



GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF FINANCE
(DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE)

8th Floor, World Trade Centre, Centre – I, Cuffe Parade,
Mumbai-400 005

F.No. 371/398/B/WZ/2022-RA | 1417 : Date of Issue : 15.03.2023

ORDER NO. 353/2023-CUS (WZ/SZ)/ASRA/MUMBAI DATED 14.03.2023
OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PASSED BY SHRI SHRAWAN KUMAR,
PRINCIPAL COMMISSIONER & EX-OFFICIO ADDITIONAL SECRETARY TO
THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA, UNDER SECTION 129DD OF THE CUSTOMS
ACT, 1962.

(i). F.No. 371/398/B/WZ/2022-RA

Applicant : Shri. Mohamad Altaf Miya Mohamad Shaikh

Respondent : Pr. Commissioner of Customs, CSMI Airport, Mumbai
400 099.

Subject : Revision Application filed under Section 129DD of the
Customs Act, 1962 against the Order-in-Appeal. No. MUM-
CUSTM-PAX-APP-152/2022-23 dated 17.05.2022 issued
through F.No. S/49-1466/2021 passed by the Commissioner
of Customs (Appeals), Mumbai – III.

ORDER

This revision application has been filed by Shri. Mohamad Altaf Miya Mohamad Shaikh (hereinafter referred to as the Applicant) against the Order-in-Appeal No. MUM-CUSTOM-PAX-APP-152/2022-23 dated 17.05.2022 issued through F.No. S/49-1466/2021 passed by the Commissioner of Customs (Appeals), Mumbai – III.

2(a). Brief facts of the case are that the applicant was intercepted by Customs Officers on 02.12.2018 at the CSMI Airport, Mumbai having earlier arrived from Dubai onboard Jet Airways Flight No. 9W-0535 / 02.12.2018. Applicant had cleared himself through the green channel and had been proceeding towards the green channel. To the query whether he was carrying any dutiable goods, contraband or gold in his baggage or on person, the applicant had replied in the negative. Applicant was asked to pass through the door frame metal detector (DFMD) which did not indicate the presence of any metal on his person. Thereafter, the baggage of the applicant were screened and one of the bags indicated presence of metal. A search of the said bag led to the recovery of 3 heavy packets. These packets were cut open which resulted in the recovery of four (04) nos of crude gold bangles, six (06) nos of crude gold chains and one (01) nos of gold ring, totally weighing 748 grams and valued at Rs. 21,55,381/-.

2(b). The applicant had revealed that he was the owner of the gold and that he had purchased the same from various jewellery shops at Dubai for around 70,000 dirhams. Later, during the investigations, the applicant had produced six invoices for purchase of one piece of gold bar of 10 tolas each and one invoice for purchase of gold weighing 48.16 grams. The applicant admitted that he had converted the gold into crude jewellery with express purpose to hoodwink the Customs and evade payment of Customs duty. He had stated that his wife and daughter had accompanied him and that some of the

invoices were in their names also. The applicant had returned to India after only 6 days stay abroad.

3. The Original Adjudicating Authority (OAA), viz, Addl. Commissioner of Customs, CSMI Airport, Mumbai vide Order-In-Original No. ADC/VD/ADJN/93/2021-22 dated 30.06.2021 issued on 01.07.2021 through F.No. S/14-5-56/2019-20/Adjn [SD/INT/AJU/524/2018 AP'A' ordered for the absolute confiscation of the four (04) nos of crude gold bangles, six (06) nos of crude gold chains and one (01) nos of gold ring, totally weighing 748 grams and valued at Rs. 21,55,381/- under Section 111(d), 111(l) & 111(m) of the Customs Act, 1962 and a penalty of Rs. 2,00,000/- under Section 112 (a) & (b) of the Customs Act, 1962 was imposed on the applicant. Further, a penalty of Rs. 1,00,000/- was imposed on the applicant under Section 114(i) of the Customs Act, 1962.

4. Aggrieved by the said order, the applicant preferred an appeal before the appellate authority (AA) viz, Commissioner of Customs (Appeals), Mumbai - III, who vide Order-In-Appeal No. MUM-CUSTOM-PAX-APP-152/2022-23 dated 17.05.2022 issued through F.No. S/49-1466/2021 did not find any reason to interfere in the impugned OIO passed by the OAA. Also, the personal penalty imposed on the applicant under Section 112 (a) and (b) of the Customs Act, 1962 was found commensurate with the offence committed.

5. Aggrieved with the above order of the appellate authority, the Applicant has filed this revision application on the following grounds;

5.01. that the order passed by the appellate authority was bad in law and unjust; that the OIA has been passed without due consideration to the documents on record and facts of the case; that the goods were neither restricted nor prohibited was not appreciated by the AA; that no previous case has been registered against applicant; that evasion of Customs duty can be done only in respect of dutiable goods and not on prohibited goods; that option to redeem the goods under Section 125

of the Customs Act, 1962 ought to have been granted by the AA; that various judgements passed by the Apex Court, High Courts, Tribunal have held that gold was neither restricted nor prohibited and therefore it should not be confiscated absolutely; that points submitted by the applicant before the OAA had not been considered and they have reiterated the same grounds before the RA alongwith copies of passport and invoices.

5.02. to buttress their case, the applicant has relied upon the following case laws;

(i). Hargovind Das K Joshi v/s. Collector of Customs [1992 (61) ELT 172 SC], Absolute confiscation of goods without considering question of redemption on payment of fine although having discretion to do so under Section 125, matter remanded back.

(ii). Alfred Menezes v/s. Commissioner of Customs (Mumbai) [2011 (236) ELT 587 (Tri-Mumbai)], Section 125(1) *ibid* clearly mandates that it is within the power of the adjudicating authority to offer redemption of goods even in respect of prohibited goods.

(iii). T. Elvarasan v/s. Commr. Of Customs (Airport), 2011-266-ELT-167-Tri-Madras on the issue of gold chains brought from Singapore and seized on the ground of non-declaration on arrival; passenger living abroad for more than 6 months and entitled to import gold; gold not prohibited item option to redeem the goods; impugned gold ordered to be released provisionally subject to adjudication proceedings.

(iv). Yakub Ibrahim Yusuf v/s. Commissioner of Customs, Mumbai [Final Order No. A/362/2010-WBZ-II/(CSTB) dated 28.10.2010 in Appeal no. C/51/1996-Mum] [2011-263-ELT-685-Tri-Mumbai]. *Term prohibited goods refers to goods like arms, ammunition, addictive drugs, whose import in any circumstance would danger or be detriment to health, welfare or morals of people as whole and makes them liable to absolute confiscation.*

(v). Mohini Bhatia vs. Commr. Of Customs [1999-106-ELT-485-Tri-Mumbai on prohibited goods and restricted goods. Gold was not included in the part II of restricted item.

(vi). In Universal Traders vs. Commissioner [2009-240-ELT-A78-SC], the apex court allowed redemption of exported goods being not prohibited.

(vii). In Gauri Enterprises vs. C.C Pune [2002-145-ELT-706-Tri-Bang], held that if similar goods had been released on fine earlier, selective

absolute confiscation was not called for, Absolute Confiscation should be exception rather than a rule.

(viii). In Shaik Jamal Basha v. Government of India 1997 (91) ELT 277 (A.P.) the Hon'ble High Court held that gold is allowed for import on payment of duty and therefore Gold in the form other than ornaments imported unauthorized can be redeemed.

(ix). In VP Hameed v. Collector of Customs, Mumbai - 1994 (73) ELT 425 (Tri.) it was held that there is no bar in allowing redemption of gold being an item notified under Section 123 of Customs Act, 1962 or for any other reason.

(x). In P. Sinnasamy v. Commissioner of Customs, Chennai 2007 (220) ELT 308 (Tri-Chennai), the Hon'ble Court allowed redemption of absolutely confiscated gold observing that option to redeem the gold to be given as there is no bar against such option by reason of goods being an item notified under Section 123 of Customs Act, 1962 or for any other reason.

(xi). In Union of India Vs Dhanak M. Ramji - 2009 (248) ELT 127 (Bom.) affirmed vide 2010 (252) ELT A102 (S C) it was held that gold is not a prohibited item and discretion of redemption can be exercised to the person from whom it was recovered.

(xii). In Kadar Mydin v. Commissioner of Customs (Preventive), West Bengal - 2001 (136) ELT 758 it was held that in view of the liberalised gold policy of the Government, absolute confiscation is unwarranted and redemption can be allowed.

(xiii). In Sapna Sanjeev Kohli v. Commissioner of Customs, Airport, Mumbai - 2008 (230) ELT. 305 the Tribunal observed that the frequent traveller was aware of rules and regulations and absolute confiscation of gold jewellery not warranted which may be cleared on payment of redemption fine.

(xiv). Vatakkal Moosa vs. Collector of Customs, Cochin - 1994(72)ELT473 (G.O.I.); it was held that absolute confiscation is not warranted and redemption of gold should be allowed.

(xv). Halithu Ibrahim v. CC [2002-TIOL 195-CESTAT-MAD. = 2002 (148) ELT 412 (Tribunal)]; it was held that absolute confiscation is not warranted and redemption of gold should be allowed.

(xvi). Krishnakumari v. CC, Chennai - 2008 (229) ELT 222 (Tri-Chennai) ; it was held that absolute confiscation is not warranted and redemption of gold should be allowed.

(xvii). S. Rajagopal v. CC, Trichy - 2007 (219) ELT 435 (Tri-Chennai); it was held that absolute confiscation is not warranted and redemption of gold should be allowed.

(xvii). M. Arumugam v. CC, Tiruchirappalli, 2007 (220) ELT 311 (Tri-Chennai); it was held that absolute confiscation is not warranted and redemption of gold should be allowed.

(ixx). In the COMM. OF C. EX. & S.T., LUCKNOW VI MOHD. HALIM MOHD. SHAMIM KHAN Final Order No. A/71054/2017-SM(BR), dated 13-9-2017 in Appeal No. C/70595/2016, reported in 2018 (359) E.L.T 265 (Tri-All.) ; Only prohibited goods cannot be released on payment of redemption fine Gold not being prohibited goods, cannot be confiscated absolutely - Order permitting release of such gold on payment of redemption fine in lieu of confiscation upheld.

Under the circumstances, the applicant has prayed to the Revision Authority that the gold may be released on payment of nominal redemption fine as per Section 125 of the Customs Act, 1962 along with applicable duty; personal penalty may be reduced or to pass any other order as deemed fit and proper.

6. Personal hearing in the case was scheduled for 09.12.2022. Shri. N.J Heera, Advocate for the applicant appeared for personal hearing on 09.12.2022 and submitted that applicant alongwith family brought gold jewellery for personal use. The gold jewellery was for marriage purpose and the same was not concealed. He further submitted that applicant is not a habitual offender. He requested to allow release of gold jewellery.

7. The Government has gone through the facts of the case and notes that the applicant had failed to declare the goods in his possession as required under Section 77 of the Customs Act, 1962. The applicant had not disclosed the goods and had he not been intercepted would have walked away with the impugned four (04) nos of crude gold bangles, six (06) nos of crude gold chains and one (01) nos of gold ring, totally weighing 748 grams and valued at Rs. 21,55,381/- without declaring the same to Customs. By his actions, it was clear that the applicant had no intention to declare the impugned gold to Customs

and pay Customs duty on it. The Government finds that the confiscation of the impugned gold was therefore, justified.

8. The Hon'ble High Court Of Madras, in the case of Commissioner Of Customs (Air), Chennai-I V/s P. Sinnasamy reported in 2016 (344) E.L.T. 1154 (Mad.), relying on the judgment of the Apex Court in the case of Om Prakash Bhatia v. Commissioner of Customs, Delhi reported in 2003 (155) E.L.T. 423 (S.C.), has held that “ *if there is any prohibition of import or export of goods under the Act or any other law for the time being in force, it would be considered to be prohibited goods; and (b) this would not include any such goods in respect of which the conditions, subject to which the goods are imported or exported, have been complied with. This would mean that if the conditions prescribed for import or export of goods are not complied with, it would be considered to be prohibited goods. Hence, prohibition of importation or exportation could be subject to certain prescribed conditions to be fulfilled before or after clearance of goods. If conditions are not fulfilled, it may amount to prohibited goods.*” It is thus clear that gold, may not be one of the enumerated goods, as prohibited goods, still, if the conditions for such import are not complied with, then import of gold, would squarely fall under the definition, “prohibited goods”.

9. Further, in para 47 of the said case the Hon'ble High Court has observed “*Smuggling in relation to any goods is forbidden and totally prohibited. Failure to check the goods on the arrival at the customs station and payment of duty at the rate prescribed, would fall under the second limb of section 112(a) of the Act, which states omission to do any act, which act or omission, would render such goods liable for confiscation.....*”. Thus, failure to declare the goods and failure to comply with the prescribed conditions has made the impugned gold “prohibited” and therefore liable for confiscation and the ‘Applicant’ thus, liable for penalty.

10. Once goods are held to be prohibited, Section 125 still provides discretion to consider release of goods on redemption fine. Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of M/s. Raj Grow Impex [CIVIL APPEAL NO(s). 2217-2218 of 2021 Arising out of SLP(C) Nos. 14633-14634 of 2020 – Order dated 17.06.2021] has laid down the conditions and circumstances under which such discretion can be used. The same are reproduced below.

71. Thus, when it comes to discretion, the exercise thereof has to be guided by law; has to be according to the rules of reason and justice; and has to be based on the relevant considerations. The exercise of discretion is essentially the discernment of what is right and proper; and such discernment is the critical and cautious judgment of what is correct and proper by differentiating between shadow and substance as also between equity and pretence. A holder of public office, when exercising discretion conferred by the statute, has to ensure that such exercise is in furtherance of accomplishment of the purpose underlying conferment of such power. The requirements of reasonableness, rationality, impartiality, fairness and equity are inherent in any exercise of discretion; such an exercise can never be according to the private opinion.

71.1. It is hardly of any debate that discretion has to be exercised judiciously and, for that matter, all the facts and all the relevant surrounding factors as also the implication of exercise of discretion either way have to be properly weighed and a balanced decision is required to be taken.

11. The quantity of the gold under import is small and is not of commercial quantity. The impugned gold i.e. four (04) nos of crude gold bangles, six (06) nos of crude gold chains and one (01) nos of gold ring, totally weighing 748 had been kept inside the baggage by the applicant and were not ingeniously concealed. The applicant had produced the invoices and had claimed ownership of the gold from the time of the seizure. There are no allegations that the applicant is a habitual offender and was involved in similar offence earlier. The facts of the case indicate that it is a case of non-declaration of gold, rather than a case of smuggling for commercial considerations. Under the circumstances, the seriousness of the misdemeanour is required to be

kept in mind when using discretion under Section 125 of the Customs Act, 1962 and while imposing quantum of penalty.

12. The absolute confiscation of the gold, leading to dispossession of the applicant of the impugned gold jewellery i.e. four (04) nos of crude gold bangles, six (06) nos of crude gold chains and one (01) nos of gold ring, totally weighing 748 grams and valued at Rs. 21,55,381/- in the instant case is therefore, harsh and not reasonable. Government therefore, is inclined to modify the OIA passed by the AA.

13. Government finds that the penalty amount of Rs. 2,00,000/- imposed on the applicant under Section 112(a) and (b) of the Customs Act, 1962 by the OAA and upheld by the AA is commensurate with the omissions and commissions committed and does not find it necessary to interfere in the same.

14(a). Government notes that penalty under Section 114(i) of the Customs Act, 1962 has been imposed on the applicant by the OAA and upheld by the AA. Government notes that Section 114(i) reads as under;

'(i) in the case of goods in respect of which any prohibition is in force under this Act or any other law for the time being in force, to a penalty ¹[not exceeding three times the value of the goods as declared by the exporter or the value as determined under this Act]], whichever is the greater'.

14(b). Government observes that once penalty has been imposed under section 112(a) and (b) there is no necessity of imposing penalty under section 114(i) of the Customs Act, 1962. Therefore, the Government is inclined to set aside the penalty of Rs. 1,00,000/- imposed under section 114(i) of the Customs Act, 1962.

15. In view of the above, Government modifies the OIA passed by the AA as under;

(i). the absolute confiscation of the impugned four (04) nos of crude gold bangles, six (06) nos of crude gold chains and one (01) nos of gold ring, totally weighing 748 grams and valued at Rs. 21,55,381/- is set aside and the same is allowed to be redeemed on payment of a fine of Rs. 4,20,000/- (Rupees Four lakhs twenty thousand only).

(ii). the penalty of Rs. 2,00,000/- (Rupees One lakh only) imposed on the applicant under Section 112(a) & (b) of the Customs Act, 1962 by the OAA and upheld by the AA, is appropriate and commensurate with the omission and commission committed and the same does not merit interference.

(iii). the penalty of Rs. 1,00,000/- (Rupees One lakh only) imposed on the applicant under Section 114(i) & (b) of the Customs Act, 1962 by the OAA and upheld by the AA, is set aside.

16. Revision Application is disposed of on the above terms.

Shrawan
12/13/23
(SHRAWAN KUMAR)

Principal Commissioner & ex-officio
Additional Secretary to Government of India

ORDER NO. 353/2023-CUS (WZ)/ASRA/MUMBAI DATED 14.03.2023.

To,

1. Shri. Mohamad Altaf Miya Mohamad Shaikh, 11/1782 – 1800, Block No. 10, Madhukunj Society, Machlipith, Sodagarwad, Surat, Pin : 395 003.
2. Pr. Commissioner of Customs, Chhatrapati Shivaji Maharaj International Airport, Terminal 2, Level – II. Sahar, Mumbai 400 099.

Copy to:

1. A.M Sachwani / V.M Advani / N.J Heera / R.R Shah, Advocates, Nulwala Bldg, Ground Floor, 41 Mint Road, Opp. G.P.O, Fort, Mumbai -400 001.
2. Sr. P.S. to AS (RA), Mumbai.
3. File Copy.
4. Notice Board.