



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

F.No. 373/250/B/15-RA

Date of Issue 10/08/2018

ORDER NO.576/2018-CUS (SZ) / ASRA / MUMBAI/ DATED .30.07.2018 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 Basheer Ahamed

Respondent: Commissioner of Customs, Chennai.

Subject: Revision Application filed, under Section 129DD of the

Customs Act, 1962 against the Order-in-Appeal No. C. Cus-I No. 368/2015 dated 30.06.2015 passed by the

Commissioner of Customs (Appeals), Chennai.



ORDER

This revision application has been filed by Shri Basheer Ahamed (herein referred to as Applicant) against the Order in Appeal C. Cus No. 368/2015 dated 30.06.2015 passed by the Commissioner of Customs (Appeals), Chennai.

- 2. Briefly stated the facts of the case are that the applicant, arrived at the Chennai Airport on 05.04.2015. He was intercepted and examination of his person resulted in the recovery of Gold bits weighing 100 gms valued at Rs. 2,43,320/- (Rupees Two lakhs Forty three thousand Three hundred and twenty) and one Samsung 40" LED TV. The impugned gold was concealed in his undergarments.
- 3. After due process of the law vide Order-In-Original No. 388 Batch C dated 05.04.2015 the Original Adjudicating Authority ordered absolute confiscation of the gold under Section 111 (d) and e, (l), (m) of the Customs Act read with Section 3 (3) of Foreign Trade (Development & Regulation) Act and imposed penalty of Rs. 25,000/- under Section 112 (a) of the Customs Act,1962. The Samsung TV was allowed to be cleared as per baggage rules; Aggrieved by the said order, the applicant filed appeal before the Commissioner (Appeals) who vide Order-In-Appeal C. Cus No. 368/2015 dated 30.06.2015 rejected the appeal of the applicant.
- 4. The applicant has filed this Revision Application interalia on the following grounds that
 - 4.1 The order of the authorities is wholly unfair, unreasonable, unjust, biased, arbitrary and contrary to legal principles; The gold was presented to him for his daughters marriage, he had no intention of evading duty and never concealing it; He never opted for the green channel; The allegation of non-declaration under section 77 is not maintainable as he had not concealed the gold; The Applicant is not a repeat offender and the goods were brought for his own purpose; The Applicant never crossed the customs clearance nor passed through the green channel; The option to redeem the gold ought to have been given to the Applicant as it is mandatory under the section 125 of the Customs Act,1962; The gold brought in reasonable quantities was not a prohibited item; The Appellate authority should have considered that there are a plethora of permitting clearance of gold brought be genuine bonafide passages; The permitting clearance of gold brought be genuine bonafide passages; The permitting clearance of gold brought be genuine bonafide passages.

٠.

A The Applicant has a strong grounds for redeeming the gold based on various decisions of GOI and The Tribunal.

- 4.2 The Revision Applicant cited case laws in his defense and prayed for passing such orders as deem fit in the interest of justice.
- 5. A personal hearing in the case was scheduled to be held on 18.07.2018, the Advocate for the respondent Shri B. Kumar attended the hearing, he reiterated the submissions filed in Revision Application and cited the decisions of GOI/Tribunals where option for re-export of gold was allowed and requested for a lenient view to be taken in the matter. Nobody from the department attended the personal hearing.
- 6. The Government has gone through the facts of the case. A written declaration of goods was not made by the Applicant as required under Section 77 of the Customs Act, 1962 and under the circumstances confiscation of the goods is justified.
- 7. However, the facts of the case state that the Applicant had not cleared the Green Channel. There is no allegation that the Applicant had tried to pass through the green channel. The impugned gold was kept in his undergarments though concealed it was not indigenously concealed. The Applicant is a frequent traveler, however he is not a repeat offender and does not have any previous cases registered against him. 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.

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 (AR) 1880 Government is of the opinion that absolute confiscation of the gold is harsh and unjustified and therefore a lenient view can be taken in the matter. The Applicant

has pleaded for redemption of the gold on fine and penalty and the Confillent is inclined to accept the plea. The impugned Order in Appeal therefore needs to be modified.

į.

Page 3 of

- 9. The Government sets aside the absolute confiscation of the gold. The impugned gold weighing 100 gms valued at Rs. 2,43,320/- (Rupees Two lakhs Forty three thousand Three hundred and twenty) is allowed to be redeemed on payment of redemption fine of Rs. 1,00,000/- (Rupees One lakh) 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. 25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five thousand) to Rs. 20,000/- (Rupees Twenty thousand) under section 112(a) of the Customs Act,1962.
- 10. The impugned Order in Appeal is modified as detailed above. Revision application is partly allowed on above terms.

11. So, ordered.

(ASHOK KUMAR MEHTA)
Principal Commissioner & ex-officio

Additional Secretary to Government of India

ORDER No. 576/2018-CUS (SZ) /ASRA/MUMBAT.

DATED 30-07.2018

To,

Shri Basheer Ahamed c/o M/s L. K. Associates "Time Tower"Room No. 5, II Floor, 169/84, Gengu Reddy Road, Egmore, Chennai- 600 008.

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.

ATTESTED

S.R. HIRULKAR
Assistant Commissioner (R.A.)

