

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. 371/415/B/WZ/2019-RA/1652 Date of Issue : 20.03.2023

---

ORDER NO. 366 /2023-CUS (WZ/SZ)/ASRA/MUMBAI DATED 17.03.2023 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. 371/415/B/WZ/2019-RA**

Applicant : Shri. Sachin Santosh Chandosbar

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-CUSTOMS-  
PAX-APP-266/19-20 dated 28.06.2019 issued on 12.07.2019  
through F.No. S/49-750/2018 passed by the Commissioner of  
Customs (Appeals), Mumbai - III.

**ORDER**

This revision application has been filed by Shri. Sachin Santosh Chandosbar (hereinafter referred to as the Applicant) against the Order-in-Appeal No. MUM-CUSTOM-PAX-APP-266/19-20 dated 28.06.2019 issued on 12.07.2019 through F.No. S/49-750/2018 passed by the Commissioner of Customs (Appeals), Mumbai – III.

2. Brief facts of the case are that the applicant was intercepted by Customs Officers on 20.11.2018 at the CSMI Airport, Mumbai having earlier arrived from Dubai onboard Spice Jet Flight No. SG-14 / 20.11.2018. Applicant had failed to declare the goods in his possession at the red channel i.e. he had opted for the green channel . The applicant was found in possession of the goods listed at Table No. 01 which were beyond his admissible free allowance. The applicant was a frequent traveller and had stayed at Dubai only for 1 day.

**TABLE NO. 01**

Sl. No.	Description of goods.	Quantity	Value in Rs.	Remarks
1.	03 cut pieces of gold bars	150 grams	4,23,475/-	Rs. 4,23,475/-
2.	Gudang Garam cigarettes	7 cartons	7,000/-	Rs. 7,000/-
3.	Burkha	26	18,200/-	
4.	PS-4 CD	5	2,500/-	
5.	Goree Cream	30	4,500/-	
6.	Whey Protein (2.17 kg)	1	5,000/-	Rs. 5000/-
7.	Jergens Alovera	3	900/-	
			4,61,575/-	Rs. 4,35,475/-

3. The Original Adjudicating Authority (OAA), viz, Dy. Commissioner of Customs, CSMI Airport, Mumbai vide Order-In-Original No. Air Cus/49/T2/982/2018-Batch'A' dated 20.11.2018 ordered for the absolute confiscation of the goods mentioned at sl. no. 1, 2 & 6 mentioned at Table No. 1

above, totally valued at Rs. 4,35,475/- under Section 111(d) of the Customs Act, 1962 and for the goods mentioned at sl. nos. 3,4,5 & 7 totally valued at Rs. 26,100/- , an option to redeem the same on payment of a fine of Rs. 10,000/- within 15 days of the order was granted under Section 125 of the Customs Act, 1962. A penalty of Rs. 30,000/- under Section 112 (a) & (b) of the Customs Act, 1962 was imposed on the applicant.

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-CUSTM-PAX-APP-266/19-20 dated 28.06.2019 issued on 12.07.2019 through F.No. S/49-750/2018 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 upheld.

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.

(xviii). 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 COMMR. 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 29.12.2022. Shri. N.J Heera, Advocate for the applicant appeared for personal hearing on 29.12.2022 and submitted that a very small quantity of gold was brought for personal use. He requested to allow release of goods on nominal fine and penalty.

7. Government notes that in the statement of facts attached with the revision application, the applicant has prayed only for the release of the gold under Section 125 of the Customs Act, 1962. No mention of any other goods besides gold has been made or alluded to by the applicant. Hence, the Revision Authority proceeds to decide only on the limited issue of the gold bars as prayed for by the applicant in his revision application.

8. 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 goods without declaring the same to Customs. By his actions, it was clear that the applicant had no intention to declare the impugned gold / goods to Customs and pay Customs duty on it. The Government finds that the confiscation of the impugned gold / goods was therefore, justified.

9. 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”.

10. 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.

11. 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.*

12. The quantity of the gold under import is small and is not of commercial quantity. The impugned gold i.e. 3 cut pieces of gold bars, totally weighing 150 grams had not been declared by applicant and a case that the same were ingeniously concealed, has not been made out. 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.

13. The absolute confiscation of the gold, leading to dispossession of the applicant of the impugned gold i.e. 3 cut pieces of gold bars, totally weighing 150 grams and valued at Rs. 4,23,475/- in the instant case is therefore, harsh and not reasonable. Government therefore, is inclined to modify the OIA passed by the AA.

14. Government finds that the penalty amount of Rs. 30,000/- 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.

15. In view of the above, (i). Government modifies the OIA passed by the AA only to the limited extent of only setting aside the absolute confiscation of the 3 cut pieces



of gold bars, totally weighing 150 grams valued at Rs. 4,23,475/- and the same is allowed to be redeemed on payment of a fine of Rs. 80,000/- (Rupees Eighty thousand only).

(ii). the penalty of Rs. 30,000/- (Rupees Thirty thousand 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.

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

  
( SHRAWAN KUMAR )  
17/3/23

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

**ORDER NO. 366 /2023-CUS (WZ)/ASRA/MUMBAI DATED 17 .03.2023.**

To,

1. Shri. Sachin Santosh Chandosbar, Behind Shri. Krishna Mandal, Section - 29, RGS School, Ulhasnagar, Thane, Pin : 421 004.
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.