

 सत्यमेव जयते	<b>केंद्रीय कर आयुक्त (अपील)</b> <b>O/O THE COMMISSIONER (APPEALS), CENTRAL TAX,</b> केंद्रीय कर भवन, सातवीं मंजिल, पोलिटेक्निक के पास, आम्बावाडी, अहमदाबाद-380015	 7 <sup>th</sup> Floor, GST Building, Near Polytechnic, Ambavadi, Ahmedabad-380015
☎ : 079-26305065		टेलिफैक्स : 079 - 26305136

6691706674

रजिस्टर्ड डाक ए.डी. द्वारा

क फाइल संख्या : File No : V2(28)26/Ahd-South/2018-19  
Stay Appl.No. /2018-19

ख अपील आदेश संख्या Order-In-Appeal Nos. AHM-EXCUS-001-APP-058-2018-19

दिनांक Date : 12-09-2018 जारी करने की तारीख Date of Issue \_\_\_\_\_

23/10/2018

श्री उमा शंकर आयुक्त (अपील) द्वारा पारित

Passed by Shri. Uma Shanker, Commissioner (Appeals)

ग Arising out of Order-in-Original No. AC/01/Div-II/2018-19 दिनांक: 11.05.2018 issued by Assistant Commissioner, Div-II, Central Tax, Ahmedabad-South

घ अपीलकर्ता का नाम एवं पता Name & Address of the Appellant / Respondent  
**Kastwell Foundries**  
**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) केंद्रीय 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, 4<sup>th</sup> 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 उत्पादन 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 मैनटल हास्पिटल 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 मांग 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

M/s. Kastwell Foundries, 46/A, Near Kiran Bus Stop, Phase I, GIDC, Vatwa, Ahmedabad (for short - 'appellant') has filed this appeal against OIO No. AC/01/Div II/2018-19 dated 11.5.2018, passed by the Assistant Commissioner, CGST, Division-II, Ahmedabad South Commissionerate (for short - 'adjudicating authority').

2. The facts briefly are that based on an audit objection, a show cause notice dated 7.4.2015 was issued to the appellant, alleging that they had availed CENVAT credit in respect of common taxable services but had failed to maintain separate accounts as stipulated in Rule 6 of the CENVAT Credit Rules, 2004. The notice further alleged that the appellant was engaged in trading activity in addition to manufacturing goods, falling under chapter 28, 72, 75, 76 and 81 of the Central Excise Tariff Act, 1985. The notice therefore, *inter alia*, demanded an amount under Rule 6(3)(i) of the CENVAT Credit Rules, 2004, in respect of the period from March 2011 to February 2015 along with interest and also proposed penalty under Rule 15(2) of the CENVAT Credit Rules, 2004 [for short CCR '04] read with Section 11AC of the Central Excise Act, 1944. Vide the earlier OIO dated 4.4.2016, the adjudicating authority decided the aforementioned show cause notice wherein he confirmed the demand of Rs. 4,24,751/- along with interest and also imposed penalty on the appellant. The appellant feeling aggrieved, filed an appeal before Commissioner(Appeals), which was decided by me vide OIA No. AHM-EXCUS-001-APP-61-2016-17 dated 26.1.2017, wherein the matter was remanded back to the adjudicating authority.

3. The adjudicating authority vide his impugned OIO dated 11.5.2018, has confirmed the demand of Rs. 66,156/- along with interest and further imposed penalty on the appellant. The amount which is partly paid by the appellant stands appropriated.

4. Feeling aggrieved, the appellant, has filed this appeal on the following grounds:

- (a) the impugned OIO is incorrect and not tenable;
- (b) the OIO calculates the amount incorrectly;
- (c) the OIO does not have findings on the submissions made by the appellant;
- (d) that the rule clearly provides that in case of trading the value would be the difference between sale price and cost of goods sold; that the value is not the value of sale but it should be the net of cost of goods sold;
- (e) that the value of inputs removed as such cannot be taken into account;
- (f) that trading cannot be considered as a service at all;
- (g) that applying the percentage trading sales to total sale, the proportionate credit to be reversed is only Rs. 173/-;
- (h) that trading sale can be considered as exempted only w.e.f. 1.4.2011;
- (i) that they would like to rely on the case of Krishna Auto Sales [2015(40)]
- (j) that the show cause notice is barred by limitation.



5. Personal hearing in the matter was held on 24.7.2018. Shri S.J.Vyas Advocate, appeared on behalf of the appellant and reiterated the arguments made in the grounds of appeal.

6. I have gone through the facts of the case, the appellant's grounds of appeal, and submissions made during the course of personal hearing. The issue to be decided is whether the demand of Rs. 66,156/-, confirmed by the adjudicating authority, along with interest and penalty, is correct or otherwise.

7. As I have already mentioned, the matter is already decided by me vide my OIA dated 26.1.2017, wherein I had decided all the major issues viz. that trading is an exempted service; that the notice is not hit by limitation etc.. Even the case laws quoted in the present appeal, have been discussed by me in the earlier OIA. Since these issues stand decided, I would not be going into these issues.

8. The only contention left is whether the computation of the demand in para 15(ii) by the adjudicating authority is correct. It is based on my directions, that the adjudicating authority computed the demand. My directions as is already mentioned was based on letter no. 334/8/2016-TRU dated 29.2.2016 of JS (TRU), CBEC, New Delhi. The appellant has once again stated the percentage of trading to total sales, which is at variance to the percentage mentioned by the adjudicating authority. No proof is provided by the appellant to substantiate what is mentioned, while the adjudicating authority has clearly mentioned the figures, which obviously must be taken from the records of the appellant. Since no proof is provided to substantiate the allegation questioning the computation, I find no need to interfere with the impugned OIO. The confirmation of demand, along with interest and imposition of penalty is upheld.

9. In view of the foregoing, the impugned OIO is upheld.

10. अपीलकर्ता द्वारा दर्ज की गई अपील का निपटारा उपरोक्त तरीके से किया जाता है।  
10. The appeal filed by the appellant stands disposed of in above terms.

*उमाशंकर*

(उमा शंकर)

आयुक्त (अपील्स - I)

Date: 12/09/2018.

Attested

*Vinoe Lukose*  
(Vinoe Lukose)  
Superintendent (Appeal)  
Central Tax, Ahmedabad.



BY R.P.A.D

M/s. Kastwell Foundries,  
46/A, Near Kiran Bus Stop,  
Phase I, GIDC, Vatwa,  
Ahmedabad

Copy to:-

1. The Chief Commissioner, Central Excise Zone, Ahmedabad.
2. The Principal Commissioner, CGST, Ahmedabad South Commissionerate.
3. The Addl./Joint Commissioner, (Systems), CGST, Ahmedabad South.
4. The Dy. / Asstt. Commissioner, CGST, Division- II, Ahmedabad South.
5. Guard file.
6. P.A

