रजिस्टर्ड डाक ए.डी. द्वारा

. .

 \bigcirc

 \bigcirc

Ľ

| 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)164 /A-II/2015-16 / 1985 रेठ 1989 |
| ख अपील आदेश संख्या : Order-In-Appeal No <u>AHM-SVTAX-000-APP-097 -16-17</u> |
| दिनॉक Date : <u>21.09.2016</u> जारी करने की तारीख Date of Issue |
| <u>श्री उमा शंकर</u> , आयुक्त (अपील–॥) द्वारा पारित |
| Passed by Shri Uma Shanker Commissioner (Appeals-II) |
| ग आयुक्त सेवाकर अहमदाबाद ः आयुक्तालय द्वारा जारी मूल आदेश सं |
| से सृजित |
| Arising out of Order-in-Original No <u>SD-02/REF-203/DRM/2015-16 D</u> ated 31.12.2015 |
| Issued by Asstt. Commr., STC, Div-II, Service Tax, Ahmedabad |
| ध अपीलकर्ता का नाम एवं पता Name & Address of The Appellants |
| M/s. I-Design 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 अपीलः– |
| 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 सकतीः— Under Section 86 of the Finance Act 1994 an appeal lies to :- |
| पश्चिम क्षेत्रीय पीठ सीमा शुल्क, उत्पाद शुल्क एवं सेवाकर अपीलीय न्यायाधिकरण ओ. २०, 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 विरूद्ध 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 वहां 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 वहां 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 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. |





(iii) वित्तीय अधिनियम,1994 की धारा 86 की उप–धाराओं एवं (2ए) के अंतर्गत अपील सेवाकर नियमावली, 1994 के नियम 9 (2ए) के अंतर्गत निर्धारित फार्म एस.टी.-7 में की जा सकेगी एवं उसके साथ आयुक्त, केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क (अपील) के आदेश की प्रतियाँ (OIA)(उसमें से प्रमाणित प्रति होगी) और अपर आयुक्त, सहायक / उप आयुक्त अथवा A219k केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क, अपीलीय न्यायाधिकरण को आवेदन करने के निदेश देते हुए आदेश (OIO) की प्रति भेजनी होगी।

(iii) The appeal under sub section (2A) of the section 86 the Finance Act 1994, shall be filed in Form ST-7 as prescribed under Rule 9 (2A) of the Service Tax Rules, 1994 and shall be accompanied by a copy of order of Commissioner Central Excise (Appeals)(OIA)(one of which shall be a certified copy) and copy of the order passed by the Addl. / Joint or Dy. /Asstt. Commissioner or Superintendent of Central Excise & Service Tax (OIO) to apply to the Appellate Tribunal.

2. यथासंशोधित न्यायालय शुल्क अधिनियम, 1975 की शर्तो पर अनुसूची—1 के अंतर्गत निर्धारित किए अनुसार मूल आदेश एवं स्थगन प्राधिकारी के आदेश की प्रति पर रू 6.50 / – पैसे का न्यायालय शुल्क टिकट लगा होना चाहिए।

2. One copy of application or O.I.O. as the case may be, and the order of the adjudication authority shall bear a court fee stamp of Rs.6.50 paise as prescribed under Schedule-I in terms of the Court Fee Act, 1975, as amended.

3. सीमा शुल्क, उत्पाद शुल्क एवं सेवाकर अपीलीय न्यायाधिकरण (कार्यविधि) नियमावली, 1982 में चर्चित एवं अन्य संबंधित मामलों को सम्मिलित करने वाले नियमों की ओर भी ध्यान आकर्षित किया जाता है।

3. Attention is also invited to the rules covering these and other related matters contained in the Customs, Excise and Service Appellate Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 1982.

4. सीमा शुल्क, केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क एवं सेवाकर अपीलीय प्राधिकरण (सीस्तेत) के प्रति अपीलों के मामलों में केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क अधिनियम, १९४४ की धारा ३५फ के अंतर्गत वित्तीय(संख्या-२) अधिनियम २०१४(२०१४ की संख्या २५) दिनांक: ०६.०८.२०१४ जो की वित्तीय अधिनियम, १९९४ की धारा ८३ के अंतर्गत सेवाकर को भी लागू की गई है, द्वारा निश्चित की गई पूर्व-राशि जमा करना अनिवार्य है, बशर्ते कि इस धारा के अंतर्गत जमा की जाने वाली अपेक्षित देय राशि दस करोड़ रूपए से अधिक न हो

केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क एवं सेवाकर के अंतर्गत '' मॉग किए गए शुल्क '' में निम्न शामिल है –

- (i) धारा 11 डी के अंतर्गत निर्धारित रकम
- (ii) सेनवैट जमा की ली गई गलत राशि
- (iii) सेनवैट जमा नियमावली के नियम 6 के अंतर्गत देय रकम
- अागे बशर्ते यह कि इस धारा के प्रावधान वित्तीय (सं. 2) अधिनियम, 2014 के आरम्भ से पूर्व किसी अपीलीय प्राधिकारी के समक्ष विचाराधीन स्थगन अर्ज़ी एवं अपील को लागू नहीं होगे।

4. For an appeal to be filed before the CESTAT, it is mandatory to pre-deposit an amount specified under the Finance (No. 2) Act, 2014 (No. 25 of 2014) dated 06.08.2014, under section 35F of the Central Excise Act, 1944 which is also made applicable to Service Tax under section 83 of the Finance Act, 1994 provided the amount of pre-deposit payable would be subject to ceiling of Rs. Ten Crores,

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.
- ⇒ Provided further that the provisions of this Section shall not apply to the stay application and appeals pending before any appellate authority prior to the commencement of the Finance (No.2) Act, 2014.

आयुद्

roh

अहमदावाद

4(1) इस संदर्भ में, 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।

4(1) In view of above, an appeal against this order shall lie before the Tribunal only 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

1. This order arises out of the appeal filed by M/s 1-Design (AIMP B2880R ST002), A-1, Asmi Flats, Opp. Memnagar Fire station, Navarangpura, Ahmedabad 380009 (hereinafter referred to as 'the appellant') against the Refund OIO No. SD-02/Ref-203/DRM/2015-16 dated 31.12.2015(hereinafter referred to as 'the impugned order') passed by the Assistant Commissioner, Service Tax, Division II, Ahmedabad (hereinafter referred to as 'the sanctioning authority') on 31.12.2015

2. The relevant facts of the case are that the appellant had filed a refund claim of the Service Tax of Rs. 7,41,996/- on 23.06.2015 with the Assistant Commissioner, Service Tax, Division-II, Ahmedabad paid under as appellant has paid excess of 50% of service tax payable under reverse charge mechanism under notification 30/2012-ST dated 20.06.2015.

3. Refund was sanctioned but Interest was not sanctioned vide impugned OIO. Appellant received refund on 31.12.2015 after delay of 100 days. Being aggrieved with the impugned order, the appellant filed an appeal claiming the interest of Rs. 36,592/- on delayed refund. It is contended that they are entitled to in view of Section 11BB of the Central Excise Act, 1944 for the period commencing three months from filing of claim. In support of their contention appellant has cited judgment in case of Surajbhan Synthetics (P) Itd. Vs. CCE Hydrabad [2014 (301) ELT 386 (Tri. Bang.)]

4. Personal Hearing in the matter was held on 17.08.2016, wherein Mr. Biren Shah, CA appeared on behalf of the appellant and reiterated the contents of the appeal memorandum.

5. I have carefully gone through the facts of the case on records, grounds of the Appeal Memorandum, and oral submissions made by the appellant at the time of personal hearing.

6. The appellant with this present appeal against the impugned order has pleaded for the interest under the provisions of Section 11BB of the Central Excise Act, 1944. The moot point for decision before me is that whether the appellant is eligible for the interest under the provisions of Section 11BB of the Central Excise Act.

7. I find that refund claim of the Service Tax of Rs. 7,41,996/- has been filed on 23.06.2015 but after scrutinizing the same query memo dated 24.07.2015 was issued which appellant complied after 15 days vide letter dated 10.08.2015. Again second query memo dated 10.08.2015 was raised on the basis of details submitted for first query memo. Required details were submitted after 38 days by two letters dated 03.09.2015 and 1.10.2015. I find that appellant has taken total 53 days to submit the compliance.



8. I find that payment of interest on sanctioning of refund beyond three months from the date of receipt of the application of refund claim till the date of refund of such duty is governed by the provisions of Section 11BB of the Central Excise Act, 1944 made applicable to the service tax cases vide Section 83 of the Finance Act, 1994. Section 11BB ibid is reproduced as under for better appreciation of the issue in appeal.

"SECTION [Interest on delayed refunds. 11BB. — If any duty ordered to be refunded under sub-section (2) of section 11B to any applicant is not refunded within three months from the date of receipt of application under sub-section (1) of that section, there shall be paid to that applicant interest at such rate, [not below five per cent] and not exceeding thirty per cent per annum as is for the time being fixed [by the Central Government, by Notification in the Official Gazette], on such duty from the date immediately after the expiry of three months from the date of receipt of such application till the date of refund of such duty"

9. Further, payment of interest on sanctioning of refund beyond three months from the date of receipt of the application of refund claim till the date of refund of such duty is a settled issue in pursuance to the various judgments passed by the higher, judicial forums as well as being clarified by the CBEC also from time to time. The CBEC vide Circular No.670/61/2002-CX dated 01.10.2002 being relevant in this case, is interalia reproduced as under.

"In this connection, Board would like to stress that the provisions of section 11BB of Central Excise Act, 1944 are attracted automatically for any refund sanctioned beyond a period of three months. The jurisdictional Central Excise Officers are not required to wait for instructions from any superior officers or to look for instructions in the orders of higher appellate authority for grant of interest."

10. Further, I find that the issue in question is also decided by the higher judicial forums in the following judgments, wherein it is held that the interest should be paid from the expiry of three months from the date of receipt of refund application.

- J.K.cement Works V/s ACC- 2004(170) ELT 4 (Raj. H.C.)- Also maintained by S.C.-2005 (179) ELT A150 (S.C.)
- Kerala Chemicals & Protines Ltd.- 2007 (211) ELT 259- (Tri. Bang.)
- CEX,Pune-III V/s Movilex Irrigation Ltd.-2007 (207) ELT 617 (Tri. Mumbai)
- CCE V/s Reliance industries Ltd- 2010(259)ELT 356 (Guj HC)

1

• Ranbaxy Laboratories Vs. Union of India, 2011(273)ELT.3.(SC)

11. In view of above, I find force in the contention of the appellant and also reliance placed by the appellant in appeal. on decisions/judgments of the higher judicial forums. Accordingly, I hold that the appellant is eligible of the interest at



such rate for the time being fixed by the Central Government by Notification in the Official Gazette on such refund amount from the date immediately after the expiry of three months from the date of such application of refund till the date of refund of such service tax. However I find that 53 days delay occurred on part of appellant. I hold that 53 days period is to be deducted from period entitled for interest payment.

÷ -2 - -

12. The appeal filed by the appellant is thereby disposed off in above terms.

(UMA SHANKER) COMMISSIONER (APPEALS-II) CENTRAL EXCISE, AHMEDABAD

ATTESTED

(R.R. PATEL) SUPERINTENDENT(APPEALS-II), CENTRAL EXCISE, AHMEDABAD.

By R.P.A.D.:

M/s I-Design, A-1, Asmi Flats, Opp. Memnagar Fire station, Navarangpura, Ahmedabad 380009

Copy To:

1) The Chief Commissioner, Central Excise, Ahmedabad.

2) The Commissioner, Service Tax, Ahmedabad.

3) The Deputy Commissioner, Service Tax, Division-II, Ahmedabad.

5) The Assistant Commissioner (Systems), Service Tax(HQ), Ahmedabad.

6) The P.A. to Commissioner (Appeals-IV), Central Excise, Ahmedabad.

7) Guard File.

1



.

· · ·