

SPEED POST



F.No. 373/394/B/SZ/2019-RA
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF FINANCE
(DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE)

14, HUDCO VISHALA BLDG., B WING
6th FLOOR, BHIKAJI CAMA PLACE,
NEW DELHI-110 066

Date of Issue. 21/03/24

Order No. 81/24-Cus dated 21-03-2024 of the Government of India passed by Smt. Shubhagata Kumar, Additional Secretary to the Government of India, under Section 129DD of the Customs Act, 1962.

Subject : Revision Applications under Section 129 DD of the Customs Act, 1962, against the Order-in-Appeal C. Cus. I. No. 195/2019 dated 09.09.2019, passed by the Commissioner of Customs (Appeals-I), Chennai.

Applicant : Shri Syed Ibrahim Sabur Batcha, Chennai

Respondent : The Principal Commissioner of Customs, Chennai-I

.....

ORDER

Revision Application No. 373/394/B/SZ/2019-RA dated 30.09.2019 has been filed by Shri Syed Ibrahim Sabur Batcha, Chennai (hereinafter referred to as the Applicant) against the Order-in-Appeal C. Cus. I. No. 195/2019 dated 09.09.2019, passed by the Commissioner of Customs (Appeals-I), Chennai. The Commissioner (Appeals) has rejected the appeal filed by the Applicant against the Order-in-Original passed by the Assistant Commissioner of Customs (Airport), Anna International Airport, Chennai, bearing OS No. 291/2019-Batch-D dated 05.04.2019, vide which one gold bit weighing 30 grams valued at Rs. 90,738/-, recovered from Applicant, was confiscated absolutely under Section 111(d), 111(l), 111(m) and 111(o) of the Customs Act, 1962 read with Section 3(3) of the Foreign Trade (Development & Regulation) Act, 1992 and Personal Penalty of Rs. 10,000/- was also imposed on the Applicant under Section 112 (a) of the Act, *ibid*.

2. Brief facts of the case are that the Applicant arrived after a stay of two days abroad on 15.03.2019, at Anna International Airport, Chennai. He was intercepted at the exit of the arrival hall by the Customs officers. Then the Applicant was questioned as to whether he was carrying any gold /prohibited/contraband items either in his baggage or on his person, to which he replied in the negative. He was then subjected to detailed examination after complying with the provisions of Section 102 of the Customs Act, 1962. During the examination, one gold cut bit in primary form weighing 30 grams valued at Rs. 90,738/- was recovered from him. He attempted to clear the above items without opting to declare the same to the Customs officials. It was noticed that the Applicant is a frequent traveller and not eligible to import gold. He admitted that impugned gold was carried by him to be handed over outside the airport for a monetary consideration. The only purpose to import the same in baggage was an attempt to make profit by sale evading Customs duty in violation of Baggage Rules, 2016 by attempting walk through green channel. The impugned gold was seized by the Customs officers and the matter was adjudicated by the adjudicating authority vide aforesaid Order-in-Original bearing OS No. 291/2019-Batch-D dated 05.04.2019. Aggrieved, the Applicant filed an appeal before the Commissioner of Customs (Appeals-I), Chennai, which has been rejected.

3. The instant revision application has been filed mainly on the grounds that order of adjudicating authority is against law, weight of evidence and circumstances and probabilities of the case; he was all along under the control of the officers of customs and he was at the red channel; gold is restricted item not prohibited goods; option ought to have been given for the release of impugned gold under Section 125 of the Customs Act, 1962 on payment of redemption fine. It is prayed to set aside the impugned order and to permit the Applicant to re-export or release the gold and also penalty may be set aside/reduced.

4. Personal hearing in the matter was fixed on 23.02.2024 and 06.03.2024 respectively. But, none appeared either from Applicant's or from the Respondents' side and no request for adjournment has been made. Therefore, the matter is taken up based on the available records.

5. The Government has examined the matter. The applicant was a frequent traveller and not in possession of any valid document for the legal import of gold. He has also admitted in his own statement that the gold was not his and that he was to hand it over to some person outside the airport. No documents evidencing ownership and licit purchase were produced by him at the time of interception. The Applicant was also not an eligible passenger to import gold as part of baggage as he did not fulfil the conditions stipulated in the Notification No. 12/2012-Cus dated 17.03.2012 vide which he was required to have stayed abroad for not less than six months and ought to have had sufficient foreign currency to pay the duty. Furthermore, he did not declare the gold to Customs as required under Section 77 of the Customs Act, 1962.

6. As per Section 123 of the Act, *ibid*, in respect of the gold and manufactures thereof, the burden of proof that such goods are not smuggled is on the person, from whom goods are recovered. The Applicant did not declare the gold items, as stipulated under Section 77 of the Act, *ibid*. The Applicant has, thus, failed to discharge the burden placed on him, in terms of Section 123, *ibid*. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case, the Government concurs with the lower authorities that the seized gold bit was liable for confiscation under Section 111 *ibid* and that the Applicant was liable for penalty.

7.1 Another contention of the Applicant is that the import of gold is not 'prohibited'. However, the Government observes that this contention of the Applicant is against several judgements of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in which it has been held that the goods, import/export whereof is allowed subject to certain conditions, are to be treated as 'prohibited goods' in case such conditions are not fulfilled. In the case of *Sheikh Mohd. Omer vs Collector of Customs, Calcutta & Ors {1971 AIR 293}*, the Apex Court has held that for the purpose of Section 111(d) of the Customs Act, 1962, the term "Any prohibition" means every prohibition. In other words, all types of prohibition. Restriction is one type of prohibition. Gold is not allowed to be imported freely in baggage and it is permitted to be imported by a passenger subject to fulfilment of certain conditions. In the present case, as correctly brought out by the lower authorities, the Applicant in this case did not fulfil the conditions specified in this behalf. In the case of *M/s Om Prakash Bhatia Vs. Commissioner of Customs, Delhi {2003(155) ELT423(SC)}*, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that "*if the conditions prescribed for import or export of goods are not complied with, it would be considered to be prohibited goods*". Further, in the case of *UOI & Ors vs. M/s Raj Grow Impex LLP & Ors (2021-TIOL-187-SC-CUS-LB)*, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has followed the judgments in *Sheikh Mohd. Omer (supra)* and *Om Prakash Bhatia (supra)* to hold that "*any restriction on import or export is to an extent a prohibition; and the expression "any prohibition" in Section 111(d) of the Customs Act includes restrictions.*"

7.2 In the case of *Malabar Diamond Gallery P. Ltd. Vs ADG, DRI, Chennai [2016(341) ELT65(Mad.)]*, the Hon'ble Madras High Court (i.e the Hon'ble jurisdictional High Court) has summarized the position on the issue, specifically in respect of gold, as under:

"64. Dictum of the Hon'ble Supreme Court and High Courts makes it 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 Section 2 (33) of the Customs Act, 1962----."

7.3 Moreover, the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in its order dated 23.11.2023 in Writ Petition No. 8976 of 2020 in the matter of *Kiran Juneja Vs. Union of India & Ors.* has held

that "A fortiori and in terms of the plain language and intent of Section 2(33), an import which is effected in violation of a restrictive or regulatory condition would also fall within the net of "prohibited goods". Hence, there is no doubt that the goods seized in the present case are to be treated as "prohibited goods", within the meaning of assigned to it under Section 2(33) of the Act, *ibid*.

7.4 In view of the above, the contention of the Applicant that the offending goods are not 'prohibited goods', cannot be accepted.

8. The Government observes that the original authority had denied the release of gold items on payment of redemption fine, under Section 125 of Customs Act, 1962. It is settled by the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, in the case of Garg Woollen Mills (P) Ltd vs. Additional Collector of Customs, New Delhi [1998 (104) E.L.T. 306 (S.C.)], that the option to release 'prohibited goods' on redemption fine is discretionary. Hon'ble Delhi High Court has, in the case of Raju Sharma [2020 (372) ELT 249 (Del)], held that "*Exercise of discretion by judicial, or quasi-judicial authorities, merits interference only where the exercise is perverse or tainted by patent illegality, or is tainted by oblique motive.*" Further, the Hon'ble Delhi High Court in its order dated 21.08.2023 in W.P. (C) Nos. 8902/2021; 9561/2021; 13131/2022; 531/2022; & 8083/2023 held that "*.....an infraction of a condition for import of goods would also fall within the ambit of Section 2(33) of the Act and thus their redemption and release would become subject to the discretionary power of the Adjudging Officer*". Therefore, keeping in view the judicial pronouncements above, the Commissioner (Appeals) has correctly refused to interfere with the discretion exercised by the original authority.

9.1 The Applicant has requested for permitting re-export of the offending goods. The Government observes that a specific provision regarding re-export of articles imported in baggage is made in Chapter-XI of the Customs Act, 1962, by way of Section 80. On a plain reading of Section 80, it is apparent that a declaration under Section 77 is a pre-requisite for allowing re-export. Hon'ble Allahabad High Court has, in the case of *Deepak Bajaj vs Commissioner of Customs (P), Lucknow*{2019(365) ELT 695(All.)}, held that a


declaration under Section 77 is a *sine qua non* for allowing re-export under Section 80 of the Act, *ibid*. In this case, the Applicant had not made a true declaration under Section 77.

9.2 Further, the Hon'ble Delhi High Court has, in the case of *Jasvir Kaur vs. UOI {2009 (241) ELT 621 (Del.)}*, held that re-export is not permissible when article is recovered from the passenger while attempting to smuggle it. Hence, the question of allowing re-export does not arise.

10. The case laws relied upon by the Applicant, in support of his various contentions, are not applicable in view of the dictum of Hon'ble Supreme Court and Hon'ble High Courts, as above.

11. Keeping in view facts and circumstances of the case, the penalty imposed is neither harsh nor excessive.

12. In view of the above, the revision application is rejected.


21/3/24
(Shubhagata Kumar)

Additional Secretary to the Government of India


Shri Syed Ibrahim Sabur Batcha,
S/o Shri Syed Ibrahim,
No. 5/2 tH Road Triplicane,
Chennai, Tamil Nadu - 600006

Order No. 81/24-Cus dated 21-03-2024

Copy to:

1. The Commissioner of Customs (Appeals-I), Chennai Airport & Air Cargo, 3rd floor, New Custom House, GST Road, Meenambakkam, Chennai – 600016
2. The Principal Commissioner of Customs, Commissionerate-I, Chennai-I (Airport), New Custom House, Meenambakkam, Chennai-600027
3. Sh. S. Palanikumar, Kameshwaran & P. Kamala Malar, Advocates, No. 10, Sunkurama Street, 2nd Floor, Chennai-600001.
4. PPS to AS (RA).
5. Guard file.
6. Spare Copy
7. Notice Board

ATTESTED


21/3/24
सरबजीत सिंह / SARABJEET SINGH
अधीक्षक / Superintendent (R.A. Unit)
वित्त मंत्रालय / Ministry of Finance
राजस्व विभाग / Department of Revenue
Room No. 605, 6th Floor., B-Wing
14, Hudco Vishala Building, Bhikaji Cama Place,
New Delhi-110066