

(ग्य) भारत के बाहर किसी राष्ट्र या प्रदेश में निर्यातित माल पर या माल के विनिर्माण में उपयोग शुल्क कच्चे माल पर उत्पादन शुल्क के रिवेट के मामलें 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 डयूटी केडिट मान्य की गई है और ऐसे आदेश जो इस धारा एवं नियम के गुताबिक आयुवत, अपील के द्वारा पारित वो समय पर या बाद में वित्त अधिनियम (न.2) 1998 धारा 109 द्वारा नियुवत 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) कोन्द्रीय 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 दिनाँक से तीन मास के भीतर मूल-आदेश एवं अपील आदेश की दो-दो प्रतियों के साथ उत्तित आवेदन किया जाना चाहिए। उसके साथ खाता इ. का मुख्यशीर्ष के अंतर्गत धारा 35-इ में निर्धारित फी के भुगतान के सतूत 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) शिविजन आवेदन के साथ जहाँ संलग्न रकम एक लाख रूपये या उससे कम हो तो रूपये 200/- फीस भुगतान की जाए ओर 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 सुल्क, 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 अंतर्गतः—

Under Section 35B/ 35E of CEA, 1944 an appeal lies to :-

- (ग) उक्तलिखित परिच्छेद २ (१) क में बताए अनुसार के अलावा की अपील, अपीलो के मागले में सीमा शुल्क, केन्द्रीय उत्पादन शुल्क एवं सेवाकर अपीलीय न्यायाधिकरण <u>(सिस्टेट)</u> की पश्चिम क्षेत्रीय पीठिका, अहमदाबाद में ओं–२०, न्यू गेन्टल ह।रिपटल 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.



2

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. Registar 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.

यदि इस आदेश में कई मूल आदेशों का समावेश होता है तो प्रत्येक मूल ओदश 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 ज्यायाधिकरण को एक अपील या केन्द्रीय सरकार को एक आवेदन किया जाता हैं।

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 not withstanding 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.

न्यायालय शुल्क अधिनियम 1970 यथा संशोधित की अनुसूचि—1 के अंतर्गत निर्धारित किए अनुसार उक्त आवेदन या मूल आदेश यथारिथति निर्णयन प्राधिकारी के आदेश में से प्रत्येक की एक प्रति पर रू.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.

ुन ओर रांबंधित गामलों 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 in invited to the rules covering these and other related matter contended in the Customs, Excise & Service Tax Appellate Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 1982.

सोमा शुल्क, केन्द्रीय उत्पादन शुल्क एवं सेवाकर अपीलीय न्यायाधिकरण <u>(सिस्टेट)</u>, के प्रति अपीलो के मामले में कर्तट्य 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)

केन्दीय 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 सेंनवेट क्रेडिट की राशि;
- (iii) सेनवैट क्रेडिट नियमों के नियम 6 के तहत देय राशि.

🔅 यह पूर्व जगा '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.

(III) वागणपार payable पाउंच गर्या उन्हें के समक्ष जहाँ शुल्क अथवा शुल्क या दण्ड विवादित हो तो माँग किए गए शुल्क के दूध दरा आदेश के प्रति अपील प्राधिकरण के समक्ष जहाँ शुल्क अथवा शुल्क या दण्ड विवादित हो तो माँग किए गए शुल्क के

एवं सेवाकर (

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 a penalty alone is in dispute."

(3)

(4)

(5)

(6)

## ORDER-IN-APPEAL

M/s. Vaibhav Jajoo,,B-803,Dev Aurum Residency,Anandnagar cross Road, Prahaladnagar,satellite,Ahmedabad (henceforth,"appellant") has filed the present appeal against the Order-in-original No.CGST/WS08/Ref-34 (ST)/PV/ 18-19 dated 28.06.2018 (henceforth,"impugned order") issued by the Assistant Commissioner, CGST, Division-VIII, Ahmedabad-South (henceforth,"adjudicating authority").

The facts of the case in brief are that appellant who had purchased a 2. Procon M/s. Dev developer/builder residential unit from the-Limited, Ahmedabad, filed a refund claim of service tax Rs.1,76,130/- on the basis of the judgment of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in case of Suresh Kumar Bansal & Anuj Goyel & others v/s Union of India (2016(6)TMI192 Delhi High Court) which was rejected initially under OIO no.SD-02/REF-166/VIP/2016 dated 17.10.2016 by the refund sanctioning authority on the ground that the service provider M/s. Dev Procon Limited was not reregistered & not paid/deposited the tax with the service tax department and also on time bar issue. Appeal preferred by the claimant against said OIO dated 17.10.2016 was rejected by Commissioner (Appeal-II), Central Excise Ahmedabad under OIA No. AHM-SVTAX-000-APP-041-10.07.2017.Therefore,the appellant approached the 17-18 dated CESTAT, Ahmedabad who under order No. A/13814//2017 dated 24.11.2017 allowed the appeal and directed the adjudicating authority to ascertain from the developer whether service tax has been collected from the claimant and to sanction the refund alongwith interest. The adjudicating authority, after necessary verification of collection of tax amount from the claimant and payment of the same to the service tax department by the developer, sanctioned the refund.

3. Being aggrieved with the impugned order the appellant preferred this appeal claiming interest on delayed payment of refund stating that adjudicating authority has missed to follow the directions of Hon'ble CESTAT, Section 11BB of the Cental Excise Act,1944 and departmental circular No 670/61/2002-CX dated 1.10.2002. They cited case law of Tata Chemicals v/s Commissioner of C.Ex.Rajkot(2016(334)ELT133(Tri.Ahd),Ranbaxy Laboratory Ltd v/s UOI92011(273)ELT3(SC) etc to stat that interest payment occurs from the expiry of three months from the date of refund application made under Section 11B(1) of the Cental Excise Act,1944 and case law Paper Products Ltd-v/s CCE 1999(112)ELT765(SC) & Collector of Central Excise,Vadodard, v/s Dhireh

Chemical Industries(2002(143)ELT19(SC) etc to stat that circulars/instructions issued by CBEC are binding on the department, etc.,

4. In the Personal hearing held on11.10.2018, Shri Vaibhav Jajoo reiterated the grounds of appeal and requested for interest as per order No. A/13814//2017 dated 24.11.2017 of CESTAT, Ahmedabad.

5. I have carefully gone through the appeal memorandum. The limited issue which requires determination in the case is whether the appellant is entitled for interest on refund amount. Section 11BB of the Central Excise Act 1944 deals with interest on delayed refunds which is reproduced below for ease of reference:

## "Section 11BB. Interest on delayed refunds. ----

If any duty ordered to be refunded under sub-section (2) of section 11B to any applicant is not refunded within three months from the date of receipt of application under sub-section (1) of that section, there shall be paid to that applicant interest at such rate, not below five per cent and not exceeding thirty per cent per annum as is for the time being fixed by the Central Government, by Notification in the Official Gazette, on such duty from the date immediately after the expiry of three months from the date of receipt of such application till the date of refund of such duty :

**Provided** that where any duty ordered to be refunded under sub-section (2) of section 11B in respect of an application under sub-section (1) of that section made before the date on which the Finance Bill, 1995 receives the assent of the President, is not refunded within three months from such date, there shall be paid to the applicant interest under this section from the date immediately after three months from such date, till the date of refund of such duty."

Explanation provided under said section stipulates that;

**"Explanation**. - Where any order of refund is made by the Commissioner (Appeals), Appellate Tribunal, National Tax Tribunal or any court against an order of the Assistant Commissioner of Central Excise or Deputy Commissioner of Central Excise, under sub-section (2) of section 11B, the order passed by the Commissioner (Appeals), Appellate Tribunal, National Tax Tribunal or, as the case may be, by the court shall be deemed to be an order passed under the said sub-section (2) for the purposes of this section."

6. I find that the issue of interest and its interpretation has already been settled by Hon'ble Apex court in case of Ranbaxy Laboratories Ltd v/s Union of India [2012 (027)ELT 193 SC] and any contrary interpretation is bad in law and not tenable. The original authority should have scrupulously followed this wherein it is held that:

(9) "It is manifest from the a fore-extracted provisions that Section 11 BB of the Act comes in to play only after an order for refund has been made under Section 11BB of the Act. Section 11BB of the Act lays down that in case any duty paid is found refundable and if the duty is not refunded within a period of three months from the date of receipt of an application to be submitted under sub-section (1) of Section 11BB of the Act, then the applicant shall be paid interest at such rate, as may be tixed by the Central Government, on expiry of a period of three months from the

2

. OLE

date of receipt of an application. The explanation appearing below the proviso to Section 11BB introduced a deeming fiction that where the order for refund of duty is not made by the Assistant Commissioner of Central Excise or the Deputy Commissioner of Central Excise but by the court shall be deemed to be an order made under sub-section (2) of Section 11BB of the Act. It is clear that the explanation has nothing to do with the postponement of the date from which interest becomes payable under Section 11BB of the Act.

Menifestly, interest under Section 11BB of the Act becomes payable, if on expiry of a period three months from the date of receipt of the application for refund, the amount claimed is still not refunded. <u>Thus, the only interpretation of Section 11BB that can be arrived at is that interest</u> <u>under the said section becomes payable on the expiry of a period of three</u> <u>months from the date of receipt of the application under sub-section (1) of</u> <u>Section 11B of the Act and that the said explanation does not have any</u> <u>bearing or connection with the date from which interest under Section 11BB</u> <u>of the Act becomes payable.</u>"

7. From the above citation it is clear that interest under Section 11BB ibid becomes payable on the expiry of a period of three months from the date of receipt of the application. Respectfully following the decision of Hon'ble Apex court, I hold that the interest should be calculated and paid accordingly.

8. Hon'ble High Court of Gujarat in case of Kamakshi Tradexim (India) Pvt Ltd v/s Union of India reported in 2017 (351) ELT 102(Guj) has categorically stated that department can't take stand contrary to the decision given by the Apex court. The facts of the case on hand are similar to the said cases and categorically applicable. Furthermore, Hon'ble CESTAT under order supra has made clear directions in this regard which needs to be followed meticulously.

9. In view of the above, the appeal filed by the appellant is allowed with consequential relief.

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

The appeal filed by the appellant stands disposed of in above terms.

3

SALEIN

(उमा शंकर) केन्द्रीय कर आयुक्त (अपील्स) <sub>ख सेवाक</sub> Date: <u>Attested</u>

(D.A Superinte Central peals) Ahmedabad

## <u>By R.P.A.D.</u>

To, M/s. Vaibhav Jajoo, B-803,Dev Aurum Residency, Anandnagar cross Road, Prahaladnagar, Satellite,Ahmedabad.

## Copy to:

- 1. The Chief Commissioner of Central Tax, Ahmedabad Zone.
- 2. The Commissioner of Central Tax, Ahmedabad -South.
- 3. The Additional Commissioner, Central Tax (System), Ahmedabad- South.

4. The Asstt./Deputy Commissioner, CGST Division-III, Ahmedabad - South.

5. Guard File.

6. P.A. File

4