

REGISTERED
SPEED POST

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

F.No. 373/67/B/16-RA

Date of Issue 20/07/2018

ORDER NO. 456/2018-CUS (SZ) / ASRA / MUMBAI/ DATED 27.06.2018 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 Abdul Rahaman

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.
119/2016 dated 29.02.2016 passed by the Commissioner of
Customs (Appeals) Chennai.

ORDER

This revision application has been filed by Shri Abdul Rahaman (herein after referred to as the Applicant) against the order C. Cus No. 119/2016 dated 29.02.2016 passed by the Commissioner of Customs (Appeals), Chennai.

2. Briefly stated the facts of the case is that the applicant a Sri Lankan citizen arrived at the Chennai Airport on 12.02.2016. Examination of his person resulted in the recovery of Four gold buttons weighing 167 grams valued at Rs. 3,98,751/- (Rupees Three Lakhs Ninety eight thousand and Seven hundred and Fifty one) kept in his undergarments.

3. The Original Adjudicating Authority vide Order-In-Original No. 86/2016 Batch C dated 21.01.2016 ordered absolute confiscation of the impugned gold under Section 111 d), and (f) of the Customs Act read with Section 3 (3) of Foreign Trade (Development & Regulation) Act, and imposed penalty of Rs. 40,000/- under Section 112 (a) of the Customs Act.

4. Aggrieved by the said order, the applicant filed appeal before the Commissioner (Appeals) who vide Order-In-Appeal No. 119/2016 dated 29.02.2016 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; gold is not an prohibited item and can be released on payment of redemption fine and duty; The Appellate Authority has simply glossed over all the judgements and points raised in the Appeal grounds; He is the owner of the gold and had brought the gold for his family; He was all along at the Red Channel under the control of the officers and did not pass through the Green channel; The only allegation is that he did not declare the gold; The Adjudication authority has not used the discretion under Section 125 of the Customs Act, 1962; he had not concealed the gold ingeniously; Gold must be prohibited before import or export simply because of non-declaration goods cannot become prohibited; does not distinguish between the owner or carrier of the goods, the contention of the department that the gold cannot be released to the Applicant because he is not the owner goes against the law; The CBEC Circular 09/2001 gives specific directions to the officer of Customs in case the passenger has not filled the declaration form, to verify details and fill up the declaration form, This exercise was not carried out by the officers.

5.2 The Revision Applicant cited various assorted judgments in support of his case and prayed for re-export of the gold on redemption fine and 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 facts of the case. The goods were not declared by the passenger as required under Section 77 of the Customs Act, 1962. Under the circumstances confiscation of the goods is justified.

8. However, the Applicant was not intercepted while trying to exit the Green Channel. There is also no allegation of the Applicant trying to pass through the green channel. The ownership of the gold is not disputed. Government, also observes that the gold was *not ingeniously concealed*. The Applicant is a frequent traveler, and yet there are no previous offences registered against him. Further, 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. In view of the above facts, the Government is of the opinion that a lenient view can be taken in the matter. The Applicant has pleaded for re-export on redemption fine and reduced personal penalty and the Government is inclined to accept the plea. The absolute confiscation in the impugned Order in Appeal therefore needs to be modified and the confiscated goods are liable to be allowed for re-export on redemption fine and penalty.

10. In view of the above, Government allows redemption of the confiscated gold bits for re-export in lieu of fine. The gold bits weighing 167 grams valued at Rs. 3,98,751/- (Rupees Three Lakhs Ninety eight thousand and Seven hundred and Fifty one) is ordered to be redeemed for re-export on payment of redemption fine of Rs. 1,75,000/- (Rupees One lakh Seventy Five) 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. 40,000/- (Rupees Forty thousand) to Rs. 35,000/- (Rupees Thirty 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 KUMAR MEHTA)
Principal Commissioner & ex-officio
Additional Secretary to Government of India

ORDER No. 466/2018-CUS (SZ) /ASRA/MUMBAI. DATED 27-06-2018

To,

Shri Abdul Rahaman
C/o S. Palanikumar, Advocate,
No. 10, Sunkurama Chetty Street,
Opp High court, 2nd 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.