



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](mailto:commrappl1-cexamd@nic.in)  
Website : [www.cgstappealahmedabad.gov.in](http://www.cgstappealahmedabad.gov.in)



आजादी का  
अमृत महोत्सव

**By SPEED POST**

DIN:- 20240164SW0000922248

(क)	फ़ाइल संख्या / File No.	GAPPL/COM/STP/3380/2023 / 2023-12
(ख)	अपील आदेश संख्या और दिनांक / Order-In -Appeal and date	AHM-EXCUS-001-APP-212/2023-24 and 28.12.2023
(ग)	पारित किया गया / Passed By	श्री ज्ञानचंद जैन, आयुक्त (अपील) Shri Gyan Chand Jain, Commissioner (Appeals)
(घ)	जारी करने की दिनांक / Date of Issue	04.01.2024
(ङ)	Arising out of Order-In-Original No. 186/WS08/AC/KSZ/2022-23 dated 01.02.2023 passed by The Assistant Commissioner, CGST, Division-VIII, Ahmedabad South.	
(च)	अपीलकर्ता का नाम और पता / Name and Address of the Appellant	M/s. Azharuddin Shahbuddin Shaikh, A-135, Ronak Park, B/h Ashraf Nagar, Sarkhej Road, Juhapura, 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 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, 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 :-

(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 उत्पादन शुल्क के रिबेट के मामलों 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 2<sup>nd</sup> माला, बहुमाली भवन, असरवा, गिरधरनागर, अहमदाबाद-380004।

To the west regional bench of Customs, Excise & Service Tax Appellate Tribunal (CESTAT) at 2<sup>nd</sup>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 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 मूलआदेश यथास्थिति निर्णयन प्राधिकारी के आदेश में से प्रत्येक की एक प्रतिपर 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.

(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 अपीलो 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. Azharuddin Shahbuddin Shaikh, A-135 Ronak Park, B/h Ashraf Nagar, Sarkhej Road, Juhapura, Ahmedabad (hereinafter referred to as “the appellant”) against Order-in-Original No. 186/WS08/AC/KSZ/2022-23 dated 01.02.2023 (hereinafter referred to as “the impugned order”) passed by the Assistant Commissioner, Central GST, Division-VIII, Ahmedabad South (hereinafter referred to as “the adjudicating authority”).

2. Briefly stated, the facts of the case are that the appellant are holding PAN No. DOPPS1097F. On scrutiny of the data received from the Central Board of Direct Taxes (CBDT) for the FY 2015-16 and F.Y. 2016-17, it was noticed that the appellant had earned an income of Rs. 15,91,732/- during the FY 2015-16 and Rs. 33,69,704/- during the F.Y. 2016-17, which was reflected under the heads “Sales / Gross Receipts from Services (Value from ITR)” filed with the Income Tax department. Accordingly, it appeared that the appellant had earned the said substantial income by way of providing taxable services but have neither obtained Service Tax registration nor paid the applicable service tax thereon. The appellant were called upon to submit copies of relevant documents for assessment for the said period. However, the appellant had not responded to the letters issued by the department.

2.1 Subsequently, the appellant were issued Show Cause Notice No. WS0802/O&A/TDP(15-16)DOPPS1097F/2020-21/5633 dated 22.12.2020 and demanding Service Tax amounting to Rs. 7,36,256/- for the periods F.Y’s 2015-16 and 2016-17, 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) & 77(2) and Section 78 of the Finance Act, 1994.

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. 7,36,256/- 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 2014-15. Further (i) Penalty of Rs. 7,36,256/- was imposed on the appellant under Section 78 of the Finance Act, 1994; and (ii) Penalty of Rs. 10,000/- was imposed on the appellant under Section 77(1) of the Finance Act, 1994 for failure to obtain the Service Tax Registration; and (iii) Penalty of Rs. 10,000/- was imposed on the appellant under Section 77(2) of the Finance Act, 1994 for failure to assess himself the tax due on the services provided by him and furnish a return in the format of ST-3 return within the specified time.

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 is acting as a residential complex predominantly meant for self-use or the use of their employees or other persons specified in the Explanation 1 to clause (44) of section 65 B of the said Act and sub-contractor providing services by way of works contract to another contractor providing works contract services which are exempt. He has received Contractor income of Rs. 49,61,436 through acting as a both as Contractor Services as well as Resident complex for self-use of persons (i.e Department of Contract Services and Resident complex for self-use) carrying on the Contractor Services.
- The extent of service tax payable by the person who provides the service and the person who receives the service for the taxable services specified in Notification No. 25/2012 dt. 20June, 2012 reads as under:

Sl. No.	Description of a service [Substituted by the Notification No. 10/2014-ST, dated 11-07-2014.]	Percentage of Service tax payable by the person providing service	Percentage of Service tax by any person liable for paying service tax other than the service provider [Substituted by the Notification No. 7/2015- ST dated 1-3-2015 w.e.f. 1-3-2015]
1	In respect of service provided	Nil	100%




<p>or agreed to be provided by a sub-contractor providing services by way of works contract to another contractor providing works contract services and Resident complex for self use of person.</p>		
--	--	--

- So, as per Notification No. 25/2012 dt. 20.06.2012, services provided by a sub-contractor providing services by way of works contract to another contractor providing works contract services and Resident complex for self-use of person business is covered under full reverse charge mechanism so as to say that 100% liability to pay service tax is on service recipient.
- In the given case, assessee is engaged in acting as a sub-contractor providing services by way of works contract to another contractor providing works contract services and Resident complex for self-use of person and hence the liability to pay service tax on value of services provided by assessee is on service recipient.
- Further the appellant has prayer that the demand of Rs. 7,36,256 should be erased and should be adjusted against the excess amount of service tax already paid.

4. The appellant were given opportunities for Personal Hearing on 06.10.2023, 25.10.2023, 13.12.2023 & 22.12.2023. The appellant were granted ample opportunity of Personal Hearing in terms of the provisions of Section 35(1A) of the Central Excise Act, 1994. But they neither appeared in personal hearing nor sought any adjournment.

4.1 In terms of the provisions of Section 35(1A) of the Central Excise Act, 1994, hearing of the appeal can be adjourned on sufficient cause being shown. However, as per the proviso to the said Section 35 (1A), no adjournment shall be granted more than three times to a party during hearing of the appeal. In the present appeals, the appellant were called for a personal hearing on four different dates, however, they neither attended the hearing nor sought any




adjournment. I am, therefore, satisfied that the appellant have been granted ample opportunities to be heard, which they have not availed. I, therefore, proceed to decide the case, ex-parte, on the basis of the material on available on record.

5. Before taking up the issue on merits, I proceed to decide the Application filed seeking condonation of delay. As per Section 85 of the Finance Act, 1994, an appeal should be filed within a period of 2 months from the date of receipt of the decision or order passed by the adjudicating authority. Under the proviso appended to sub-section (3A) of Section 85 of the Finance Act, 1994, the Commissioner (Appeals) is empowered to condone the delay or to allow the filing of an appeal within a further period of one month thereafter if, he is satisfied that the appellant was prevented by sufficient cause from presenting the appeal within the period of two months. Considering the cause of delay given in application as genuine, I condone the delay of 16 days and take up the appeal for decision on merits.

6. I have carefully gone through the facts of the case, grounds of appeal, submissions made in the Appeal Memorandum, during the course of personal hearing 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 and F.Y. 2016-17.

7. I find that in the SCN in question, the demand has been raised for the periods FY 2015-16 and FY 2016-17 based on the Income Tax Returns filed by the appellant. **I further find that the order has been passed ex-parte.**

8. It is observed that the main contentions of the appellant in the appeal memorandum are that he is engaged in acting as a sub-contractor providing services by way of works contract to another contractor providing works contract services and Resident complex for self-use of person business is covered under full reverse charge mechanism so as to say that 100% liability to



pay service tax is on service recipient. In this regard, I am of the considered view that the appellant cannot seek to establish their eligibility for exemption at the appellate stage by bypassing the adjudicating authority. They should have submitted the relevant records and documents before the adjudicating authority, who is best placed to verify the authenticity of the documents as well as their eligibility for exemption.

9. I also find that in the grounds of appeal, the appellant has stated that he is **sub-contractor providing services by way of works contract to another contractor providing works contract services and Resident complex for self-use of person business is covered under full reverse charge mechanism so as to say that 100% liability to pay service tax is on service recipient.** While in the prayer part of appeal he is stating that the demand of Rs. 7,36,256 should be erased and **should be adjusted against the excess amount of service tax already paid.** These contradictory claims by the appellant necessitates detailed verification and scrutiny of the claim of the appellant. Therefore, the matter needs to be remanded back.

10. In view of the above discussion, I remand the matter back to the adjudicating authority to reconsider the issue a fresh and pass a speaking order after following the principles of natural justice.

11. 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.




(ज्ञानचंद जैन)

आयुक्त (अपील्स)

Dated: 28<sup>th</sup> December, 2023

सत्यापित (Attested):

  
(अमरेंद्र कुमार)

अधीक्षक(अपील्स)

केंद्रीय जीएसटी, अहमदाबाद





**By RPAD / SPEED POST**

To,  
M/s. Azharuddin Shahbuddin Shaikh,  
A-135 Ronak Park,  
B/h Ashraf Nagar, Sarkhej Road,  
Juhapura, Ahmedabad

Copy to :

- 1) The Principal Chief Commissioner, Central GST, Ahmedabad Zone
- 2) The Commissioner, CGST, Ahmedabad South
- 3) The Assistant Commissioner, CGST, Division VIII, Ahmedabad South
- 4) The supdt(Systems) Appeals Ahmedabad, with a request to upload on Website,
- 5) Guard File
- 6) PA file



