To,

M/s. Carbogen Amcis (India) Ltd.,

Bhadra-Raj Chambers,

Swastik Cross Road, Navrangpura,

Ahmedabad

Copy To:-

1. The Chief Commissioner, Central Excise, Ahmedabad Zone, Ahmedabad.
2. The Commissioner, Central Tax, Ahmedabad (South).
3. The Assistant/Deputy Commissioner, CGST, Division-VI (Vastrapur), Ahmedabad (South).
4. The Assistant Commissioner, (System) Central Tax, Ahmedabad (South).
5. Guard File.
6. P.A. File.

