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. 371/50/B/2022-RA /618 : Date of Issue : 29.01.2024

ORDER NO. 72 /2024-CUS (WZ)/ASRA/MUMBAI DATED 24.01.2024 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.

Applicant : Shri. Mohammed Asim Urf Asim

Respondent : Pr. Commissioner of Customs, Airport-I, Mumbai

Subject : Revision Application filed, under Section 129DD of the Customs Act, 1962 against the Order-in-Appeal No. MUM-CUSTM-PAX-APP-776-2021-22 dated 26.10.2021 passed by the Commissioner of Customs (Appeals), Mumbai-III.

ORDER

This revision application has been filed by Shri. Mohammed Asim Urf Asim (herein referred to as Applicant) against the Order-in-Appeal No. MUM-CUSTM-PAX-APP-776-2021-22 dated 26.10.2021 passed by the Commissioner of Customs (Appeals), Mumbai-III.

2. Brief facts of the case are that, on 16.02.2019, officers of Customs at CSI Airport, Mumbai, intercepted the applicant on arrival at CSI Airport, Terminal 2, Mumbai from Riyad by Flight No 9W-523. While screening of his baggage at Green Channel of Customs, the officers noticed suspicious article in one of his baggage. The detailed examination of his baggage resulted in recovery of three gold bars collectively weighing 350 grams and totally valued at Rs. 10,73,040/-. The impugned gold was found concealed inside three Nivea Cream containers containing white cream. The impugned gold was seized under Panchanama dated 16.02 2019.

3 The case was adjudicated and the adjudicating authority absolutely confiscated the recovered gold under Section 111(d), (l) and (m) of Customs Act, 1962 A penalty of Rs.1,00,000/- under section 112(a)(i) of the Customs Act, 1962 was also imposed on the applicant

4 Aggrieved with the Order, the applicant filed an appeal before the Appellate Authority viz Commissioner of Customs (Appeals), Mumbai-III, who vide the impugned Order-in-Appeal, rejected the appeal, and upheld the OIO.

5. Aggrieved with the order of the Appellate authority, the Applicant has filed this revision application inter alia on the grounds that;

5.1 the Appellate court denies everything and passed the order against the applicant dated 26.10.2021 which is not fair and just. The order in the light of justice must be quashed and set aside. The applicant must get back his belongings

5.2 That the order dated 26.10.2021 passed by the Appellate court does not mentioned a single word in the whole Judgment that the documents and facts are submitted by the applicant is false and fabricated. If the Appellate court even gone through the facts and documents then in that situation neither the order dated 26.10.2021 passed nor against the applicant. So, the order dated 26.10.2021 is against the law and facts are liable to be set aside.

5.3 the appellate court denies each and every document on record and did not pay any type of attention towards it that's why the unfair decision dated 26.10.2021 must be set aside.

5.4 the Applicant did not exits any type of criminal record in the past which clearly proves from the police clearance certificate but the authority did not pay any type of attention towards it that's why the unfair decision dated 26.10.2021 must be set aside.

5.5 the invoice is on record of the gold bars purchased from Saudia Arabia. The family of applicant is a joint family. The applicant is not at all indulge in any type of smuggling. The gold bars was purchased for the purpose of making ornaments and jewellary for the marriage of real uncle's son. The invitation card is on the record but the appellate court did not pay any type of attention towards it that's why the unfair and unjust decision dated 26.10.2021 must be set aside.

5.6 in the answer of the show cause notice the applicant clearly stated that the family of applicant is a joint family. The family faces many financial problems due to seizure of the three gold bars, the debts is the core problem faced by the applicant's family. The applicant is in need of the three gold bars for the supporting the family in clearing of the debt but the authority did not pay any type of attention towards it that's why the unfair and unjust decision dated 27 10.2021 must be set aside.

5.7 the applicant present the copy of NRI account pass book in order to show that after 2016 there is no transaction occured till today. It clearly

showed that the applicant saved the earned money for the purchasing of the gold bars. The invoice number of the purchased gold bars is on record but the authority did not pay any type of attention towards it that's why the unfair and unjust decision dated 26.10.2021 must be set aside.

5.8 Under the circumstances, the applicant has prayed to the Revision Authority to set aside the impugned OIA and to release the gold bars to the applicant.

6 Personal hearing in the case was scheduled on 28.08.2022. Mr. Aasif Moyal, Advocate for the applicant appeared for personal hearing and submitted that applicant brought small quantity of gold for ornaments of family members He further submitted that gold was purchased out of personal saving. He further submitted that applicants are not habitual offenders and they work in Oman. He requested to release the gold on nominal fine and penalty.

7.1 Government observes that the applicant has filed an application for condonation of delay. Applicant has stated that the OIA was received by him on 15 02.2022 and that there was delay in filing the application due to the disruption caused by COVID. Government observes that the applicant was required to file the revision application within 3 months i.e. by. 26.01.2022. Considering, the further extension of 3 months which can be condoned, the applicant was required to file the revision by 26.04.2022. The applicant had filed the revision application on 15.02.2022 which is within the extendable period and hence the Government condones the delay and goes into the merits of the case.

7 2 The Government has gone through the facts of the case, and observes that the applicant had failed to declare the gold while availing the green channel facility. The applicant clearly had failed to declare the goods to the Customs as required under Section 77 of the Customs Act, 1962. By not declaring the gold carried by him, the applicant clearly revealed his intention not to declare the

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

8.1 The relevant sections of the Customs Act are reproduced below:

Section 2(33)

"prohibited goods" means any goods the import or export of which is subject to any prohibition under this Act or any other law for the time being in force but does not include any such goods in respect of which the conditions subject to which the goods are permitted to be imported or exported have been complied with"

Section 125

"Option to pay fine in lieu of confiscation. - (1) Whenever confiscation of any goods is authorised by this Act, the officer adjudging it may, in the case of any goods, the importation or exportation whereof is prohibited under this Act or under any other law for the time being in force, and shall, in the case of any other goods, give to the owner of the goods or, where such owner is not known, the person from whose possession or custody such goods have been seized, an option to pay in lieu of confiscation such fine as the said officer thinks fit :

Provided that where the proceedings are deemed to be concluded under the proviso to sub-section (2) of section 28 or under clause (i) of sub-section (6) of that section in respect of the goods which are not prohibited or restricted, the provisions of this section shall not apply :

Provided further that, without prejudice to the provisions of the proviso to sub-section (2) of section 115, such fine shall not exceed the market price of the goods confiscated, less in the case of imported goods the duty chargeable thereon.

(2) Where any fine in lieu of confiscation of goods is imposed under sub-section (1), the owner of such goods or the person referred to in sub-section (1), shall, in addition, be liable to any duty and charges payable in respect of such goods

(3) Where the fine imposed under sub-section (1) is not paid within a period of one hundred and twenty days from the date of option given thereunder, such option shall become void, unless an appeal against such order is pending."

8.2 It is undisputed that as per the Foreign Trade Policy applicable during the period, gold was not freely importable and it could be imported only by the banks authorized by the RBI or by others authorized by DGFT and to some extent by passengers Therefore, gold which is a restricted item for import but which was imported without fulfilling the conditions for import becomes a prohibited goods in terms of Section 2(33) and hence it liable for confiscation under Section 111(d) of the Customs Act.

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" in terms of Section 2(33) and hence it is liable for confiscation under Section 111(d) of the Customs Act, 1962.

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 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. A plain reading of the section 125 shows that the Adjudicating Authority is bound to give an option of redemption when goods are not subjected to any prohibition. In case of prohibited goods, such as, the gold, the Adjudicating Authority may allow redemption. There is no bar on the Adjudicating Authority allowing redemption of prohibited goods. This exercise of discretion will depend on the nature of the goods and the nature of the prohibition. For instance, spurious drugs, arms, ammunition, hazardous goods, contaminated flora or fauna, food which does not meet the food safety standards, etc. are harmful to the society if allowed to find their way into the domestic market. On the other hand, release of certain goods on redemption fine, even though the same becomes prohibited as conditions of import have not been satisfied, may not be harmful to the society at large. Thus, Adjudicating authority can allow redemption under Section 125 of any goods which are prohibited either under the Customs Act or any other law on payment of fine.

13 Government further observes that there are a catena of judgements, over a period of time, of the Hon'ble Courts and other forums which have been categorical in the view that grant of the option of redemption under Section 125 of the Customs Act, 1962 can be exercised in the interest of justice. Government places reliance on some of the judgements as under:

a) In the case of Commissioner of Customs, Aliganj, Lucknow vs Rajesh Jhamatmal Bhat, [2022(382) E.L T. 345 (All)], the Lucknow Bench of the

Hon'ble High Court of Allahabad, has held at Para 22 that "Customs Excise & Service Tax Appellate Tribunal Allahabad has not committed any error in upholding the order dated 27.08.2018 passed by the Commissioner (Appeals) holding that Gold is not a prohibited item and, therefore, it should be offered for redemption in terms of Section 125 of the Act."

b) The Hon'ble High Court of Judicature at Madras, in the judgment in the case of Shik Mastani Bi vs. Principal Commissioner of Customs, Chennai-I [2017(345) E.L.T. 201 (Mad)] upheld the order of the Appellate Authority allowing re-export of gold on payment of redemption fine.

c) The Hon'ble High Court of Kerala at Ernakulam in the case of R. Mohandas vs. Commissioner of Cochin [2016(336) E.L.T, 399 (Ker.)] has, observed at Para 8 that "The intention of Section 125 is that, after adjudication, the Customs Authority is bound to release the goods to any such person from whom such custody has been seized.. "

d) Also, in the case of Union of India vs Dhanak M Ramji [2010(252)E.L.T. A102(S.C)], the Hon'ble Apex Court vide its judgement dated 08.03.2010 upheld the decision of the Hon'ble High Court of Judicature at Bombay [2009(248) E L.T 127 (Bom)], and approved redemption of absolutely confiscated goods to the passenger.

14. Government, observing the ratios of all the above judicial pronouncements, arrives at the conclusion that decision to grant the option of redemption would be appropriate in the facts and circumstances of the instant case.

15. Government observes that the quantity of gold was not substantial, which indicates that the same was not for commercial use. The Applicant claimed ownership of the impugned gold. There are no other claimants of the said gold. There is no allegation 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.

16.1 The absolute confiscation of the gold, leading to dispossession of the applicant of the same in the instant case is therefore, harsh and not reasonable. Government for the aforesaid reasons, is inclined to set aside the absolute confiscation held in the OIA and considers granting an option to the Applicant to redeem the Gold on payment of a suitable redemption fine, as the same would be more reasonable and judicious

16.2 Government finds that the penalty of Rs. 1,00,000/- imposed on the Applicant for the gold valued at Rs 10,73,040/- under Section 112(a) & (i) of the Customs Act, 1962 is appropriate and commensurate to the omissions and commissions of the Applicant.

17.1 In view of the above, the Government modifies the impugned order passed by the Appellate authority and allows the applicant to redeem the impugned gold viz. gold weighing 350 grams and valued at Rs. 10,73,040/- on payment of redemption fine of Rs. 2,00,000/- (Rupees Two Lakhs Only).

17.2 The penalty of Rs. 1,00,000/- imposed under Section 112(a) and (i) of the Customs Act, 1962 being appropriate and commensurate with the omissions and commissions of the Applicant, Government does not feel it necessary to interfere with the imposition of the same and is sustained

18. The Revision Application is disposed off on the above terms.

(SHRAWAN KUMAR)
Principal Commissioner & ex-officio
Additional Secretary to Government of India

ORDER NO. 72/2024-CUS (WZ)/ASRA/MUMBAI DATED 24.01.2024

To,

1. Shri. Mohammed Asim Urf Asim, S/o. Mohammed Yusuf R/o. 10 Mukarabpur Sirsi, Sirsi Dehat Sambhal, UP- 244301.
2. Pr. Commissioner of Customs, Airport-I, Chhatrapati Shivaji International Airport, Terminal – 2, Level – II, Andheri(E), Mumbai – 400099.

Copy to:

1. The Commissioner of Custom Appeals, Mumbai-III, Awas Corporate Point (5th Floor), Makwana Lane, Behind S. M. Centre Andheri-Kurla Road, Marol, Mumbai-400059.
2. Shri Mohd Rafiq Khan Moyal (Advocate), S/o Shri Abdul Gaffar Khan Near Kalu Khan ka Kuaa, Ward No. 22, Sardar Shahr, Churu, Rajasthan- 331403.
3. Sr. P.S. to AS (RA), Mumbai.
4. File Copy.
5. Notice Board.