

आयुक्त (अपील - II) का कार्यालय केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क
सैन्टल एक्साइज भवन, सातवीं मंजिल, पौलिटैक्नीक के पास,
आंबावाडी, अहमदाबाद- 380015.

क फाइल संख्या : File No : V2(ST)98/A-II/2015-16

ख अपील आदेश संख्या : Order-In-Appeal No.. AHM-SVTAX-000-APP-021-16-17

दिनांक Date : 20.05.2016 जारी करने की तारीख Date of Issue

श्री उमा शंकर, आयुक्त (अपील-II) द्वारा पारित

Passed by **Shri Uma Shanker** Commissioner (Appeals-II)

ग _____ आयुक्त सेवाकर अहमदाबाद : आयुक्तालय द्वारा जारी मूल आदेश सं
_____ दिनांक : _____ से सृजित

Arising out of Order-in-Original No SD-02/Ref-139/DRM/2015-16 Dated 18.09.2015

Issued by Assistant Commissioner, Div-II, Service Tax, Ahmedabad

घ अपीलकर्ता का नाम एवं पता Name & Address of The Appellants

M/s. Atelier Consultants Ahmedabad

इस अपील आदेश से असंतुष्ट कोई भी व्यक्ति उचित प्राधिकारी को अपील निम्नलिखित प्रकार से कर सकता है:-

Any person aggrieved by this Order-in-Appeal may file an appeal to the appropriate authority in the following way :-

सीमा शुल्क, उत्पाद शुल्क एवं सेवाकर अपीलीय न्यायाधिकरण को अपील:-

Appeal To Customs Central Excise And Service Tax Appellate Tribunal :-

वित्तीय अधिनियम, 1994 की धारा 86 के अंतर्गत अपील को निम्न के पास की जा सकती:-

Under Section 86 of the Finance Act 1994 an appeal lies to :-

पश्चिम क्षेत्रीय पीठ सीमा शुल्क, उत्पाद शुल्क एवं सेवाकर अपीलीय न्यायाधिकरण ओ. 20, न्यू मैन्टल हास्पिटल कम्पाउण्ड, मेधाणी नगर, अहमदाबाद-380016

The West Regional Bench of Customs, Excise, Service Tax Appellate Tribunal (CESTAT) at O-20, New Mental Hospital Compound, Meghani Nagar, Ahmedabad - 380 016.

(ii) अपीलीय न्यायाधिकरण को वित्तीय अधिनियम, 1994 की धारा 86 (1) के अंतर्गत अपील सेवाकर नियमावली, 1994 के नियम 9 (1) के अंतर्गत निर्धारित फार्म एस.टी- 5 में चार प्रतियों में की जा सकेगी एवं उसके साथ जिस आदेश के विरुद्ध अपील की गई हो उसकी प्रतियाँ भेजी जानी चाहिए (उनमें से एक प्रमाणित प्रति होगी) और साथ में जिस स्थान में न्यायाधिकरण का न्यायपीठ स्थित है, वहाँ के नामित सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र बैंक के न्यायपीठ के सहायक रजिस्ट्रार के नाम से रेखांकित बैंक ड्राफ्ट के रूप में जहाँ सेवाकर की मांग, ब्याज की मांग ओर लगाया गया जुर्माना रूपए 5 लाख या उससे कम है वहाँ रूपए 1000/- फीस भेजनी होगी। जहाँ सेवाकर की मांग, ब्याज की मांग ओर लगाया गया जुर्माना रूपए 5 लाख या 50 लाख तक हो तो रूपए 5000/- फीस भेजनी होगी। जहाँ सेवाकर की मांग, ब्याज की मांग ओर लगाया गया जुर्माना रूपए 50 लाख या उससे ज्यादा है वहाँ रूपए 10000/- फीस भेजनी होगी।

(ii) The appeal under sub section (1) of Section 86 of the Finance Act 1994 to the Appellate Tribunal Shall be filed in quadruplicate in Form S.T.5 as prescribed under Rule 9(1) of the Service Tax Rules 1994 and Shall be accompanied by a copy of the order appealed against (one of which shall be certified copy) and should be accompanied by a fees of Rs. 1000/- where the amount of service tax & interest demanded & penalty levied of Rs. 5 Lakhs or less, Rs.5000/- where the amount of service tax & interest demanded & penalty levied is is more than five lakhs but not exceeding Rs. Fifty Lakhs, Rs.10,000/- where the amount of service tax & interest demanded & penalty levied is more than fifty Lakhs rupees, in the form of crossed-bank draft in favour of the Assistant Registrar of the bench of nominated Public Sector Bank of the place where the bench of Tribunal is situated.



ध 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।

(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) 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 भीतर मूल-आदेश एवं अपील आदेश की दो-दो प्रतियों के साथ उचित आवेदन किया जाना चाहिए। उसके साथ खाता इ. का मुख्यशीर्ष 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 हो तो 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 सेवाकर अपीलीय न्यायाधिकरण के प्रति अपील:-
Appeal to Custom, Excise, & Service Tax Appellate Tribunal.

(1) केन्द्रीय उत्पादन शुल्क अधिनियम, 1944 की धारा 35- ए0बी/35-इ के अंतर्गत:-

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

(क) वर्गीकरण मूल्यांकन से संबंधित सभी मामले सीमा शुल्क, केन्द्रीय उत्पादन शुल्क एवं सेवाकर अपीलीय न्यायाधिकरण की विशेष पीठिका वेस्ट ब्लॉक नं. 3. आर. के. पुरम, नई दिल्ली को एवं


(a) the special bench of Custom, Excise & Service Tax Appellate Tribunal of West Block No.2, R.K. Puram, New Delhi-1 in all matters relating to classification valuation and.

(ख) 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 ओ-20, न्यू मैन्टल हास्पिटल कम्पाउण्ड, मेघानी नगर, अहमदाबाद-380016.

(b) 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) केन्द्रीय उत्पादन शुल्क (अपील) नियमावली, 2001 की धारा 6 के अंतर्गत प्रपत्र इए-3 में निर्धारित किए अनुसार अपीलीय न्यायाधिकरणों की गई अपील के विरुद्ध अपील किए गए आदेश की चार प्रतियाँ सहित जहाँ उत्पाद शुल्क की मांग, ब्याज की मांग ओर लगाया गया जुर्माना रूपए 5 लाख या उससे कम है वहाँ रूपए 1000/- फीस भेजनी होगी। जहाँ उत्पाद शुल्क की मांग, ब्याज की मांग ओर लगाया गया जुर्माना रूपए 5 लाख या 50 लाख तक हो तो रूपए 5000/- फीस भेजनी होगी। जहाँ उत्पाद शुल्क की मांग, ब्याज की मांग ओर लगाया गया जुर्माना रूपए 50 लाख या उससे ज्यादा है वहाँ रूपए 10000/- फीस भेजनी होगी। की फीस सहायक रजिस्टार के नाम से रेखांकित बैंक ड्राफ्ट के रूप में संबंध की जाये। यह ड्राफ्ट उस स्थान के किसी नामित सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र के बैंक की शाखा का हो

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



ORDER IN APPEAL


This order arises out of the appeal filed by M/s Atelier Consultants, Spec India Division, Parth Complex, Near Swastik Cross Roads, Navrangpura, Ahmedabad (hereinafter referred to as the "said appellants") against the Order In Original No. SD-02/REF-139/DRM/2015-16 dated 18.09.2015 (hereinafter referred to as the "impugned order") passed by the Assistant Commissioner of Service Tax, Division-II, Ahmedabad (hereinafter referred to as the "adjudicating authority").

2. The relevant facts of the case are that the appellants are holding valid Service Tax Registration and filed a refund claim of ₹4,06,638/- on 15.06.2015 for the period from July 2012 to September 2012 under Notification No. 27/2012-CE(NT) dated 18.06.2012 in respect of Service Tax paid on the specific services used for export of goods/ services.
3. In light of discrepancies noticed in the refund claim a Show cause notice was issued on 10.08.2015. The said SCN was adjudicated vide the impugned order wherein the refund claim was rejected by the adjudicating authority on the grounds that claim was hit by the time limitations under the provisions of Section 11B of the Central Excise Act, 1944, hence time barred.
4. Being aggrieved by the above order, the appellants have filed an appeal on the following grounds,
 1. The adjudicating authority has observed at Para 14 of the impugned order, that the date of receipt of the payment of export services is the relevant date for Section 11B of the Central Excise Act, 1944 and therefore the refund claim filed after one year from such date is time barred. However, the appellants find that there is no such clause provided in the explanation to the Section 11B, wherein relevant date for the purpose of Section 11B has been specifically defined.
 2. The appellants are not providing any services to the domestic customers and the entire IT services provided by them are exported during the relevant period. As such they do not have any opportunity so as to utilize the said Service Tax Credit against any Service Tax liability. Other than IT services they are not providing any other services. Rule 5 of the CCR speaks that "where for any reason such adjustment is not possible, the manufacturer or provider of output services shall be allowed refund of such amount subject to such safeguards, conditions and limitations, as may be specified, by the Central Government by notification". Hence, the Cenvat Credit of



- input Service Tax lying unutilized may be sanctioned in terms of the said notification.
3. The adjudicating authority has wrongly rejected the refund claim on the ground of time bar as the claim was filed on 15.06.2015 after one year from the last date of the quarter ending September 2012. They submitted that there is no time limit prescribed for refund of unutilized credit under Rule 5 of the Cenvat Credit Rules, 2004 under Section 11B of the Central Excise Act, 1944 as made applicable to Service Tax refunds.
 4. The appellant had filed the refund claim under the said Notification which specifies that the same should be filed before expiry of the period specified under Section 11B of the Central Excise Act, 1944. However, Section 11 B does not provide for any time limit for claiming refund of credit of Service Tax paid on input services used for export of services.
 5. Section 11B(1) states that the refund is required to be filed within one year from the relevant date. For this purpose, 'relevant date' has been defined under Explanation B to the Section 11B as is evident from the definition of 'relevant date', relevant date has not been defined in relation to refund of credit of service tax paid on input services used in export of services.
 6. The sub clauses (a) to (eb) of the Explanation B prescribed the relevant date for specific situations which do not cover refund of (accumulated) credit of input taxes which has been claimed by them. Sub clause (f) i.e. 'date of payment of duty' cannot be applied to the refund filed since appellants have not sought refund of duty/taxes paid on its output service but has filed a claim for refund of unutilized Cenvat Credit. Hence the time limit of one year from the relevant date stated under Section 11 B (1) is not applicable to the refund claim filed by them and therefore the refund cannot be rejected on the grounds of time bar. The appellants have further submitted that they had filed the claim under Section 11 B (2)(c) i.e. refund of credit of duty paid on excisable goods used as inputs in accordance with the rules made, or any notification issued, under this Act, for which no time limit has been prescribed under Section 11B. The appellants have placed reliance on the following judgments, wherein it has been categorically held, beyond any doubt, that the time limit under Section 11B is not applicable to the claim for refund of credit of duty paid.

- a) In Re: Patodia Synthetic Ltd 2009 (239)-ELT 0506-Comm(A).
- b) CCE, Ahmedabad vs. Anjani Synthetics Ltd. [2001(132) ELT 688 (Tri. Mumbai)]



- c) Sanghi Textiles Ltd vs. CCE Hyderabad-III [2006 (206) ELT 854].
- d) CCE vs. Swagat Synthetics cited in 2008 (232) E.L.T. 413 (Guj.) in Tax Appeal No. 726 of 2008, decided on 14.07.2008.

5. Personal hearing in the matter was granted and held on 19.04.2016. Shri R. Subramnya, Advocate, appeared before me and reiterated the grounds of appeal.

6. I have carefully gone through the Statement of Facts, Grounds of appeal and the impugned order issued in the instant case.

7. I find that the appellant has claimed refund of Cenvat Credit of Input Services utilized during the export of IT Services during the period July 2012 to September 2012 under Notification No. 27/2012-CE(NT) dated 18.06.2012. Further, the impugned order speaks of rejection of the claim on the grounds of time limitations as the same has been filed after the passage of one year of the export of the said Services, contrary to the stipulations under Section 11B of the Central Excise Act, 1944.

8.1 Hence, I would like to examine the basic contention of the adjudicating authority on rejection of the claim on the grounds of time limitation, prescribed under Section 11B of the Central Excise Act, 1944 vis-à-vis the grounds of appeal put forth by the appellant.

8.2 Rule 5 of the CCR speaks of the following,

"# [5. **Refund of CENVAT credit:** - Where any input or input service is used in the manufacture of final product which is cleared for export under bond or letter of undertaking, as the case may be, or used in the intermediate product cleared for export, or used in providing output service which is exported, the CENVAT credit in respect of the input or input service so used shall be allowed to be utilized by the manufacturer or provider of output service towards payment of,

(i) duty of excise on any final product cleared for home consumption or for export on payment of duty; or

(ii) service tax on output service,

and where for any reason such adjustment is not possible, the manufacturer or the provider of output service shall be allowed refund of such amount subject to such safeguards, conditions



and limitations, as may be specified, by the Central Government, by notification:

Provided that no refund of credit shall be allowed if the manufacturer or provider of output service avails of drawback allowed under the Customs and Central Excise Duties Drawback Rules, 1995, or claims rebate of duty under the Central Excise Rules, 2002, in respect of such duty; or claims rebate of service tax under the Export of Service Rules, 2005 in respect of such tax.

Provided further that no credit of the additional duty leviable under sub-section (5) of section 3 of the Customs Tariff Act shall be utilised for payment of service tax on any output service.

Explanation: For the purposes of this rule, the word 'output service which is exported' means the output service exported in accordance with the Export of Services Rules, 2005.]

8.3 The mandate of the said rule is very clear inasmuch that the Cenvat credit taken on input services can be utilized for the payment of Service Tax on any output services and where, for any reason such adjustment is not possible, the manufacturer shall be allowed refund of such amount subject to the safe guards. Further, the relevant rules indicate that the refund is to be isolated only to the extent of the Credit of Service Tax availed and involved in the inputs utilized in the services subsequently exported and which remain unutilized after utilizing the said credit after payment of Service Tax, both under domestic clearances as well as under exports (on payment of taxes under claim of rebate prescribed under Rule 5 of the CCR). In this case, the export of services is no where disputed under the impugned order.

8.4 Further, the Notification No.5/2006-CE (NT) dated 6.3.2006 issued under the above Rule reads as follows,

"In exercise of the powers conferred by rule 5 of the CENVAT Credit Rules, 2004 (hereinafter referred to as the 'said rules'), and in supersession of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Finance (Department of Revenue), No.11/2002 - Central Excise (NT), dated 1st March, 2002, published in the Gazette of India Extraordinary, vide number G.S.R. 150(E), dated 1st March 2002, the Central Government hereby directs that refund of CENVAT credit shall be allowed in respect of:



(a) *input or input service used in the manufacture of final product which is cleared for export under bond or letter of undertaking;*

(b) *input or input service used in providing output service which has been exported without payment of service tax, subject to safeguards, conditions and limitations, set out in the Appendix to this notification.*

Appendix

1. *The final product or the output service is exported in accordance with the procedure laid down in the Central Excise Rules, 2002, or the Export of Services Rules, 2005, as the case may be.*


8.5 Similarly Clause 6 of the Appendix to the aforesaid Notification further stipulates,

6. *The application in Form A, along with the prescribed enclosures and the relevant extracts of the records maintained under the Central Excise Rules, 2002, CENVAT Credit Rules, 2004, or the Service Tax Rules, 1994, in original, are filed with the Deputy Commissioner of Central Excise or the Assistant Commissioner of Central Excise, as the case may be, before the expiry of the period specified in section 11B of the Central Excise Act, 1944(1 of 1944).*

8.6 The above law clearly stipulates that refund claimed under this Rule is governed by limitations set under Section 11B of the Act, *ibid.* Hence, Refund under Rule 5 cannot be independently read for requirement of limitations under Section 11 B of the Act. However, the appellants have appealed contrary to the above in as much as the claim under Rule 5, is not governed by time limitation under Section 11B of the Act, which after the above reading appears to be incorrect.

9. Further, to come to the exact proposition of relevant date, I would like to visit the concerned provision under Export of Service Rules, 2005 as Rule 5 of the CCR and the Notification issued thereunder refers to the Exports of output services governed under the Export of Service Rules, 2005. Rule 3(2) of the Export of Services Rules, 2005 deals with the situation where it has been described that what provisions of export of service are. The same is reproduced as,

"(2) *The provision of any taxable service specified in sub-rule (1)*



shall be treated as export of service when the following conditions are satisfied, namely : —


- (a) [.....]
- (b) payment for such service [.....] is received by the service provider in convertible foreign exchange."

10. From the above provisions, it is very much clear in the case of export of service, that the relevant date would be the date when the payment of services exported has been received by the assessee. In this case, I place the reliance on the judgment of Honorable CESTAT WZB, Mumbai in case of COMMISSIONER OF CENTRAL EXCISE, PUNE-I Vs. EATON INDUSTRIES P. LTD. reported under 2011 (22) S.T.R. 223 (Tri. - Mumbai). Further, effective from March 1, 2016, Notification No. 27 is amended vide Notification No. 14/2016 - CE (NT) dated March 1, 2016 so as to provide the time limit for filing application for refund of Cenvat credit under Rule 5 of the Credit Rules, in case of export as under:

- in case of manufacturer, before the expiry of the period specified in Section 11B of the Excise Act,
- in case of service provider, before the expiry of one year from the date of:
- receipt of payment in convertible foreign exchange, where provision of service had been completed prior to receipt of such payment; or
- Issue of invoice, where payment for the service had been received in advance prior to the date of issue of the invoice

This amendment resolves all the disputes, which had originated in course of interpretation of Section 11B of the Excise Act in the case of time limit for filing refund claim on export of services.

11. In view of above, I do not find any reason to interfere in the impugned order and reject the appeal filed by the appellants.


(UMA SHANKER)

COMMISSIONER (APPEAL-II)
CENTRAL EXCISE, AHMEDABAD.

ATTESTED


(S. DUTTA) 220576

SUPERINTENDENT (APPEAL-II),
CENTRAL EXCISE, AHMEDABAD.



BY R.P.A.D

To :-

M/s Atelier Consultants,
Spec India Division, Parth Complex,
Near Swastik Cross Roads, Navrangpura,
Ahmedabad- 380 009.

Copy to:-

- 1) The Chief Commissioner, Central Excise, Ahmedabad.
- 2) The Commissioner, Service Tax, Ahmedabad.
- 3) The Dy./Asst. Commissioner, Service Tax, Division-II, Ahmedabad.
- 4) The Asst. Commissioner (System), Service Tax Hq, Ahmedabad.
- 5) Guard File.
- 6) P. A. File.



