REGISTERED SPEED POST



## GOVERNMENT OF INDIA MINISTRY OF FINANCE (DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE) 8<sup>th</sup> Floor, World Trade Centre, Centre – I, Cuffe Parade, Mumbai-400 005

F.No. 373/247/B/14-RA

Date of Issue 29/05/2018

ORDER NO  $2^{1/2018-CUS}$  (SZ) / ASRA / MUMBAI/ DATED  $^{1/2018-CUS}$  (SZ) / ASRA / MUMBAI/ DATED  $^{1/2018-CUS}$  of the government of india passed by Shri Ashok kumar mehta , principal commissioner & ex-officio additional secretary to the government of india, under section 129DD of the customs ACT, 1962.

Applicant	: Shri Katheef Shahul Hameed
Respondent	: Commissioner of Customs(Airport), Chennai.
Subject	: Revision Application filed, under Section 129DD of the
	Customs Act, 1962 against the Order-in-Appeal C.Cus No. 296/2015 dated 24.06.2015 passed by the Commissioner of
	Customs (Appeals) Chennai.



## ORDER

This revision application has been filed by Shri Katheef Shahul Hameed (herein after referred to as the Applicant) against the order no C. Cus No. 296/2015 dated 24.06.2015 passed by the Commissioner of Customs (Appeals), Chennai.

2. Briefly stated the facts of the case is that the applicant, arrived at the Chennai Airport on 07.11.2014. He was intercepted by the Customs Officers on suspicion and on examination of his person resulted in the recovery of 3 (three) gold bars wrapped in black adhesive tape from his pant pockets totally weighing 349.5 grams valued at Rs. 8,45,891/-(Rupees Eight lacs Forty Five thousand and Eight hundred and Ninety one).

3. The Original Adjudicating Authority vide Order-In-Original No. 1369/2014 - AIR dated 28.03.2014 ordered confiscation of the impugned goods under Section 111 (d) and (l) of the Customs Act, 1962 read with Section 3 (3) of Foreign Trade (Development & Regulation) Act, giving an option to redeem the goods on payment of a redemption fine of Rs. 3,50,000/- and imposed penalty of Rs. 85,000/- under Section 112 (a) of the Customs Act.

4. Aggrieved by the said order, the department filed appeal before the Commissioner (Appeals) who vide Order-In-Appeal No. C. Cus No. 296/2015 dated 24.06.2015 allowed the Appeal and ordered absolute confiscation of the gold.

5. The applicant has filed this revision application on the grounds that :

That the order of the appellate authority is against law, weight of evidence 5.1. and circumstances and probabilities of the case; The Department filed an appeal against the Adjudication order but failed to serve a copy to the applicant; The Appellate Authority has passed an order without giving the Applicant suitable opportunity; He was all along at the red channel under the control of the officers and he did not admittedly pass through the green channel; Goods must be prohibited before import or export simply because of non-declaration goods cannot become prohibited; There is no specific allegation that he passed through the green channel; Section 125 states that "Whenever confiscation of any goods is authorised by this Act, the officer adjudging it may, in the case of any goods, the importation or exportation whereof is prohibited under this Act or under any other law for the time being in force, and shall, in the case of any other goods, give to the owner of the goods or, where such owner is not known, the person from whose possession or custody such goods have been seized"; But the Appellate order claims that the person carrying the gold is not entitled to claim the gold; The Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh in the case of Sheikh A Chica (Realized )

2

សីមញ២ឆ្នាំ गुंबई

Mumbal মূল্র

Jamal Basha vs GOI 1997 (91) ELT 277 (AP) has stated held that under section 125 of the ACT is Mandatory duty to give option to the person found guilty to pay fine in lieu of confiscation; The Apex court in the case of Hargovind Dash vs Collector Of Customs 1992 (61) ELT 172 (SC) and several other cases has pronounced that the quasi judicial authorities should use the discretionary powers in a judicious and not an arbitrary manner.

5.2 The Revision Applicant cited various assorted judgments in support of re-export and prayed for permission to re-export the gold on payment of nominal redemption fine and reduced personal penalty.

6. A personal hearing in the case was held on 19.03.2018, the Advocate for the respondent Shri Palanikumar re-iterated the submissions filed in Revision Application and cited the decisions of GOI/Tribunals where option for re-export of gold was allowed. Nobody from the department attended the personal hearing.

7. The Government has gone through the facts of the case. It is a fact that the gold was not declared by the Applicant as required under Section 77 of the Customs Act, 1962 and under the circumstances confiscation of the gold is justified.

8. However, the facts of the case state that the Applicant was intercepted before he exited the Green Channel. The gold is claimed by the Applicant and there is no other claimant. The gold bars were carried by the Applicant in his pant pockets and it was not ingeniously concealed. There are no previous offences registered against the Applicant. The CBEC Circular 09/2001 gives specific directions to the Customs officer in case the declaration form is incomplete/not filled up, the proper Customs officer should help the passenger record to the oral declaration on the Disembarkation Card and only thereafter should countersign/stamp the same, after taking the passenger's signature. Thus, mere non-submission of the declaration cannot be held against the Applicant.

9. There are a catena of judgments which align with the view that the discretionary powers vested with the lower authorities under section 125(1) of the Customs Act, 1962 have to be exercised. The absolute confiscation of the gold is therefore harsh and unjustified. In view of the above facts, Further, the section 125 of the Customs Act, 1962 does not make any distinction between the person owning or the person carring the gold. The Government therefore is of the opinion that a lenient view can be taken in the matter. The Applicant has pleaded for re-export and the Government is included of the section of the gold in the impugned of the section of the gold in the impugned of the section of the gold in the impugned of the section of the gold in the impugned of the section of the gold in the impugned of the section of the gold in the impugned of the section of the gold in the impugned of the section of the gold in the impugned of the section of the gold in the impugned of the section of the gold in the impugned of the section of the gold in the impugned of the section of the gold in the impugned of the section of the gold in the impugned of the section of the gold in the impugned of the section of the gold in the impugned of the section of the gold in the impugned of the section of the gold in the impugned of the section of the gold in the impugned of the section of the gold in the impugned of the section of the gold in the impugned of the section of the gold in the impugned of the section of the gold in the impugned of the section of the gold in the impugned of the section of the gold in the impugned of the section of the gold in the impugned of the section of the gold in the impugned of the section of the gold in the impugned of the section of the gold in the impugned of the section of the gold in the impugned of the section of the gold in the impugned of the section of the gold in the impugned of the section of the gold in the impugned of the section of the gold in the impugned of the section of the gold in th

gum

Appeal therefore needs to be modified and the confiscated gold is liable to be allowed for re-export on payment of redemption fine and penalty.

10. Taking into consideration the foregoing discussion, Government allows redemption of the confiscated gold for re-export in lieu of fine. The gold chains weighing 349.5 grams valued at Rs. 8,45,891/- (Rupees Eight lacs Forty Five thousand and Eight hundred and Ninety one) is ordered to be redeemed for re-export on payment of redemption fine of Rs. 3,25,000/- (Rupees Three Lacs Twenty Five thousand) under section 125 of the Customs Act, 1962. Government also observes that the facts of the case justify reduction in the penalty imposed. The penalty imposed on the Applicant is therefore reduced from Rs. 85,000/- (Rupees One Iac) to Rs. 75,000/- (Rupees Seventy Five thousand) under section 112(a) of the Customs Act, 1962.

11. The impugned Order in Appeal stands modified to that extent. Revision application is partly allowed on above terms

12. So, ordered.

(ASHOK KUMÁR MEHTA) Principal Commissioner & ex-officio Additional Secretary to Government of India

ORDER No 295/2018-CUS (SZ) /ASRA/NUMBAT\_

DATED07 05.2018

To,

Shri Katheef Shahul Hameed C/o S. Palanikumar, Advocate, No. 10, Sunkurama Chetty Street, Opp High court, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, Chennai 600 001.

Copy to:

- 1. The Commissioner of Customs, Anna International Airport, Chennai.
- 2. The Commissioner of Customs (Appeals), Custom House, Chennai.
- 3. \_\_\_\_ Sr. P.S. to AS (RA), Mumbai.
- 4. Guard File.
- 5. Spare Copy.

True Copy Attested

29/5/18

SANKARSAN MUNDA Asatt. Commissioner of Custom & C. Ez.

