



S सत्यमेव जयते

केंद्रीय कर आयुक्त (अपील)

O/O THE COMMISSIONER (APPEALS), CENTRAL TAX,

वस्तु एवं सेवा

कर भवन,

सातवीं मंजिल, पोलिटेकनिकके पास,
आम्बावाडी, अहमदाबाद-380015

GST Building, 7th Floor,
Near Polytechnic,
Ambavadi, Ahmedabad-
380015



☎ : 079-26305065

टेलीफैक्स : 079 - 26305136

क फाइल संख्या : File No : **V2(WCS)23/AHD-III/2017-18** / 645
ख अपील आदेश संख्या : Order-In-Appeal No. : **AHM-EXCUS-003-APP-0182-17-18**
दिनांक Date : **19.01.2018** जारी करने की तारीख Date of Issue: **29/01/18**
श्री उमाशंकर आयुक्त (अपील) द्वारा पारित

Passed by **Shri Uma Shanker** Commissioner (Appeals) Ahmedabad

ग अपर आयुक्त, केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क, अहमदाबाद-III आयुक्तालय द्वारा जारी मूल आदेश :
GNR-STX-DEM-DC-19/2017 दिनांक : **25.04.2017** से सृजित

Arising out of Order-in-Original: **GNR-STX-DEM-DC-19/2017**, Date: **25.04.2017** Issued
by: Assistant Commissioner, Service Tax, Div: Gandhinagar, Ahmedabad-III.

घ अपीलकर्ता एवं प्रतिवादी का नाम एवं पता

Name & Address of the **Appellant** & Respondent

M/s. ONGC

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 अंतर्गत नीचे बताए गए मामलों के बारे में पूर्वोक्त धारा को उप-धारा के प्रथम परन्तुक के अंतर्गत पुनरीक्षण आवेदन अवर 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 हानि कारखाने 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.

(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।

(b) 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।
- (C) In case of goods exported outside India export to Nepal or Bhutan, without payment of duty.

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 दिनोंक 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 :-

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.

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 इ.ए-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 और लगाया गया जुर्माना रूपए 5 लाख या उससे कम है वहां रूपए 1000/- फीस भेजनी होगी। जहाँ उत्पाद शुल्क की मांग, ब्याज की मांग और 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 और लगाया गया जुर्माना रूपए 50 लाख या उससे ज्यादा है वहां 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

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 शुल्क अधिनियम 1970 यथा संशोधित की अनुसूचि-1 के अंतर्गत निर्धारित किए अनुसार उक्त आवेदन या मूल आदेश यथास्थिति निर्णयन प्राधिकारी के आदेश में से प्रत्येक की एक प्रति पर रु.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 bear a court fee stamp of Rs.6.50 paisa 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 उत्पाद शुल्क एवं सेवाकर अपीलीय प्राधिकरण (सीस्तेत) के प्रति अपीलों के मामलों में केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क अधिनियम, 1988 की धारा 34फ के अंतर्गत वित्तीय(संख्या-2) अधिनियम 2014(2014 की संख्या 24) दिनांक: 06.08.2014 जो की वित्तीय अधिनियम, 1998 की धारा 13 के अंतर्गत सेवाकर को भी लागू की गई है, द्वारा निश्चित की गई पूर्व-राशि जमा करना अनिवार्य है, बशर्त 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 "माँग 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

→ आगे बशर्त 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 होंगे।

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 3 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.

(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।

(6)(i) 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

This appeal has been filed by M/s. Oil and Natural Gas Corporation Ltd., KDM Bhavan, Palavasana, Mehsana (hereinafter referred to as "the appellants") against the Order-in-Original number GNR-STX-DEM-DC-19/2017 dated 25.04.2017 (hereinafter referred to as "the impugned order") passed by the then Assistant Commissioner of Central Excise, Gandhinagar Division (hereinafter referred to as "the adjudicating authority").

2. Brief facts of the case are that the appellants are holding Service Tax registration number AAACO1598AST014 under the categories of "Transport of Goods through Pipe Line service, transport of Goods by Road service, Technical Inspection & Certification Agency service, Commercial Training or Coaching service, manpower Supply Agency service, Consulting Engineer service, Rent-a-cab Scheme Operator service, Works Contract service, Legal Consultancy service, Renting of Immovable Property service, Sponsorship service and Other Taxable services- Other than the 119 listed. During the course of audit, it was noticed that the appellants had short paid Service Tax amounting to ₹3,82,727/- under the category of Legal Consultancy service during the Financial Year 2015-16. As per Notification No.30/2012-ST dated 20.06.2012, as amended, w.e.f. 01.07.2012, the recipient of Legal Consultancy service is liable to pay 100% Service Tax i.r.o. the legal services provided by an advocate to a business entity. Being pointed out by the audit team, the appellants agreed to the said observation and paid the short paid Service Tax along with interest. However, they paid the above amount under protest and did not pay the penalty.
3. Thus, a show cause notice dated 27.12.2016 was issued to the appellants which was adjudicated by the adjudicating authority, vide the impugned order. The adjudicating authority, vide the impugned order, confirmed the demand of Service Tax of ₹3,82,727/- under Section 73 and as the Service Tax was already paid by the appellants, he ordered to appropriate the same against the said demand. The adjudicating authority further asked the appellants to pay interest under Section 75 of the Finance Act, 1994 and as interest amounting to ₹31,000/- was already paid by the appellants, he ordered the same to be appropriated against the total interest liability. The adjudicating authority also imposed penalty under Sections 77 and 78 of the Finance Act, 1994 amounting to ₹10,000/- and ₹3,82,727/- respectively.
4. Being aggrieved, the appellants have filed the present appeal on the grounds that they had no intention to evade Service Tax as whatever Service Tax paid under Reverse Charge Mechanism towards the said service, they were eligible to avail credit for the same. The show cause notice was issued after the appellants deposited the short paid Service Tax along with interest



(under protest) as instructed by the audit team. The appellants further informed that they were not having any intention to commit any fraud as they were not to gain any profit out of evasion of the said tax. There is no fraud, mala fide intention, will full misstatement and suppression of facts and therefore, penalty should have not been imposed upon them. There was only bona fide mistake in confusion and the appellants, in good faith, corrected the mistake.

5. A personal hearing in the matter was held on 09.01.2018 and Shri Devashish K. Trivedi, Advocate, appeared for the same on behalf of the appellants. He reiterated the contents of grounds of appeal and claimed that penalty should have not been imposed as the matter is revenue neutral.

6. I have carefully gone through the facts of the case on records, appeal memorandum and submissions made by the appellants at the time of personal hearing. Now, the only issue appears before me is that whether the adjudicating authority has rightly imposed penalty under Sections 77 and 78 of the Finance Act, 1994 or otherwise. In their grounds of appeal, the appellants argued that the payment of Service Tax was not made because of some genuine confusion on their part and as the matter was brought to their notice by the audit team, they immediately paid the same along with interest. In paragraph 6 of the impugned order, I find that the appellants had received legal services total valued at ₹ 38,32,452/- in the FY 2015-16. However, they paid Service Tax only on value ₹ 11,78,453/- and the rest amount of ₹ 26,53,999/- was left unpaid. Had there been a genuine confusion on their part, they would have failed to pay Service Tax on the entire value of ₹ 38,32,452/- and not on ₹ 26,53,999/-. This shows their intention to be mala fide. Further, when the issue of short payment was raised by the audit team, the appellants, without any argument, paid the amount along with interest as they were well aware of the entire issue. Genuine confusion is always followed by arguments and counter arguments till the confusion is cleared. But here, it seems that the moment the issue was raised, the payment, under protest, was made. As if, they were well prepared to pay the amount whenever the department points out the folly. The appellants, in their grounds of appeal, did not mention as to why they paid Service Tax on the value ₹ 11,78,453/-. A confusion regarding taxability of a certain service should pertain to the entire value of the service and not a part of that. This is sufficient enough to establish that their intention was to evade payment of Service Tax as long as the department does not point it out. Had there been no departmental auditing of their documents, the issue have remained undetected and the appellants would have continued with the said practice of non-payment of Service Tax on legal services. This is enough to establish suppression in the said act of the appellants. In view of the




above, I consider that the adjudicating authority has very rightly imposed penalty under the Sections 77 and 78 of the Finance Act, 1994.

7. In view of above discussions, I up held the impugned order passed by the adjudicating authority and reject the appeal filed by the appellants.

8. अपीलकर्ता द्वारा दर्ज की गई अपील का निपटारा उपरोक्त तरीके से किया जाता है।

8. The appeals filed by the appellant stand disposed off in above terms.


(उमा शंकर)

CENTRAL TAX (Appeals),

AHMEDABAD.

ATTESTED


(S. DUTTA) 23/01/18

SUPERINTENDENT, CENTRAL TAX (APPEALS),

AHMEDABAD.

To,

M/s. Oil and Natural Gas Corporation Ltd.,

KDM Bhavan, Palavasana,

Mehsana

Copy to:-

1. The Chief Commissioner, Central Tax Zone, Ahmedabad.
2. The Commissioner, Central Tax, Gandhinagar.
3. The Dy. / Asstt. Commissioner, Central Tax, Division- Kalol.
- ✓ 4. The Addl./Joint Commissioner, (Systems), Central Tax, Gandhinagar.
5. Guard file.
6. P.A file.