



सत्यमेव जयते

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

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



DIN: 20230864SW0000888AAD

स्पीड पोस्ट

- क फाइल संख्या : File No : GAPPL/COM/STP/3201/2023 / 11983-88
- ख अपील आदेश संख्या Order-In-Appeal No. AHM-EXCUS-001-APP-95/2023-24
दिनांक Date : 28-08-2023 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. 153/AC/M/s. Technomech Engineers (i)/Div-VI/A'bad-South/JDM/2022-23 दिनांक: 29.12.2022 passed by The Assistant Commissioner (RB), CGST, Ahmedabad South.
- घ अपीलकर्ता का नाम एवं पता Name & Address

Appellant

M/s. M/s. Technomech Engineers (i),
B-3, Sarita Complex, Jain Temple Lane,
Off: C.G. Road, Navrangpura HQ,
Ahmedabad-380009.

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) 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 प्रकिया 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 इका 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 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 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 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 यथासंशोधित 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.

- 1प 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 alone is in dispute."




ORDER-IN-APPEAL

The present appeal has been filed by M/s. Technomech Engineers (India), B-3, Sarita Complex, Jain Temple Lane, Off. C.G. Road, Navrangpura, Ahmedabad – 380009 (hereinafter referred to as “the appellant”) against Order-in-Original No. 153/AC/M/S Technomech Engineers(I)/Div-VI/A’bad-South/JDM/2022-23 dated 29.12.2022 (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 appellant were holding Service Tax Registration No. ADFPJ1371HST001. 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. 79,58,702/- 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/WS06/O&A/SCN-554/2020-21 dated 28.12.2020 demanding Service Tax amounting to Rs. 11,93,805/- 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)(c), 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. 11,93,805/- 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. 11,93,805/- was imposed on the appellant under Section 78 of the Finance Act, 1994; (ii) Penalty of Rs. 10,000/- was imposed on the appellant under Section 77(1)(c) of the Finance Act, 1994; and (iii) 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, along with an application for condonation of delay, inter alia, on the following grounds:

- The appellant is engaged in providing works contract services along with the goods. The appellant has provided works contract service which is eligible for benefit of 50% tax which is payable by recipient under Reverse Charge as per Notification No. 30/2012-ST.
- Further in the present case, appellant made only one mistake during filing of Form ST-3 for the quarter of Apr-Jun and Jul-Sep of the FY 2015-16 by showing reduced value (i.e., 50% remaining after value on which tax is to be paid recipient) in Gross amount for Works Contract Service head. For this mistake value as per STR for FY 2015-16 went to Rs. 27,00,177/- while in fact the Value of Service of Works Contract is Rs. 31,85,412/-. However, there is no short payment of service tax because this is only presentation mistake which makes no difference for the purpose of Value and Service Tax.
- Hence, it is not the case of short payment of Service Tax and this is also not the case where appellant suppressed anything from the department. The appellant's turnover of taxable service for the said period was Rs. 31,85,412/- which can be reconciled with audit report. They have submitted reconciliation of the figures, which is as under:

Sr. No.	Particulars	Apr to Jun	Jul to Sep	Oct to Dec	Jan to Mar	Total
1	Receipt on Maintenance & Repairs Services	19750	20250	259350	307500	
2	Works Contract Services (having 50% RCM)	233260	737210	677960	930132	
3	Less: 50% RCM in Works Contract	116630	368605	338980	465066	
4	Sales shown in STR	136380	388855	937310	1237632	2700177
5	Figures not shown in STR is recipient's portion of taxable value on which tax as per RCM is to be paid by them	116630	368605			485235
	Total value of services	253010	757460	937310	1237632	3185412
6	Sales as per Books	253010	757460	937310	1237632	3185412
	Total sales in ITR					10658879
	Less: Sales of material					3859265



Sales ACC					1969563
Sales of polycab (lighting equipment)					1670792
Sales return					-26153
					(7473467)
Sales of Service as per Books					3185412

- They have also submitted Copy of ITR, 26AS, Audit Report and Form ST-3 for FY2015-16.
- Without prejudice to the other submissions it is to submit that on value which VAT is paid the Service Tax cannot be demanded. The appellant is also enclosing their VAT return to substantiate that the value in Service Tax Return is on higher side as compared to the books of accounts.
- In the present case, from the evidence adduced by the appellant, it can be easily inferred that they were bona fide in their conduct. Thus, the non-disclosure of value, at the most be termed as 'omission' and not willful suppression, as alleged in the SCN. Without prejudice to the above-written submissions, without admitting but assuming, the appellant submits that they have not suppressed the facts with the intention to evade the Service Tax.

4. On going through the appeal memorandum, it is noticed that the impugned order was issued on 29.12.2022 and received by the appellant on 06.01.2023. However, the present appeal, in terms of Section 85 of the Finance Act, 1994 was filed on 14.03.2023, i.e. after a delay of 8 days from the last date of filing of appeal. The appellant have along with appeal memorandum also filed an Application seeking condonation of delay stating that the matter being 7 years old, it required more time in order to collect all relevant documents. The appellant is an individual and not having regular staff to maintain accounts and records. Hence, there is delay in filing of appeal.

4.1 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 7 days and take up the appeal for decision on merits.

4.2 Personal hearing in the case was held on 21.08.2023. Shri Gunjan Shah, Chartered Accountant, appeared on behalf of the appellant for personal hearing and reiterated submissions made in appeal memorandum. He submitted that value shown in the ITR which has been wrongly taken as taxable value for service tax purpose, actually the said value included sale of goods and materials to the extent of Rs. 80,00,000/-. Further, in respect of work contract service provided by the appellant, the appellant was liable to pay only 50 per cent of the tax on the service portion and the remaining 50 per cent was payable by the recipient on reverse charge basis. He submitted that in the second return they have shown the liability as 50 per cent however, in the first return inadvertently, they missed to show the same. However, they correctly discharge the liability and therefore, he requested to set aside the impugned order, which has been passed ex-parte without any verification.

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 FY 2015-16.

6. It is observed that the main contentions of the appellant are that (i) the value shown in the ITR which has been wrongly taken as taxable value for service tax purpose, actually the said value included sale of goods and materials to the extent of Rs. 80,00,000/-; and (ii) during filing of Form ST-3 for the quarter of Apr-Jun and Jul-Sep of the FY 2015-16 they have shown reduced value (i.e., 50% remaining after value on which tax is to be paid recipient) in Gross amount for Works Contract Service head and due to this mistake there is difference arise in the income figures shown in Income Tax and Gross taxable value as shown in Service Tax Return for FY 2015-16. However, there is no short payment of service tax.

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 in the present case, where the appellant is already registered with the service tax department and filed their ST-3 Returns regularly.

8. On verification of Profit & Loss Account for the FY 2015-16, I find that the appellant shown total income of Rs. 1,06,58,879=21 in Sales Account, head wise bifurcation of the said amount is as under:

<u>Particular</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Sales (A.C.)	- Rs. 19,69,563=36.
Sales Material	- Rs. 38,59,265=22
Sales (Polycab)	- Rs. 16,70,791=85
Sales Return	- (-) Rs. 26,153=22
Sales – (Service)	- Rs. 31,85,412=00

8.1 On verification of the VAT Return for the FY 2015-16, I find that the appellant shown Net Taxable Value as Rs. 80,22,276/- in the same. The sale of goods / trading of goods falls in Negative List as per Section 66D(e) of the Finance Act, 1994. Hence, the appellant are not liable to pay service tax on the said amount. Thus, out of Rs. 1,06,58,879/- only Rs. 31,85,412/- is the taxable value of services provided by the appellant for FY 2015-16. The



appellant already shown Rs. 27,00,177/- as gross value of service provided in the ST-3 Returns filed by them for FY 2015-16. Therefore, there is difference of Rs. 4,85,235/- in the value of services as per income data (P&L Account) & ST-3 Returns.


8.2 On verification of the ST-3 Return for the period from April to September-2015, I find that in the Service head 'Works Contract Service', the appellant has shown Notification No. 30/2012-ST and also shown service tax payable as '50%' in the Sr. No. A10.5. However, by mistake, they have shown 50% of Gross Value in 'Gross Amount' (Sr. No. B1.1) as well as 'Net Taxable Value' (Sr. No. B1.14). Thus, the appellant shown reduce value i.e. Rs. 4,85,235/- instead of Rs. 9,70,470/- for the first half of FY 2015-16, which resulted in difference in the income figures shown in Income Tax and Gross taxable value as shown in Service Tax Return for FY 2015-16. Thus, I find that the contention of the appellant is correct that there is no short payment of service tax in the present case.

9. In view of the above discussion, I am of the considered view that the appellant not liable to pay Service Tax as demanded and confirmed in the impugned order. Since the demand of Service Tax is not sustainable on merits, there does not arise any question of charging interest or imposing penalties in the case.

10. In view of above, I hold that the impugned order passed by the adjudicating authority confirming demand of Service Tax for the FY 2015-16, is not legal and proper and deserve to be set aside. Accordingly, I set aside the impugned order and allow the appeal filed by the appellant.


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.




(Shiv Pratap Singh)
Commissioner (Appeals)

Attested


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

Date : 28.08.2023



By RPAD / SPEED POST

To,
M/s. Technomech Engineers (India),
B-3, Sarita Complex,
Jain Temple Lane, Off. C.G. Road,
Navrangpura, Ahmedabad – 380009

Appellant

The Assistant Commissioner,
CGST, Division-II,
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 II, Ahmedabad South
- 4) The Assistant Commissioner, CGST, Division VI, Ahmedabad South
- 5) The Assistant Commissioner (HQ System), CGST, Ahmedabad South
(for uploading the OIA)

- ~~6) Guard File~~
- 7) PA file