

REGISTERED SPEED POST AD



**GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF FINANCE
DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE**

**Office of the Principal Commissioner RA and
Ex-Officio Additional Secretary to the Government of India
8th Floor, World Trade Centre, Cuffe Parade,
Mumbai- 400 005**

F. No. 380/71/DBK/14-RA
F. No. 380/69/DBK/14-RA

Date of Issue: 31.08.2020

ORDER NO. ~~23-26~~ 2020-CUS (WZ) /ASRA/MUMBAI DATED 21.04.2020 OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PASSED BY SMT.SEEMA ARORA, PRINCIPAL COMMISSIONER & EX-OFFICIO ADDITIONAL SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA, UNDER SECTION 129DD OF THE CUSTOMS ACT, 1962.

Applicant : Commissioner of Customs
Custom House,
Kandla

Respondent : M/s Vippy Industries Ltd.
28-30, Industrial Area,
Dewas(MP) - 455001
& 1 Other

Subject : Revision Applications filed under Section 129DD of the Customs Act, 1962 against OIA No. 67 to 89/2014/Cus/Commr(A)/KDL/2014 dated 10.03.2014 passed by the Commissioner of Customs(Appeals), Kandla.



ORDER

These revision applications have been filed by the Commissioner of Customs, Kandla(hereinafter referred to as "the applicant" or "the Department") against OIA No. 67 to 89/2014/Cus/Commr(A)/KDL/2014 dated 10.03.2014 passed by the Commissioner of Customs(Appeals), Kandla in the case of M/s Proton Exports, D-141, Okhla Industrial Area, Phase-I, New Delhi(hereinafter referred to as "the noticee")

2.1 The noticee was engaged in the export of agriculture products including Soya Bean De Oiled Cake(hereinafter referred to as DOC) falling under Tariff Item No. 2304 0020 of the First Schedule to the Customs Tariff Act, 1975. Shri Ashok Chaudhary was the Chief Executive Officer of the company at the relevant period. All the activities of the noticee relating to export and availment of duty drawback had taken place as per his directions. The said noticee had exported Soya De Oiled Cake from Kandla Port falling under the jurisdiction of the Commissioner of Customs, Kandla under claim of drawback.

2.2 M/s Vippy Industries Ltd., 28-30, Industrial Area, Dewas(MP) - 455001 (hereinafter referred to as "respondent no. 1") and M/s Sharda Solvent Ltd., Dwarka Sadan, Press Complex, Zone-I, M. P. Nagar, Bhopal - 462 011(hereinafter referred to as "respondent no. 2) were manufacturers engaged in the manufacture of soya oil and soya DOC by solvent extraction process using hexane as solvent in their factories and had sold the said DOC to the noticee which was exported by noticee by availing the facility of duty drawback.

2.3 An intelligence gathered by the Directorate General of Central Excise Intelligence(DGCEI) , Regional Unit, Indore indicated that the noticee had exported the DOC falling under Tariff Item No. 2304 0020 of the First Schedule to the Customs Tariff Act, 1975 from Kandla Port by availing the benefit of Duty Drawback. The said DOC was purchased by them from the manufacturers who had manufactured the same by availing the benefit under Rule 19(2) of the CER, 2002 by procuring hexane without payment of central excise duty by following the procedure as prescribed under Rule 19(2) of the CER, 2002 and notifications issued thereunder. The said hexane procured without payment of central excise duty was used in the manufacture of DOC and such DOC was exported by the noticee under claim of duty drawback @ 1% of FOB value as per All Industry Rate of Drawback(Sr. No. 23) prescribed vide Notification No. 81/2006-



Cus(NT) dated 13.07.2006, 68/2007-Cus(NT) dated 16.07.2007 superseded by Notification No. 103/2008-Cus(NT) dated 29.08.2008.

2.4 In view of the provisions of Rule 3 of the Customs, Central Excise Duties and Service Tax Drawback Rules, 1995 and condition 7(f) of the Notification No. 81/2006-Cus(NT) dated 13.07.2006, 68/2007-Cus(NT) dated 16.07.2007 (and other similar notifications), it appeared that All Industry Rate of Drawback specified under the Schedule annexed to Notification No. 81/2006-Cus(NT) dated 13.07.2006, 68/2007-Cus(NT) dated 16.07.2007, as amended, from time to time (and other similar notifications) are not admissible on export of DOC if the same is manufactured in terms of sub-rule (2) of Rule 19 of the CER, 2002 by using excisable material (hexane) in respect of which duties have not been paid.

3.1 On the basis of the details, partywise chart submitted by the noticee and the investigation carried out at the end of the manufacturers, the documents of duty free procurement of hexane by availing the benefit under Rule 19(2) of the Central Excise Rules, 2002 resumed from them; viz. hexane procurement and consumption registers, Appendix-46 and invoices of petroleum companies M/s HPCL, M/s BPCL, M/s IOCL etc. and the statements of authorised persons of the manufacturer and the legal position mentioned above, it appeared that the noticee had wrongly claimed and availed duty drawback amounting to Rs. 3,93,173/- from Kandla Port on the exported goods (DOC) purchased by them from the manufacturers who had manufactured the same under bond by procuring hexane without payment of duty payable thereon and by availing the benefit under Rule 19(2) of the CER, 2002. It therefore appeared that the noticee was not entitled to duty drawback on the exports of such DOC in view of the provisions of Rule 3 of the Customs, Central Excise Duties and Service Tax Drawback Rules, 1995 (Drawback Rules) and condition 7(f) of Notification No. 81/2006-Cus(NT) dated 13.07.2006, 68/2007-Cus(NT) dated 16.07.2007 and condition no. 8(f) of Notification No. 103/2008-Cus(NT) dated 29.08.2008 and therefore the said amount of duty drawback paid to them appeared to be recoverable from them under Rule 16 of the Drawback Rules read with Section 75 and Section 28(1) of the Customs Act, 1962. It also appeared that the said noticee had wrongly claimed and irregularly availed the said amount of duty drawback by suppression of facts and willful mis-declaration as they had not disclosed the facts of manufacturing the DOC by availing the benefit of Rule 19(2) of the CER, 2002 in the Appendix-I submitted with the shipping bills for claim of



drawback. The noticee was also liable to pay interest at the applicable rate under Section 28AB of the Customs Act, 1962.

3.2 It appeared that these acts of omission and commission on the part of the noticee and the CEO of the company who was over all in charge of all the export related work including the availment of drawback at the relevant period have knowingly and intentionally got filed incorrect declaration in Appendix-I/III of the shipping bills that DOC had been manufactured without availing the benefit of Rule 19(2) of the CER, 2002 thereby rendering themselves liable to penalty under Section 114 of the Customs Act, 1962 and Section 114AA of the Customs Act, 1962.

3.3 The manufacturers of DOC; respondent no. 1 & respondent no. 2 had in connivance with the noticee deliberately not issued ARE-2 for removal of the said DOC and by abetting/omission had rendered the DOC liable for confiscation under Section 113(f) of the Customs Act, 1962. The respondents had been called upon to show cause why penalty should not be imposed on them under Section 114(iii) of the Customs Act, 1962 for having connived with the exporter by purposely not issuing ARE-2. The respondents were issued SCN on the above grounds.

4. After careful consideration of the evidences adduced by the investigation and relying on various case laws, the Additional Commissioner of Customs, Custom House, Kandla vide OIO No. KDL/DBK/1453/ADC/SS/2013-14 dated 04/18.11.2013 disallowed the drawback claims amounting to Rs. 3,93,197/- and ordered recovery of the amount of duty drawback already sanctioned/released, directed the noticee to pay back the amount of duty drawback erroneously availed by them, ordered recovery of interest on the amount of duty drawback erroneously sanctioned, imposed penalty of Rs. 2,00,000/- on the noticee, imposed penalty of Rs. 2,00,000/- each on respondent no. 1 & respondent no. 2 and imposed penalty of Rs. 1,00,000/- on the CEO of the noticee.


5. Aggrieved by the OIO, the respondents filed appeal before the Commissioner(Appeals). The Commissioner(Appeals) averred that procurement of raw materials under Rule 19(2) of the CER, 2002 would not be a hindrance for claiming 1% drawback being the customs component. He took note of the fact that the dispute related to the period prior to 17.09.2010. However, he discussed the contents of Circular No. 35/2010-Cus dated 17.09.2010 for interpretation of Notification No. 81/2006-Cus(NT), 68/2007-Cus(NT) & 103/2008. He observed that condition 5/6 of these notifications



identifies the customs component when CENVAT facility has been availed. It also clarifies that in a situation where the rate of drawback under the category of CENVAT facility availed and CENVAT facility not being availed is the same signifies that the drawback pertains only to the customs component. The benefits under Rule 18 and Rule 19(2) would have no effect on drawback of customs component. He observed that the noticee had claimed drawback of 1% of FOB value which was the customs component of AIR drawback. He averred that rebate of duty on export goods and drawback of customs component does not amount to double benefit. The Commissioner(Appeals) concluded that Notification No. 84/2010-Cus(NT) dated 17.09.2010 & Circular No. 35/2010-Cus dated 17.09.2010 reinforce the position that drawback of customs was available even if facility under Rule 18 or Rule 19(2) has been availed. He held that circulars are clarificatory in nature and would apply to notifications issued earlier if the provisions therein are identical and that Notification No. 84/2010-Cus(NT) and Circular No. 35/2010-Cus make explicit what was implicit in earlier notification. In the light of these findings, the Commissioner(Appeals) vide his OIA No. 67 to 89/2014/Cus/Commr(A)/KDL/2014 dated 10.03.2014 set aside the OIO with consequential relief to the appellants.


6. The Commissioner of Customs, Kandla found that the OIA No. 67 to 89/2014/Cus/Commr(A)/KDL/2014 dated 10.03.2014 was not legal and proper and therefore directed the Assistant Commissioner to file revision application on the following grounds :

- (i) AIR Drawback is not available when an exporter avails the facility under Rule 19(2) of the CER, 2002 as per condition 7(f) of Notification No. 81/2006-Cus(NT) and 8(f) of Notification No. 103/2008-Cus(NT).
- (ii) Rule 5 of the Drawback Rules provides that revised rate of drawback could be given retrospective effect whereas in the instant case the benefit of AIR drawback has been allowed only w.e.f. 20.09.2010 under Notification No. 84/2010-Cus(NT) as clarified by the Office of the Drawback Commissioner vide letter dated 04.01.2012 and therefore there is no retrospective effect.
- (iii) Commissioner(Appeals) has ignored the clarification dated 04.01.2012 issued by Commissioner(Drawback) misinterpreting Board Circular No. 35/2010-Cus and Notification No. 84/2010-Cus(NT) although it clearly mentions that it is effective only w.e.f. 20.09.2010.



- (iv) Reliance was placed on the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Rubfila International Ltd. vs. Commissioner[2008(224)ELT A133(SC)] wherein it was held that where it was evident that inputs had not suffered any duty, the mischief of Rule 3(1)(ii) of the Drawback Rules would be attracted and no drawback can be claimed.
- (v) Reliance was also placed upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of CCE, Chandigarh-I vs. Mahaan Dairies[2004(166)ELT 23(SC)], Hon'ble Delhi High Court in the case of Sesame Foods Pvt. Ltd. vs. UOI[2010(253)ELT 167(Del)]. Reliance was placed upon the decision in the case of Sterling Agro Industries Ltd. Government of India Order No. 214-215/10-Cus dated 06.07.2010 against which the party filed W.P. No. 5894/2011 before the Division Bench of the Gwalior Bench of Hon'ble High Court of Madhya Pradesh and their Lordships held that drawback would be admissible under Rule 3(1) of the Drawback Rules if the benefit from payment of duty or rebate of CENVAT had been reversed, thus upholding the stand that simultaneous availment of drawback and Rule 19(2) cannot be permitted.
- (vi) The case laws of Mars International[2012(286)ELT 146(GOI)] and Aarti Industries Ltd.[2012(285)ELT 461(GOI)] relied upon by the Commissioner(Appeals) in the impugned order pertained to the period after 20.09.2010 after issuance of Notification No: 84/2010-Cus(NT) dated 17.09.2010.
- (vii) Even the C & AG had pointed out this fraud in PAC Audit Report No. 15/2011-12 in para 2.3.12.

7. Shri H. U. Patel, Superintendent(DBK), Custom House, Kandla attended the personal hearing on 08.01.2020 on behalf of the Department. He reiterated the grounds of revision application and prayed that the OIA be set aside. Respondent no. 1 was granted personal hearing in the matter on 04.10.2019. Shri Ashutosh Upadhyay, Advocate appeared on their behalf. He explained the case and relied upon the decision In Re : Rama Phosphate Ltd.[2014(313) ELT 838(GOI)]. Thereafter, Respondent no. 1 submitted letter dated 04.01.2020 acknowledging personal hearings granted on 08.01.2020 and 14.01.2020. They further stated that their counsel Shri Ashutosh Upadhyay had attended earlier personal hearing fixed on 04.10.2019, explained the case and filed written reply/submissions well within the time period. They stated that they do not wish to add anything further or again attend a hearing. They prayed that




the case may be decided on merits as per the grounds of appeal and submissions filed by them. They requested that the revision application filed by the Department be dismissed/rejected. Respondent no. 2 was granted personal hearings in the matter on 04.06.2018, 04.10.2019 and 08.01.2020. However, they neither appeared for personal hearing nor did they file written submissions.

8.1 Government has carefully gone through the relevant case records and perused the impugned order-in-original and order-in-appeal. Government observes that the case of the Department was whether duty drawback @ 1% of FOB value is admissible to the exporter on the exports of DOC under Rule 3(1) of the Drawback Rules read with the provisions of Notification No. 81/2006-Cus(NT) dated 13.07.2006, 68/2007-Cus(NT) dated 16.07.2007 and 103/2008-Cus(NT) dated 29.08.2008 and whether the manufacturers were liable to penalty for supplying DOC without issuing ARE-2 for DOC manufactured out of duty free hexane procured by availing the facility under Rule 19(2) of the CER, 2002.

8.2 It is observed that the detailed investigation has established that the respondent no. 1 and respondent no. 2 had procured duty free hexane by availing the facility under Rule 19(2) of the CER, 2002 and used the same for the manufacture of DOC and sold the same to the noticee (exporter). Government takes note that the second proviso to Rule 3 of the Drawback Rules at clause (ii) thereof bars drawback if goods are produced or manufactured using imported materials or excisable materials or taxable services in respect of which duties or taxes have not been paid. Similarly condition no. 7(f) of Notification No. 81/2006-Cus(NT), 68/2007-Cus(NT) and condition no. 8(f) of Notification No. 103/2008-Cus(NT) provides that the rates of drawback specified in the schedule shall not be applicable to export of a commodity or product if such product is manufactured or exported in terms of sub-rule (2) of Rule 19 of the CER, 2002. Thus it is apparent that the All Industry Rates of Drawback specified under the schedule annexed to the notifications are not applicable to the exporter of such goods if the goods have been manufactured with inputs on which duty has not been paid and have been procured by availing the facility under Rule 19(2) of the CER, 2002.

9. Government finds that the respondents have not denied the fact of duty free procurement of inputs and their use in the manufacture of DOC by them for the goods exported under claim of duty drawback. The inference that can be drawn from the condition in the notifications and Rule 3 of the Drawback Rules is that duty should



necessarily have been suffered on the inputs used in the export product. This is also the settled legal position. The duty element on the inputs is the primary ingredient for deciding the admissibility of drawback on exports. With regard to the inferences drawn by the Commissioner(Appeals) in the impugned order based on CBEC Circular No. 35/2010-Cus dated 17.09.2010, it is apparent from the text of the circular that the clarification regarding drawback in a situation where the raw materials have been procured without payment of central excise duty under Rule 19(2) of the CER, 2002 has been specifically stated to be admissible only with reference to Notification No. 84/2010-Cus(NT) dated 17.09.2010. It is pertinent to note that the portion where the issue has been raised in clause (d) of para 4(vi) of the circular, the notification mentioned is Notification No. 103/2008-Cus(NT) dated 29.08.2008. However, the notifications determining AIR rate of drawback for the preceding periods do not find mention in the portion where the reference has been answered and only Notification No. 84/2010-Cus(NT) dated 17.09.2010 finds mention. Therefore, it is obvious that the clarification issued by the Board applies only to Notification No. 84/2010-Cus(NT) dated 17.09.2010 which is applicable from 20.09.2010. The issue has been settled beyond doubt by the clarification issued by the Office of the Drawback Commissioner vide his letter F. No: 609/292/2008-DBK dated 04.01.2012 to the Federation of Indian Export Organisation.

10.1 Government takes note of the judgments of the courts on the issue. In the case of Rubfila International Ltd. vs. Commissioner[2008(224)ELT.A133(SC)]; the apex court upheld the principle that when there is evidence that the inputs had not suffered duty, the mischief of Rule 3(1)(ii) of the Drawback Rules would be attracted and no drawback can be claimed. So also, in the case of Sesame Foods Pvt. Ltd. vs. UOI[2010(253)ELT 167(Del)], their Lordships held that "drawback" presupposes that it is preceded by a transaction that has suffered some incidence of duty and if goods like agricultural inputs are not imported and do not suffer incidence of excise duty, the question of fixing AIR for such commodities cannot arise. In the case of Suraj Impex (India) Pvt. Ltd. vs. Secretary, Union of India[2017(347)ELT 252(M.P.)], the Hon'ble High Court of Madhya Pradesh held that simultaneous availment of drawback as well as Rule 19(2) was introduced by omission of clause 8(f) of the erstwhile Notification No. 103/2008 and the introduction of new clause 9(b) in Notification No. 84/2010 which was made effective from 20.09.2010 and explained the same in Circular No. 35/2010. Since the Notification No. 84/2010 was effective from 20.09.2010, the same cannot be given retrospective effect in the light of the aforementioned facts.



10.2 Government observes that in the case of Anandeya Zinc Oxides Pvt. Ltd.[2016(337)ELT 354(Bom.)], the Hon'ble Bombay High Court had occasion to examine the argument put forth by that manufacturer that drawback of customs portion could be availed alongwith facility for procurement of inputs under Rule 19(2) of the CER, 2002. The Hon'ble Bombay High Court found that the view taken by the authorities below that the petitioners in that case could not avail customs drawback under Notification No. 26/2003-Cus(NT) dated 01.04.2003 could not be faulted. It was further held that there was no scope for bifurcating drawback towards customs and excise allocation. Their Lordships noted that the notification clearly provides an exclusion to the applicability of the entire notification in specific situations which have been specified therein; one of which was - goods manufactured or exported in terms of sub-rule (2) of Rule 19 of the CER, 2002. They opined that nothing could be read into such notification and that it was well settled that taxation and fiscal statutes have to be strictly construed. Their Lordships firmly held that the Courts cannot read words into such provisos. The judgments of the Apex Court and the High Courts are binding precedents. Therefore, Government concludes that AIR drawback is not admissible to the noticee exporter and the drawback sanctioned and paid to them is liable to be recovered alongwith interest. In this regard, the Government observes that the name of the noticee exporter does not figure in the list of appellants against OIO No. KDL/DBK/1453/ADC/SS/2013-14 dated 04/18.11.2013. The noticee exporter has not filed appeal against the OIO No. KDL/DBK/1453/ADC/SS/2013-14 dated 04/18.11.2013. The said noticee exporter therefore has clearly admitted to their role in wrongly claiming drawback by resort to mis-declaration and suppression of facts in connivance with the respondent manufacturers. As held by the courts from time to time, admitted facts need not be proved.

11. However, Government proceeds to consider the case for imposition of penalty on the manufacturers who have supplied DOC to the exporter. The respondent no. 1 and respondent no. 2 have not issued ARE-2 for removal of the DOC but have only issued export invoices while clearing the goods. The fact that many different manufacturers failed in following the procedure in an identical manner puts a question mark on their actions. Such synchronized failure in not issuing the ARE-2's cannot be passed of as a coincidence. This fact further weakens any possible defence about their bonafides as the DGCEI has booked cases against several manufacturers and exporters who had adopted the same practice of not issuing ARE-2's. There are a total of 18



manufacturers/exporters involved in the proceedings under the impugned order. Besides these manufacturers/exporters there are other cases booked by the DGCEI which involve identical facts and involve several other manufacturers/exporters which have been decided under other Orders-in-Appeal. It is therefore apparent that the procedure adopted by the manufacturers was ideal for the exporter to claim ignorance of the fact that inputs had been procured by availing the facility of Rule 19(2) of the CER, 2002 and claim drawback. The modus was an attempt to shield themselves from any possible recovery action by the Department. The fact that this practice was adopted by several manufacturers/exporters across Commissionerates is a pointer to the widespread adoption of this modus to enable exporters to claim drawback where the manufacturers had availed the facility under Rule 19(2) of the CER, 2002 to procure inputs. Government is therefore of the view that the manufacturer respondents have rendered themselves liable to be penalized. In Re : Rama Phosphate Ltd.[2014(313)ELT 838(GOI)], the Government had arrived at the conclusion that the manufacturer could not be penalized as there was no documentary evidence. The Government finds that the very fact that all the manufacturers had not issued ARE-2 and the practice has been commonly adopted by all of them evidences the fact that there was discernably an understanding between the manufacturers and the exporters to enable the exporter to avail drawback. Government therefore holds that both the respondent manufacturers are liable to be penalized.

12. Government therefore sets aside the impugned OIA No. 67 to 89/2014/Cus/Commr(A)/KDL/2014 dated 10.03.2014 and restores the OIO No. OIO No. KDL/DBK/1453/ADC/SS/2013-14 dated 04/18.11.2013 passed by the Additional Commissioner of Customs, Custom House, Kandla.

13. The revision applications filed by the Department are allowed.

14. So ordered.

ATTESTED

B. LOKANATHA REDDY
Deputy Commissioner (R.A.)

(SEEMA ARORA)
Principal Commissioner & Ex-Officio
Additional Secretary to Government of India

23-24
ORDER No. /2020-CUS (WZ) /ASRA/Mumbai DATED 21.04.2020.



To,

1. M/s Vippy Industries Ltd.,
28-30, Industrial Area,
Dewas(MP) - 455001
2. M/s Sharda Solvent Ltd.,
Dwarka Sadan,
Press Complex, Zone-I,
M. P. Nagar, Bhopal - 462 011

Copy to:

1. The Commissioner of Customs, Custom House, Kandla.
2. The Commissioner of Customs(Appeals), Kandla.
3. Sr. P.S. to AS (RA), Mumbai
4. Guard file
5. Spare Copy

