



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
Website : www.cgstappealahmedabad.gov.in



By SPEED POST

DIN:- 20240164SW000000F27D

(क)	फ़ाइल संख्या / File No.	GAPPL/COM/STP/4928/2023 / 1099-1104
(ख)	अपील आदेश संख्या और दिनांक / Order-In -Appeal and date	AHM-EXCUS-001-APP-237/2023-24 and 25.01.2024
(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	31.01.2024
(ङ)	Arising out of Order-In-Original No. 167/AC/Samir Chaturbahi Labakamana/A'bad-South/JDM/2022-23 dated 24.02.2023 passed by the Assistant Commissioner, Central GST, Division II, Ahmedabad South.	
(च)	अपीलकर्ता का नाम और पता / Name and Address of the Appellant	M/s. Samir Chatubhai Labakamana, Harikrishna Balancing Industries, Plot No. -I- 4115, Phase-IV, NICA Tube Cross, B/h. New Nirma, Vatva, 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, 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 :-

(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 शुल्क कच्चे माल पर उत्पादन शुल्क के रिबेट के मामलों में जो भारत के बाहर किसी राष्ट्र या प्रदेश में निर्यातित है।



(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 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 अपील 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."



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 2nd माला, बहुमाली भवन, असरवा, गिरधरनागर, अहमदाबाद-380004।

To the west regional bench of Customs, Excise & Service Tax Appellate Tribunal (CESTAT) at 2ndfloor, 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.



ORDER-IN-APPEAL

The present appeal has been filed by M/s. Samir Chatubhai Labakamana, Harikrishna Balancing Industries, Plot No. -I- 4115, Phase-IV, NICA Tube Cross, B/h. New Nirma, Vatva, Ahmedabad (hereinafter referred to as the "*appellant*") against Order-in-Original No. 167/AC/Samir Chaturbahi Labakamana/A⁷bad-South/JDM/2022-23 dated 24.02.2023 (hereinafter referred to as "*the impugned order*") passed by the Assistant Commissioner, Central GST, Division II, Ahmedabad South (hereinafter referred to as "*the adjudicating authority*").

2. Briefly stated, the facts of the case are that the respondents, having PAN No. ACIPL5636P had earned substantial service income during the F.Y. 2014-15. On scrutiny of the data received from Income Tax department, it was noticed that the appellant had earned an income of Rs. 16,60,331/- during the F.Y. 2014-15. Accordingly, it appeared that the appellant had earned the said substantial income by way of providing taxable services but had neither obtained Service Tax registration nor paid the applicable service tax thereon. The appellant were called upon to submit copies of required 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. CGST/WS0201/Samir/TPD/2020-21 dated 29.09.2020 wherein:

- a) Demand and recover an amount of Rs. 2,05,217/- under proviso to Sub Section (1) of Section 73 of the Act along with interest under section 75 of the Finance Act 1994 (hereinafter referred to as '*the Act*').




- b) Impose penalty under the provisions of Section 70, 77(1) and 78 of the Act.

2.2 The Show Cause Notice was adjudicated ex-parte vide the impugned order by the adjudicating authority wherein:

- a) The demand of service tax amounting to Rs. 2,05,217/- was confirmed under section 73(1) of the Act by invoking extended period along with interest under section 75 of the Act.
- b) Penalty amounting to Rs. 10,000/- was imposed under section 77(1) of the Act for failure to include the supply services in their registration under the provision of Section 69 of the Act read with Rule 4 of the Service Tax Rule, 1994.
- c) Penalty amounting to Rs. 2,05,217/- was imposed under 78 of the Act.
- d) Penalty of Rs. 10,000/- was imposed on the appellant under for each return filed late, for the relevant period under Rule 7C of Service Tax Rule, 1994 read with Section 70 of the Act.

3. Being aggrieved with the impugned order passed by the adjudicating authority, the appellant have preferred the present appeal, inter alia, on the following grounds:-


- That the appellant are engaged in the business of doing job-work activities viz. Static and Dynamic Balancing.
- That they are specialist in Computerize Static and Dynamic Balancing i.e. on site balancing of Air Fans, Coilers, Pump Impellers, On site Balancing, Laser Alignment of Machineries. Vibration & Bearing Analysis & Measurement of Industrial Noise, Blower Rotor, Crank Shafts, Roller Pipes etc.



- During the period as mentioned in the impugned order in original, they had done the business of job-work in respect of following group of companies viz. 1. M/s. Anil Limited 2. M/s. Apollo Machinery 3. M/s. Reddhi Siddhi Recyclers Pvt. Ltd. 4. M/s. Chiripal Industries Ltd. 5. M/s. TMVT Industries Pvt. Ltd. 6. M/s. Metso outotec India Pvt. Ltd. 7. M/s. Encore Natural Polymers Pvt. Ltd. 8. M/s. Jupiter Comtex Pvt. Ltd., 9. M/s. JMC Paper tech Pvt. Ltd., etc.
- The appellant have submitted during filing of Appeal Memorandum following documents (1) copy of Form 26AS (TDS Certificate) for the F.Y. 2014-15, (2) copy of P & L Account and Balance Sheet, (3) Copy of Income Tax Return for the A.Y. 2014-16 (F.Y. 2014-15),(4) Coy of Sales Register for the F.Y. 2014-15 (5) Copy of sales invoices along with Annexure-II (evidencing job-work), (6) copy of Balancing Works process Chart.
- That on the basis of documentary evidences submitted by the appellant they requested to the impugned order may be dropped.

4. Personal hearing in the case was held on 09.01.2024. Shri Ramesh D. Prajapati, Tax Consultant appeared on behalf of the appellant for personal hearing and reiterated the written submission. They stated that their client is doing engineering job work.

5. I have carefully gone through the facts of the case, grounds of appeal, submissions made in the Appeal Memorandum 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 F.Y. 2014-15.

6. Accordingly, I find that the following issues are required to be decided by me (1) whether the Service Tax has been correctly demanded vide the impugned order, (2) whether the contention of the appellant that the services provided by them are exempted in the light of Mega Exemption Notification No. 25/2012-ST dated 20.06.2012 is sustainable or not.

7. I find that the contention of the appellant is that they are engaged in doing job work activities especially specialized in Computerized static and Dynamic balancing. They submit that their expertise extends to onsite balancing of various equipment such as Air Fans, Coilers, Pump Impellers, as well as laser Alignment of machineries., Vibration and Bearing Analysis, measurement of Industrial Noise and balancing service for items like Blower Rotor, Crank Shafts, Roller, Pipers among others. They further submitted that they provided services to a specific group of companies during the period under consideration in the impugned order. They reiterated that the above said services provided by them is exempted service as per Notification No. 25/2012-ST dated 20.06.2012; that accordingly they were not liable to pay service tax on provision of such services. For ease of reference, I reproduce the relevant provision of Notification No. 25/2012-ST dated 20.06.2012, which reads as under:

“Notification No. 25/2012-Service Tax dated 20th June, 2012

G.S.R. 467(E).- In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 93 of the Finance Act, 1994 (32 of 1994) (hereinafter referred to as the said Act) and in supersession of notification No. 12/2012- Service Tax, dated the 17th March, 2012, published in the Gazette of India, Extraordinary, Part II, Section 3, Sub-section



(i) vide number G.S.R. 210 (E), dated the 17th March, 2012, the Central Government, being satisfied that it is necessary in the public interest so to do, hereby exempts the following taxable services from the whole of the service tax leviable thereon under section 66B of the said Act, namely:-

1...

2... ..

30. Services by way of carrying out -

(i) any process amounting to manufacture or production of goods excluding alcoholic liquor for human consumption; or

(ii) any intermediate production process as job work not amounting to manufacture or production in relation to:


(a) agriculture, printing or textiles processing

(b) cut and polished diamonds and gemstones; or plain and studded jewellery of gold and other precious metals, falling under Chapter 71 of the Central Excise Tariff Act, 1985 (5 of 1986);

(c) any goods excluding alcoholic liquors for human consumption, on which appropriate duty is payable by the principal manufacturer; or

(d) processes of electroplating, zinc plating, anodizing, heat treatment, powder coating, painting including spray painting or auto black, during the course of manufacture of parts of cycles or sewing machines upto an aggregate value of taxable service of the specified processes of one hundred and fifty lakh rupees in a financial year subject to the condition that such aggregate value had not exceeded one hundred and fifty lakh rupees during the preceding financial year;"

8. Further, I find that the appellant, in support of the contention have submitted records copy of Form 26AS (TDS Certificate) for the F.Y. 2014-15, (2) copy of P & L Account and Balance Sheet, (3) Copy of Income Tax Return for the A.Y. 2014-16 (F.Y. 2014-15), (4) Coy of Sales Register for the F.Y. 2014-15 (5) Copy of sales invoices along with Annexure-II (evidencing job-work), (6) copy of Balancing Works process Chart. On analysis of the documents submitted by the appellant, it is observed that the appellant were engaged in the activity of engineering job work. The entry No. 30 (ii) (c) of



Notification No. 25/2012-ST dated 20th June 2012 also states that “any intermediate production process as job work not amounting to manufacture or production in relation to any goods excluding alcoholic liquors for human consumption, on which appropriate duty is payable by the principal manufacturer” is exempt from Service Tax. Therefore I hold that the services rendered by the appellant is exempted in terms of entry No. 30 (ii) (c) of Notification No. 25/2012-ST dated 20th June 2012. Due to the above finding, I am of the considered opinion that the appellant are not liable for service tax. Consequently the question of interest and penalties also does not arise.

9. Accordingly, the impugned order is set aside and the appeal is allowed.

10. 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)

Date: 25.01.2024

Attested



(अमरेंद्र कुमार)

अधीक्षक (अपील्स)

सी. जी. एस. टी, अहमदाबाद

BY RPAD/ SPEED POST



To

M/s. Samir Chatubhai Labakamana,
Harikrishna Balancing Industries,
Plot No. -I- 4115, Phase-IV, NICA Tube Cross,
B/h. New Nirma, Vatva, Ahmedabad

Copy to :

1. The Principal Chief Commissioner, Central GST, Ahmedabad Zone.
2. The Commissioner Central GST, Ahmedabad South.
3. The Deputy Commissioner, CGST, Division II, Ahmedabad South
4. The Deputy/Assistant Commissioner (RRA), Ahmedabad South
5. The Asstt. Commissioner (HQ System) Central GST, Ahmedabad South (for uploading the OIA).
6. Guard File.
7. P.A. File.

