



सत्यमेव जयते

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF FINANCE
(DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE)
8th Floor, World Trade Centre, Centre - I, Cuffe Parade,
Mumbai-400 005

F.No. 373/183/B/14-RA / *W/S*

Date of Issue 29/05/2018

ORDER NO. 298/2018-CUS (SZ) / ASRA / MUMBAI/ DATED 22.05.2018 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 Madaka Veeranjanyulu

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-I No. 104/2015 dated 27.03.2015 passed by the Commissioner of Customs (Appeals-I) Chennai.



ORDER

This revision application has been filed by Shri Madaka Veeranjanyulu (herein after referred to as the Applicant) against the order no C. Cus-I No. 104/2015 dated 27.03.2015 passed by the Commissioner of Customs (Appeals-I), Chennai.

2. Briefly stated the facts of the case is that the applicant, arrived at the Chennai Airport on 21.02.2014. He was intercepted by the officers of the Customs as he was walking through the green channel without declaration. Examination of his baggage resulted in the recovery of 3 (three) gold pieces totally weighing 634.5 gms totally valued at Rs. 19,37,784/- (Rupees Nineteen lacs Thirty Seven thousand Seven hundred and Eighty four). The gold was ingeniously concealed in two polythene packets containing dates.

3. The Original Adjudicating Authority vide Order-In-Original No. 190/2014 – AIU dated 03.01.2015 ordered for absolute confiscation of the impugned gold under Section 111 (d), and (l) of the Customs Act read with Section 3 (3) of Foreign Trade (Development & Regulation) Act and imposed penalty of Rs. 1,75,000/- under Section 112 (a) of the Customs Act.

4. Aggrieved by the said order, the applicant filed appeal before the Commissioner (Appeals-I) who vide Order-In-Appeal No. C. Cus-I No. 104/2015 dated 27.03.2015 rejected the appeal of the applicant.

5. The applicant has filed this Revision Application interalia on the following grounds that;

5.1. The order of the Commissioner (Appeals) is against law, weight of evidence and circumstances and probabilities of the case; The Appellate Authority has not applied his mind and glossed over the judgments and points raised in the Appeal grounds; Ownership of the gold is not a criterion for its eligibility to be imported; Due to pressure from the officers he had to give a statement that the gold belonged to someone else; The Appellate Authority states that the Applicant has not declared the goods and on the other hand states that the Applicant is not the owner of the goods, Even assuming without admitting that the Applicant is not the owner the question of declaration arise; Under Section 125 does not make any distinction between the owner



and carrier of the goods; He is not a frequent visitor and has no previous offences registered against him.


5.2 The Applicant further submitted that as he had stayed abroad for 2 and a half years, he is eligible to bring gold at concessional rate; Goods must be prohibited before import or export simply because of non-declaration goods cannot be come prohibited; The CBEC Circular 09/2001 gives specific directions to the Customs officer in case the declaration form is incomplete/not filled, but it was not such an exercise was not done by the officers; The Hon'ble Supreme Court has in the case of Om Prakash vs Union of India states that the main object of the Customs Authority is to collect the duty and not to punish the person for infringement of its provisions;

5.3 The Revision Applicant cited various assorted judgments in support of re-export even when the gold was concealed and prayed for setting aside the impugned order and 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 19.04.2018, 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 case records it is observed that the Applicant did not declare the gold at the time of interception. The gold was ingeniously concealed in two polythene packets containing dates. There is absolutely no doubt that the concealment was planned so as to evade Customs duty and to smuggle the gold into India. The aspect of allowing the gold for re-export can be considered when imports have been made in a legal manner and properly declared as per Section 77 of the Customs Act, 1962. The elaborate methods taken to hide the gold indicate that the Applicant had no intention of declaring the gold to the authorities and if he was not intercepted before the exit, the Applicant would have taken out the gold in contravention of the provisions of Customs Act, 1962 without payment of customs duty.

8. The above acts have therefore rendered the seized gold of 634.5 gms liable for confiscation under Section 111 of Customs Act, 1962 and the Applicant liable for penal action under section 112 (a) of the Customs Act, 1962. The Government



therefore holds that the Original Adjudicating Authority has rightly confiscated the gold absolutely and imposed a penalty of Rs. 1,75,000/-. In view of the above discussions, the Government also holds that Commissioner (Appeals) has rightly upheld the order of the original adjudicating authority.

9. The Government therefore finds the Appellate order C. Cus. No. 104/2015 dated 27.03.2015 passed by the Commissioner of Customs (Appeals) as legal and proper does not warrant any interference.

10. Revision Application is dismissed.

11. So, ordered.

(Signature)
22.5.18

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

ORDER No. 298/2018-CUS (SZ) /ASRA/MUMBAI DATED 22.05.2018

To,

True Copy Attested

Shri Madaka Veeranjanyulu
C/o S. Palanikumar, Advocate,
No. 10, Sunkurama Chetty Street,
Opp High court, 2nd Floor,
Chennai 600 001.

(Signature)
SANKARSAN MUNDA
Asstt. Commissioner of Custom & C. Ex.

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.

