



सत्यमेव जयते

केंद्रीय कर आयुक्त (अपील)

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

केंद्रीय कर भवन,
सातवीं मंजिल, पोलिटेकनिक के पास,
आम्बावाडी, अहमदाबाद-380015

7th Floor, GST Building,
Near Polytechnic,
Ambavadi, Ahmedabad-380015

☎ : 079-26305065

टेलिफैक्स : 079 - 26305136



रजिस्टर्ड डाक ए.डी. द्वारा

क फाइल संख्या : File No : V2(ST)/202/Ahd-I/2017-18
Stay Appl.No. NA/2017-18

25/03/18
28/33

ख अपील आदेश संख्या Order-In-Appeal Nos. AHM-EXCUS-001-APP-469-2017-18
दिनांक Date : 26-03-2018 जारी करने की तारीख Date of Issue 24/4/2018

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-80/Veeda/17-18 दिनांक: 31/01/2018 issued by
Assistant Commissioner, Central Tax, Ahmedabad-South

घ अपीलकर्ता का नाम एवं पता Name & Address of the Appellant / Respondent
Veeda Clinical Research Pvt.Ltd
Ahmedabad

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 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।


(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, 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 :

(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 हो 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।



(ख) भारत के बाहर किसी राष्ट्र या प्रदेश में निर्यातित माल पर या माल के विनिर्माण में उपयोग शुल्क कच्चे माल पर उत्पन्न शुल्क के रिबेट के मामलों में जो भारत के बाहर किसी राष्ट्र या प्रदेश में निर्यातित है।

(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 पीठिका, अहमदाबाद में ओ-20, न्यू मेटल हॉस्पिटल कम्पाउण्ड, मेघानी 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 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 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 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 alone is in dispute."



ORDER-IN-APPEAL


M/s Veeda Clinical Research Pvt. Ltd., Shivalik Plaza-A, IIM Road, Ambawadi, Ahmedabad (*hereinafter referred to as 'appellant'*) has filed the present appeal against the Order-in-Original No. CGST-VI/REF-80/VEEDA-CLINICAL/17-18 dated 31.01.2018 (*hereinafter referred to as 'impugned order'*) passed by the Assistant Commissioner, CGST, Division-VI (Vastrapur), Ahmedabad South Commissionerate (*hereinafter referred to as 'adjudicating authority'*).

2. The facts of the case in brief are that the appellant is engaged in providing the service of Technical Testing and Analysis, Scientific and Technical Consultancy Services and were registered with Service Tax Department having Service Tax Registration No. AACCC3633QST001. The appellant had filed a refund application amounting to ₹7,55,94,236/- paid by them towards Service Tax for the period of October 2016 to March 2017. As per the refund application, the said amount of Service Tax was paid by the appellant under protest towards their Service tax liability of Technical Testing and Analysis service as there was dispute as to whether the said service provided by the appellant to their overseas client was covered under the definition of export of service. The appellant filed the refund claim on the basis of the CESTAT, Mumbai's order in the case of Commissioner of Central Excise, Pune -I vs. M/s. Sai Life Sciences Ltd. [2016(42)S.T.R. (882)].

3. During scrutiny of the said claim and on perusal of their records by the adjudicating authority it was found that their own appeal, involving the question as to whether the said service provided by them was covered under the definition of export of service, has been pending before the CESTAT, Ahmedabad and before Commissioner (Appeals), Ahmedabad. In view of the above, the adjudicating authority considered the case to be premature and rejected the entire refund claim of ₹7,55,94,236/- vide the impugned order.

4. Being aggrieved with the impugned order the appellant preferred the present appeal. The appellant has submitted that they had performed the services covered under Technical Testing and Analysis service from their registered premises in India and delivered the clinical study reports to their foreign clients through e-mail, courier or web-sites and claimed that as export of service. They further explained that during the said process, sample drug or IP (formula) is being sent by their clients and they (the appellant) carry out testing and analysis on such sample or material procured as per the IP on behalf of their clients. They quoted the judgment of the CESTAT, Mumbai in the case of Commissioner of Central Excise, Pune -I vs. M/s. Sai Life Sciences Ltd. [2016(42)S.T.R. (882)].

5. Personal hearing in the matter was held on 15.03.2018. Shri Vipul Khandhar, Chartered Accountant, appeared on behalf of the appellant for hearing and reiterated the contents of appeal memorandum. He further submitted the



photocopy of my earlier order Nos. AHM-EXCUS-001-APP-116-17-18 dated 25.09.2017 and AHM-EXCUS-001-APP-265-2017-18 dated 24.01.2018, pertaining to earlier case of the appellant.

6. I have carefully gone through the impugned order, appeal memorandum and written as well as oral submission made at the time of personal hearing. The issue is already decided by me vide OIA No. AHM-EXCUS-001-APP-265-2017-18 dated 24.01.2018. The operating part is reproduced below for ease of reference:

7. *"I find that the activity performed by the appellant is that they conduct technical testing and analysis of the sample drugs or IP as sent by their client. After performing the tests, the appellant send the clinical study reports to their foreign clients through e-mail, courier or web-sites. The adjudicating authority, without going to the merits of the case, has rejected the refund claim stating the case to be premature since similar appeals of the appellant are pending before the CESTAT and Commissioner (Appeals). This is a clear case of denial of justice because the case has been handled with prejudiced mindset. An issue cannot be decided arbitrarily (without looking through the merits of the case) as similar matter is pending with higher judicial bodies. I consider this wrong, haphazard and laden with prejudice.*

8. *Regarding the merit of the case, my view in terms of export of services is very clear which I have already discussed in my previous order number AHM-EXCUS-001-APP-116-17-18 dated 25.09.2017 pertaining to an earlier case of the appellant. In light of my said order, I consider that the place of provision of service, in this case, is outside India and no tax liability can be fixed on the appellant."*

The facts of the present case being similar to the facts in OIA No. AHM-EXCUS-001-APP-265-2017-18 dated 24.01.2018, the impugned OIO is rejected and the appeal filed by the appellant is allowed.

7. Thus the appeal filed by the appellant is disposed off in above terms.


उमा शंकर

(उमा शंकर)

CENTRAL TAX (Appeals),
AHMEDABAD

ATTESTED

S. Dutta
(S. Dutta)
Superintendent,
Central Tax (Appeals),
Ahmedabad.



To,
M/s. Veeda Clinical Research Pvt Ltd,
2nd Floor, Shivalik Plaza-A, IIM Road, Ambawadi,
Ahmedabad.

Copy to:

- 1) The Chief Commissioner, Central Tax, Ahmedabad.
- 2) The Commissioner, Central Tax, Ahmedabad (South).
- 3) The Dy./Asst. Commissioner, CGST, Division-VI (Vastrapur), Ahmedabad (South).
- 4) The Asst. Commissioner (System), Central Tax, Hq., Ahmedabad (South).
- ✓ 5) Guard File.
- 6) P. A. File.

