



आयुक्त(अपील)का कार्यालय,
Office of the Commissioner (Appeal),

केंद्रीय जीएसटी, अपील आयुक्तालय, अहमदाबाद
Central GST, Appeal Commissionerate, Ahmedabad
जीएसटी भवन, राजस्वमार्ग, अम्बावाड़ी अहमदाबाद ३८००१५.
CGST Bhavan, Revenue Marg, Ambawadi, Ahmedabad 380015
☎ 07926305065 - टेलिफैक्स 07926305136



DIN: 20230864SW000032323C

स्पीड पोस्ट

- क फाइल संख्या : File No : GAPPL/COM/STP/2515/2023 /5051 - 5055
- ख अपील आदेश संख्या Order-In-Appeal No. AHM-EXCUS-001-APP-90/2023-24
दिनांक Date : 25-08-2023 जारी करने की तारीख Date of Issue 28.08.2023
आयुक्त (अपील) द्वारा पारित
Passed by Shri Shiv Pratap Singh, Commissioner (Appeals)
- ग Arising out of OIO No. WSO7/O&A/OIO-233/AC-KSZ/2022-23 दिनांक: 06.01.2023 passed by
Joint Commissioner, CGST, Ahmedabad South.
- घ अपीलकर्ता का नाम एवं पता Name & Address

Appellant

M/s: Sonal Mayur Desai,
17, Abhishree Residency,
Behind Kantam Party Plot,
Rajpath Rangoli Road,
Bopal Ambali Road, Thaltej,
Ahmedabad - 380058.

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:

(i) 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 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 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.



(क) 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।

(A) 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.

(ख) यदि शुल्क का भुगतान किए बिना भारत के बाहर (नेपाल या भूटान को) निर्यात किया गया माल हो।

(B) 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।

(c) 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 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.

(2) 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 :-

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

(a) To the west regional bench of Customs, Excise & Service Tax Appellate Tribunal (CESTAT) at 2nd Floor, Bahumali Bhawan, Asarwa, Girdhar Nagar, Ahmedabad : 380004. 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 शुल्कअधिनियम 1970 यथासंशोधित की अनुसूचि-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 कान्यायालय 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.

17 सीमा शुल्क, केन्द्रीय उत्पादन शुल्क एवं सेवाकर अपीलीय न्यायाधिकरण(सिस्टेट),के प्रतिअपीलो 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)-

- a. (Section) खंड 11D के तहत निर्धारित राशि;
इण लिया गलत सेनवैट क्रेडिट की राशि;
बण 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 where penalty alone is in dispute."



ORDER-IN-APPEAL


The present appeal has been filed by Dr. Sonal Mayur Desai, 17, Abhishree Residency, Behind Kantam Party Plot, Rajpath Rangoli Road, Bopal Ambali Road, Thaltej, Ahmedabad – 380058 (hereinafter referred to as “the appellant”) against Order-in-Original No. WS07/O&A/OIO-233/AC-KSZ/2022-23 dated 06.01.2023 (hereinafter referred to as “the impugned order”) passed by the Assistant Commissioner, Central GST, Division VII, Ahmedabad South (hereinafter referred to as “the adjudicating authority”).

2. Briefly stated, the facts of the case are that the appellant were holding Service Tax Registration No. AEKPD8473JST001. On scrutiny of the data received from the Central Board of Direct Taxes (CBDT) for the Financial Year 2015-16, it was noticed that there is difference of value of service amounting to Rs. 8,12,971/- between the gross value of service provided in the said data and the gross value of service shown in Service Tax return filed by the appellant for the FY 2015-16. Accordingly, it appeared that the appellant had earned the said substantial income by way of providing taxable services but not paid the applicable service tax thereon. The appellant were called upon to submit clarification for difference along with supporting documents, 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. V/WS07/I/O&A/SCN-540/2015-16/REG/2020-21 dated 28.12.2020 demanding Service Tax amounting to Rs. 1,17,880/- for the period FY 2015-16, 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); Section 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. 1,17,880/- 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 FY 2015-16. Further (i) Penalty of Rs. 1,17,880/- 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(2) of the Finance Act, 1994.

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:




- The appellant is working as an Authorized Medical Practitioner (Medical Reg. No.G-19542) and providing health care services to cure the illness of patients. The appellant is duly registered with the service tax department and holding Service Tax Registration No.AEKPD8473JST001 and duly discharged service tax liability and has filed their ST-3 Returns regularly.
- Before the period under dispute, the appellant was residing at A-302, Shiromani Apartment, Opp. Ocean Park, Satellite Road, Polytechnic, Ahmedabad- 380015 (address as mentioned in SCN and impugned order), that property had been sold out by the appellant on 24/03/2014. Since such property was sold out way back in March 2014, the appellant had neither received Show Cause Notice nor any letters as mentioned the impugned order. In this regard, the appellant made an Affidavit (Declaration) dated 23/03/2023 before notary, on stamp papers which was submitted along with appeal memorandum.
- From the above evidence, it is crystal clear that impugned order has been passed without delivery of SCN to the appellant. If any SCN is served, it may be served on old address of the appellant and the department has never bother to conduct any investigation or inquiry about current address of the appellant and has never bother to deliver SCN to the appellant.
- The appellant has earned an income of Rs. 26,65,780/- during the year FY 2015-16 by providing health care services like OPD Income, Sonography and Delivery charges which is exempted from service tax liability by virtue of Entry No. 2 of Notification No. 25/2012-ST.
- The appellant is an authorized medical practitioner, Certificate of Registration No. G-19542 issued by Gujarat Medical Council and appellant's Degree Certificate issued by Gujarat University submitted by them along with appeal memorandum. Further, they have also submitted their Income Tax Return (ITR) declaring "Income code 0604" "Medical Professional", which suggest that they earned their income as medical Professionals. They have also submitted Income Tax Return (ITR) for the F.Y. 2015-16
- The appellant is also engaged in the activity of renting of immovable property and for that appellant has registered herself with the service tax department.



- During the F.Y. 2015-16, appellant earned rent income of Rs.18,52,809/- and on that service tax has been paid and duly shown in service tax returns of the FY 2015-16. They have submitted copy of service tax returns for the FY 2015-16.
- While filing Income Tax Return (ITR) for the FY 2015-16, Medical Professional Income (Doctor) Rs. 26,65,780/- shown as Sale of Services as main income while rent income of Rs. 18,52,809/- shown under the head other income. Due to that impugned order has been passed demanding service tax on difference of income declared in ITR and ST-3.
- The appellant submitted that the SCN merely issued on the basis of amount reflected in 26AS/ITR taking the said value for the purpose of payment of service tax, which is not sustainable as per various recent judgements of the higher forum. ..
- The appellant also submitted that SCN has been issued and demand has been confirmed by invoking the extended period under Section 73(1) of the Finance Act, 1994. However, from the above facts it can be very well established that the appellant was not liable to pay service tax. There is not an iota of evidence how the appellant has suppressed any fact. In fact, entire notice is issued merely based on assumption and presumptions which have no legs to stand.
- On the basis of their aforesaid submission, they requested to set aside the impugned order.

4. Personal hearing in the case was held on 18.08.2023. Shri Keyur Kamdar, Chartered Accountant, appeared on behalf of the appellant for personal hearing and reiterated submissions made in appeal memorandum. He submitted that the appellant is a doctor and also had rental income on which service tax was paid and the return was filed. The remaining income from medical profession is not taxable. Therefore, he requested to set aside the impugned order.

5. 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.



6. It is observed that the main contentions of the appellant are that (i) the income of Rs. 26,65,780/- during the year FY 2015-16, on the basis of which the SCN issued and confirmed demand of service tax under the impugned order, received by the appellant by providing health care services like OPD Income, Sonography and Delivery charges which is exempted from service tax liability by virtue of Entry No. 2 of Notification No. 25/2012-ST; and (ii) the appellant also engaged in the activity of renting of immovable property and for that appellant has registered herself with the service tax department and during the FY 2015-16, appellant earned rent income of Rs. 18,52,809/- and on that service tax has been paid and duly shown in service tax returns of the FY 2015-16.


6.1 It is also observed that the adjudicating authority has confirmed the demand of service tax vide the impugned order passed ex-parte.

7. I find that in the SCN in question, the demand has been raised for the period FY 2015-16 based on the Income Tax Returns filed by the appellant. Except for the value of "Sales of Services under Sales / Gross Receipts from Services" provided by the Income Tax Department, no other cogent reason or justification is forthcoming from the SCN for raising the demand against the appellant. It is also not specified as to under which category of service the non-levy of service tax is alleged against the appellant. Merely because the appellant had reported receipts from services, the same cannot form the basis for arriving at the conclusion that the respondent was liable to pay service tax, which was not paid by them. In this regard, I find that CBIC had, vide Instruction dated 26.10.2021, directed that:

"It was further reiterated that demand notices may not be issued indiscriminately based on the difference between the ITR-TDS taxable value and the taxable value in Service Tax Returns.

3. It is once again reiterated that instructions of the Board to issue show cause notices based on the difference in ITR-TDS data and service tax returns only after proper verification of facts, may be followed diligently. Pr. Chief Commissioner /Chief Commissioner (s) may devise a suitable mechanism to monitor and prevent issue of indiscriminate show cause notices. Needless to mention that in all such cases where the notices have already been issued, adjudicating authorities are expected to pass a judicious order after proper appreciation of facts and submission of the noticee."

7.1 In the present case, I find that letters were issued to the appellant seeking details and documents, which were allegedly not submitted by them. However, without any further inquiry or investigation, the SCN has been issued only on the basis of details received from



the Income Tax department, without even specifying the category of service in respect of which service tax is sought to be levied and collected. This, in my considered view, is not a valid ground for raising of demand of service tax, specifically when the appellant registered with service tax department and filed their ST-3 returns regularly.

8. The appellant also contended that they have not received Show Cause Notice, any letters as mentioned in the impugned order as they have sold their old premises and also submitted an affidavit in this regard. In this regard, I find that the adjudicating authority not checked the facts that the SCN or letters of PH, etc. delivered to the appellant or not and passed impugned order ex-parte. Thus, I find that the adjudicating authority has passed the impugned order violating the principles of natural justice.

9. For ease of reference, I reproduce the relevant provision of Notification No. 25/2012-ST dated 20.06.2012 as amended, 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. (i) Health care services by a clinical establishment, an authorised medical practitioner or para-medics;

(ii) Services provided by way of transportation of a patient in an ambulance, other than those specified in (i) above"

9.1 As regards the exemption claimed by the appellant, it is observed that as per Sr. No. 2 of the Notification No. 25/2012-ST dated 20.06.2012, Health Care Services provided by a clinical establishment or an authorized medical practitioner or para-medics, are exempted taxable services from the whole of the service tax leviable thereon under section 66B of the said Act.




9.2 As per definition of Health Care Services given in Para 2(t) of the Notification No. 25/2012-ST dated 20.06.2012, "Health Care Services" – means any service by way of diagnosis or treatment or care for illness, injury, deformity, abnormality or pregnancy in any recognized system of medicines in India and includes services by way of transportation of the patient to and from a clinical establishment, but does not include hair transplant or cosmetic or plastic surgery, except when undertaken to restore or to reconstruct anatomy or functions of body affected due to congenital defects, developmental abnormalities, injury or trauma.

9.3 Further, as per definition of Authorised Medical Practitioner given in Para 2(d) of the Notification No. 25/2012-ST dated 20.06.2012, "Authorised Medical Practitioner" means a medical practitioner registered with any of the councils of the recognized system of medicines established or recognized by law in India and includes a medical professional having the requisite qualification to practice in any recognized system of medicines in India as per any law for the time being in force;

9.4 Further, as per definition of Clinical Establishment given in per Para 2(j) of the Notification No. 25/2012-ST dated 20.06.2012, "Clinical Establishment" means a hospital, nursing home, clinic, sanatorium or any other institution by, whatever name called, that offers services or facilities requiring diagnosis or treatment or care for illness, injury, deformity, abnormality or pregnancy in any recognized system of medicines in India, or a place established as an independent entity or a part of an establishment to carry out diagnostic or investigative services of diseases.

10. It is observed from the case records that the appellant is an authorized medical practitioner, having registration with The Gujarat Medical Council Registration No. G-19542. He has submitted his Medical Certificate No. G-19542 dated 19.10.1991 issued by the Gujarat Medical Council, Ahmedabad, indicating his registration with the Gujarat Medical Council.

10.1 In view of the above, I find that the Health Care Services provided by a clinical establishment, an authorized medical practitioner or para-medics, are exempted from the whole of the service tax leviable thereon under section 66B of the said Act. In the present case, the appellant has submitted his medical registration certificate, and also submitted details of the service provided by him. As per the Income Tax Return, ledger and details provided by the appellant, I find that during the FY 2015-16, the appellant had received income of Rs. 26,65,780/-, on the basis of which the SCN issued and confirmed demand of service tax under the impugned order, received by the appellant by providing health care services like OPD Income, Sonography and Delivery charges.



11. In view of the above, I am of considered opinion that the appellant during the FY 2015-16 were engaged in providing Health Care Services, which are exempted from levy of the service tax thereon under Section 66B of the Finance Act, 1994 in terms of Sr. No. 2 of Notification No. 25/2012-ST dated 20.06.2012. Thus, the income of Rs. 26,65,780/- received by them during the FY 2015-16 is not liable for Service Tax. Thus, the impugned order passed by the adjudicating authority confirming demand of service tax on difference of value of service amounting to Rs. 8,12,971/- between the gross value of service provided in the said data i.e. Rs. 26,65,780/- and the gross value of service shown in Service Tax return i.e. Rs. Rs. 18,52,809/- filed by the appellant for the FY 2015-16, is not legally sustainable on merits and is liable to be set aside.

12. Since the demand of service tax is not sustainable on merits, I am not delving into the aspect of natural justice raised by the appellant. When the demand fails, there does not arise any question of charging interest or imposing penalty in the case.

13. Accordingly, I set aside the impugned order and allow the appeal filed by the appellant.

14. 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.



(Shiv Pratap Singh)
Commissioner (Appeals)

Attested



(R. C. Maniyar)
Superintendent(Appeals),
CGST, Ahmedabad

Date : 25.08.2023



By RPAD / SPEED POST

To,
Dr. Sonal Mayur Desai,
17, Abhishree Residency,
Behind Kantam Party Plot, Rajpath Rangoli Road,
Bopal Ambali Road, Thaltej,
Ahmedabad – 380058

Appellant

The Assistant Commissioner,
CGST, Division-VII,
Ahmedabad South

Respondent

Copy to :

- 1) The Principal Chief Commissioner, Central GST, Ahmedabad Zone-
- 2) The Commissioner, CGST, Ahmedabad South
- 3) The Assistant Commissioner, CGST, Division VII, Ahmedabad South
- 4) The Assistant Commissioner (HQ System), CGST, Ahmedabad South
(for uploading the OIA)
- ✓ 5) Guard File
- 6) PA file



