

REGISTERED  
SPEED POST



GOVERNMENT OF INDIA  
MINISTRY OF FINANCE  
DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE

Office of the Principal Commissioner RA and  
Ex-Officio Additional Secretary to the Government of India  
8th Floor, World Trade Centre, Cuffe Parade,  
Mumbai- 400 005

F.No. 371/55/DBK/2020-RA

16530

Date of issue: 05.09.2023

ORDER NO. 622/2023-CUS (WZ)/ASRA/MUMBAI DATED 30.8.2023  
OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PASSED BY SHRI SHRAWAN KUMAR,  
PRINCIPAL COMMISSIONER & EX-OFFICIO ADDITIONAL SECRETARY TO THE  
OF INDIA, UNDER SECTION 129DD OF THE CUSTOMS ACT, 1962.

Applicants : M/s. Al Fawwaz Leather Xporter

Respondent: Pr. Commissioner of Customs (Export), ACC, Mumbai

Subject : Revision Applications filed, under Section 129DD of the Customs Act,  
1962, against the Order-in-Appeal No. Mum-CUSTOM-AXP-APP-747/19-20 dated  
28.11.2019 passed by Commissioner of Customs (Appeals), Mumbai Zone-III.

## ORDER

This Revision Application has been filed by M/s. Al Fawwaz Leather Xporter (hereinafter referred as 'applicant') against the Order-in-Appeal No. Mum-CUSTOM-AXP-APP-747/19-20 dated 29.11.2019 passed by Commissioner of Customs (Appeals), Mumbai Zone-III.

2. Briefly stated, facts of the case are that a show cause notice was issued to the applicant, demanding Rs. 2,35,231/- as the drawback amount obtained for exports made under the Shipping Bills, which is required to be returned to the Customs Department with applicable interest as the exporter has not realized the foreign exchange involved in the exported goods, as per Rule 16(A) Sub Rule [1] and [2] of Customs, Central Excise and Duties and Service Tax Drawback Rules, 1995. Further a Public Notice No. 19/2015 on dated 02.12.2015 was issued by Commissioner of Customs (export) ACC, Sahar where in, it was stipulated that the exporters will submit a certificate from the authorised dealer(s) or Chartered Accountant providing details of shipment beyond the prescribed details of shipment which remain outstanding beyond the prescribed time-limit including the extended time, if any, allowed by the authorized dealer / RBI on a 6 monthly basis. Such certificate shall be furnished by the exporter, authorized dealer wise for each port. Also, a Facility Notice No. 08/2016-17 name is in the list of defaulters should immediately contact the Dy. Commissioner of Customs, Drawback (XOS) Section between 22.08.2016 to 29.08.2016 for personal hearing on all working days and within working hours with all the required documents. The applicant has neither submitted the proof of their realization of export proceeds nor appeared for personal hearing on the given dates even after been given so many opportunities. Since the exporter failed to produce evidence to show that the sale proceeds in respect of the goods exported have been realized, the adjudicating authority confirmed the demand. Aggrieved, the applicant filed appeal, however, the Appellate authority vide OIA NO. Mum-CUSTOM-AXP-APP-747/19-20 dated 28.11.2019 rejected the appeal holding them time barred, being filed beyond the time limit prescribed under Section 128 of the Customs Act, 1962.



3. Hence, the Applicant has filed the impugned Revision Applications mainly on the following grounds:

- i. Hon'ble appellate authority is not correct because it is a fact that the order -in-original has not been received by the applicant's address. That office of the adjudicating authority while issuing the certified copy dated 25.09.2019 of the impugned order verified the fact that the applicant had not received the copy. Then only, the adjudicating authority issued certified copy to enable the applicant to approach appellate authority for redressal of their grievances in the appropriate forum after following criteria enumerated in Standing Instruction No.01/2018 dated 14.03.2018 issued by the Addl. Commissioner of Customs, Export, Sahar. In this case the certified copy of impugned order -in-original was issued to the applicant and same was received by the applicant on 25.09.2019 so as to enable them to file appeal.
- ii. The applicant has explained the facts vividly in the ground of Appeal submitted to the Appellate authority that the applicant was ignorant about the issuance of impugned O-in-O against them. The applicant came to know when their bankers DBS Bank India Ltd. Tamilnadu intimated the Applicant that they have marked lien against our account for Rs.246231/--(Rs.2,35,231/ drawback + Rs. 11,000/- penalty) (availed earlier as drawback) at the advice of the Asst. Commissioner of Customs, TRC (Export), ACC, Sahar. Accordingly, the applicant paid total amount of Rs. Rs.2, 46,231/- to Govt. Applicant was made to pay the above stated amount inspite of having export realization.
- iii. The contentions of Hon'ble appellate authority at paras 5&6 of his order are not proper. The applicant has submitted that they were ignorant about the issuance of impugned order-in-original. When they came to know about the impugned order-in-original they immediately acted and taken all Steps to obtain a certified copy of the said order so

that they can file appeal against the said order. The applicant without further loss of time requested adjudicating authority to issue certified copy as they had already in receipt of Bank realization certificate of export proceeds received for the port done during period 2013-2014.

iv. Applicant has received the foreign remittances well within the time.

v. In view of above Applicants requested to:

- i. set aside the impugned Order-in-Appeal.
- ii. Rs.2,46,231/-deposited with the Commissioner of Customs(Export), ACC in lieu of Recovery Notice should be refunded to the Applicant with interest as export proceeds were already realized.

4. Personal hearing in this case was scheduled on 10.05.2023,17.05.2023,07.06.2023 and 21.06.2023. However, neither the applicant nor respondent appeared for the personal hearing on the appointed dates, or made any correspondence seeking adjournment of hearings despite having been afforded the opportunity on more than three different occasions and therefore, Government proceeds to decide these cases on merits on the basis of available records.

5. Government has carefully gone through the relevant case records, written submissions and perused the impugned Order-in-Original and Order-in-Appeal.

6. Government observes that the applicant has all been sanctioned drawback in respect of exports made by them. However, the applicant had not produced evidence to show that the sale proceeds (foreign exchange) in respect of the exported goods had been realised within the time limit prescribed under FEMA, 1999. The applicant had therefore been issued show cause cum demand notice for recovery of the drawback sanctioned to them along with interest and penalty. The applicants did not respond to the intimations for personal hearing and therefore the adjudicating authority proceeded to confirm the demand for recovery of drawback sanctioned along with interest and penalty at the applicable rate. Applicant has claimed that they have not received the copies of the SCN & OIO passed by the adjudicating authority deciding the show cause



notice for recovery of drawback sanctioned and that they became aware of the OIO only when their bankers DBS Bank India Ltd., Tamilnadu intimated the Applicant that they have marked lien against their account for Rs.246231/- at the advice of the Asst. Commissioner of Customs, TRC (Export), ACC, Sahar. This matter was carried in appeal before Commissioner (Appeals) who has rejected the appeal on the ground of being time bar.

7. Government observes that the Circular No. 5/2009-Customs dated 02.02.2009 had set out a mechanism to monitor the realization of export proceeds. The circular dated 02.02.2009 was in vogue and therefore the applicants were required to follow the instructions contained therein and were duty bound to produce evidence of receipt of export proceeds before the Assistant/ Deputy Commissioner of Customs in terms of Rule 16A of the Drawback Rules, 1995/ Rule 18 of the Drawback Rules, 2017 within the period allowed under the FEMA, 1999. Government observes that no ground has been made out in the revision application to the effect that the applicant had already submitted evidence before the Assistant/Deputy Commissioner to substantiate receipt of export proceeds before issue of notice. The applicants ground regarding submission of evidence of realisation of foreign exchange is that they furnished such evidence before Commissioner (Appeals) and not at any time before that. Government observes that the impugned Order by the Appellate authority are passed during the year 2019. Even if it is presumed that the applicants claim about receipt of foreign exchange is accurate, the record suggests that the applicants have not been diligent and did not intimate the Department about the receipt of foreign exchange. However, the proximate cause for the revision application is that the appeals filed by the applicant has been dismissed on grounds of time bar.

8. The appeal before the Commissioner(Appeals) has been dismissed solely on the ground that the appeal has been filed beyond 60 days of the statutory time limit for filing appeal and the 30 days of condonable period. In this regard,

Government observes that the Commissioner(Appeals) has not made any attempt to ascertain as to whether the OIO had actually been served on the applicant.

9.1 Government observes that there are several binding judgments which provide insights on how proper service of orders is to be determined. It would be apposite to make reference to these judgments. The relevant headnote of the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case of Saral Wire Craft Pvt. Ltd. vs. Commissioner of Customs, Central Excise & Service Tax[2015(322)ELT 192(SC)] is reproduced below :

*"Appeal to Commissioner(Appeals) — Limitation --- Date of service of order - - Commissioner(Appeals), Tribunal as well as High Court rejecting appeal of Applicants only on question of power with Commissioner(Appeals) for delay condonation without ascertaining factum of date of actual service of order— Failure to take notice of Statutory provisions of service of order leading to gross miscarriage of justice - Affected party requires to be served meaningfully and realistically -- Adjudication order issued at back of Applicants, having not been properly served, came to his knowledge only on 26-7-2012 — Appeal filed on 22-8-2012, being within time, no question of condonation of delay Appeal allowed — Applicants directed to appear before Commissioner(Appeals) on 3-8-2015 for hearing — Section 35 of Central Excise Act, 1944.[paras 7,8,9,10]"*.

9.2 A case involving facts similar to those in the instant case had received the attention of the Hon'ble High Court of Bombay in the case of Soham Realtors Pole Star vs. Commissioner of Central Excise, Customs & Service Tax, 288(Bom)]. The relevant portion of the head-note thereof is reproduced below.

*"Appeal to Commissioner(Appeals) — Limitation — Delay in filing — Condonation - Scope of— Instant case COD application rejected merely on ground that department took proper steps for effecting service of impugned order — Question of condonation of delay is independent of date of service of impugned order as said date relevant only for determining length of delay — Reasons of delay in filing appeal have nothing to do with date of service*



*of order — Appellate authority not recording any finding on correctness of Applicants's plea of having received certified copy of adjudication order much later — Further findings on proper service of order also incorrect as sequence of procedure prescribed in Section 37C of Central Excise Act, J 944 not followed — As substantial amount of demand already stood deposited, matter remanded to Commissioner(Appeals) for reconsideration of issue and take a decision within 6 months - Section 35 of Central Excise Act, 1944.[paras5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11]"*

9.3 The relevant headnote of the citation where the Hon'ble High Court of Madras had occasion to deal with the issue of service of order in the case of Osa Shipping Pvt. Ltd. vs. CCE, Chennai [2015(325)ELT 486(Mad.)] is reproduced below.

*"Order — Adjudication order — Service of— Said order reportedly sent by Department by registered post — No acknowledgment card produced by Department — Service of order not complete — Section 37C of Central Excise Act, 1944.[paras 5, 6]"*

10. Government infers from the judgments cited that it is incumbent upon the appellate authority to confirm service of the order. The factum of service of order cannot be based upon presumption. In the present case, the Commissioner (Appeals) has not made any effort to ascertain actual date of service. The Commissioner (Appeals) was required to call for the records from the office of the adjudicating authority to corroborate the actual service of the order. He has not made any attempt to counter the submissions of the applicants stating that they had not received the OIO. Needless to say, the onus to establish service of the order to the applicant was upon the Department and Commissioner (Appeals) has not given any findings as to how the onus has been discharged.

11. In view of the assertions made by the applicant regarding receipt of export proceeds, it would be travesty of justice if applicant realized sale proceeds still the recovery orders are sustained exactly on the same ground of non realisation

of sale proceeds. Therefore, appropriate verification would be vital to settle the issue once and for all. Government therefore sets aside the impugned Order-in-Appeal and directs the original authority to decide the cases after due verification of documents in terms of the extant drawback rules and specifically Rule 16A of the Customs, Central Excise Duties and Service Tax Drawback Rules, 1995/ Rule 18 of the Customs and Central Excise Duties Drawback Rules, 2017. The applicant is required to provide the documents evidencing receipt of foreign remittances to the concerned authorities. The original authority is directed to pass appropriate order in accordance with the law after following the principles of natural justice, within 8 weeks from the receipt of this order.

12. The Revision Application/s are disposed of on the above terms.

*Shrawan*  
*30/8/23*

(SHRAWAN KUMAR)

Principal Commissioner & Ex-Officio  
Additional Secretary to Government of India.

ORDER No. *622*/2023-CUS (WZ)/ASRA/Mumbai dated *30.8.23*

To,

1. M/s. Al Fawwaz Leather Xporter, No. 08/23, Karpura Street, Periamet Chennai(Tamil Nadu)- 600003.
2. The Pr. Commissioner of Customs(E), Air Cargo Complex, Sahar, Andheri(E), Mumbai - 400099.

Copy to:-

1. The Commissioner of Customs (Appeals) Mumbai, Zone - III, 5th floor, Awas Corporate Point, Makwana Lane, Behind S.M. Centre, Andheri - Kurla Road, Marol, Mumbai - 400 059.
2. Sr. P.S. to AS(RA), Mumbai.
3. Guard file.