

CUSTOMS, EXCISE & SERVICE TAX APPELLATE TRIBUNAL
38, MG Marg Civil Lines, Old Red Building, Allahabad-211001
Regional Branch, Allahabad

Dated: 10/04/2018


To

Appellant as per address in table below

Respondent as per address in table below

Final Order No. A/70728/2018-SM[BR] dated 06/04/2018

I am directed to transmit herewith a certified copy of order passed by the Tribunal under section 35-C(1) of the Central Excise and Salt Act, 1944.


 Asstt. Registrar

Application	Appeal	Name and Address of Appellant
1	E/3310/2009	Hi-Tech Surfcants Pvt. Ltd. A-52 & 36, Industrial Area, Sikandrabad BULANDSHAHR UP 203206

Name and Address of Respondent

2	C.C. & C.E. & S.T.-Noida C-56/42...SECTOR 62, NOIDA, UTTAR PRADESH-201307
---	--

Copy To

3 Advocate(s) / Consultant(s):

R. Krishnan
 297-E, Pocket-II, Phase-I, Mayur
 vihar, New Delhi.
 Mayur Vihar,
 Delhi
 110091

4 Bar Association, CESTAT, Allahabad

5 Director Publications, Customs, Excise. I.P. Estate, Delhi

6 M/s Centax Publications Pvt. Ltd., 1512-B, Bhishm Pitamah Marg, Opp ICICI Bank of Defence Colony New Delhi-3

7 Company Law Institute of India Pvt. Ltd., No.2 (old no.36), Vaithyaram Street, T. Nagar, Chennai-17

8 Taxmann Allied Service Pvt. Ltd., 59/32, New Rohtak Road, New Delhi-110005

9 LAWCRUX Advisors Pvt. Ltd., LAW House, 1-8, Sector-10, Faridabad 121003 (Haryana)

10 TaxIndiaOnline.com Pvt. Ltd., 2nd Floor, Vasant Arcade, Vasant Kunj, New Delhi - 110070

11 Mark Professional Services Pvt. Ltd., 108, Everest Block, Aditya Enclave, Hyderabad - 38

12 The ICAI society, 52, Nagarjuna Hill, Punjagutta Hyderabad.-500082

13 M/S Knowledge Processing Pvt. Ltd.(taxinamagementindia.com), FF-19, 1st Floor, Cross River Mall, CBD Ground, Near Karkardooma Court, Delhi-110032

14 C.D.R. 15 Office Copy 16 Second Folder Copy 17 Guard File


 Asstt. Registrar

IN THE CUSTOMS, EXCISE & SERVICE TAX APPELLATE
TRIBUNAL
REGIONAL BENCH : ALLAHABAD
COURT No. I

APPEAL No. E/3310/2009-EX[SM]

(Arising out of Order-in-Appeal No. 289-CE/APPL/Noida/09 dated 30/09/2009 passed by Commissioner of Central Excise & Customs (Appeals), Noida)

M/s Hi-Tech Surfactants (P) Ltd.

Appellant

Vs.

Commissioner of Central Excise, Noida

Respondent

Appearance:

Shri R. Krishnan, Advocate,

for Appellant

Shri Sandeep Kumar Singh, Deputy Commissioner (AR),

for Respondent

CORAM:


Hon'ble Mr. Anil Choudhary, Member (Judicial)



Date of Hearing & Date of Decision : 19/12/2017

FINAL ORDER NO. 70728/2018

Per: Anil Choudhary



The issue in this appeal is, whether the appellant a manufacturer of detergent and registered with the Department, have contravened the provisions of Rule 9(1)(b) of Cenvat Credit Rules, 2004, as it appeared to Revenue that they have taken wrong Cenvat credit on the strength of supplementary invoice No. 528 dated 16th of February, 2007 issued by one M/s R. K. Industries, Pondicherry for Rs1,59,571/-. Vide RG-23A Part-II Entry No. 981 dated 15/03/2007.

2. The brief facts are that the appellant had taken Cenvat credit on the aforementioned supplementary invoice, which came to notice when the Judicial Supdt. – in charge of M/s R. K. Industries, Pondicherry (hereinafter referred as “M/s RKI” for short) vide his office letter dated 22/08/2007 informed to the Supdt., Central Excise, Range 33, Secunderabad, Bulandsahar have under whose jurisdiction the appellant factory falls, that a case of undervaluation has been booked against M/s RKI, Pondicherry alleging that they had raised supplementary invoice as aforementioned against the differential duty, collected from them and on the receipt of the said supplementary invoice, appellant Hi-Tech have taken the Cenvat credit thereof. Accordingly, pursuant to show cause notice vide Order-in-Original dated 31/12/2008. The Cenvat credit of Rs.1,59,571/- was disallowed and further penalty Rs.10,000/- was imposed under Rule 15 of CCR, 2004 along with interest. Being aggrieved, the appellant preferred appeal before Id. Commissioner (Appeals) who vide the impugned order was pleased to reject the appeal.


3. Being aggrieved the appellant/assessee is before this Tribunal. The learned counsel for the appellant informs that a case was also booked against M/s RKI as well as Hindustan Unilever Ltd. with respect to the same facts and investigation and/or allegations. The said matter finally reached before the Chennai Bench of this Tribunal in appeal No. E/117 and 118/2008 and vide final order No. 41869-41870/2017, dated



23/08/2017. This Tribunal has held as follows:-

"7. The ld. Counsel has submitted that the appellant is not contesting the demand of duty or the interest thereon and has confined his arguments on the penalties imposed. He has submitted that out of the 15 products of Mixed Odoriferous Substances (perfumes) manufactured by appellant, the allegation of undervaluation is only with respect of two products. It is also brought out from the facts that M/s. HLL was providing the costing to the appellant based on which the goods were cleared by the appellant. That immediately, after being pointed out by the audit, the appellants have paid the duty along with interest. In such a case, the show cause notice ought not to have issued. So also the intention to evade payment of duty cannot be alleged when the job worker/vendors/HLL is eligible to take Cenvat credit on the duty paid. Thus, the situation would give rise to Revenue neutral and therefore, in our opinion, as laid down in the case of Prakash Industries Ltd. (supra), the demand is unsustainable. Since the demand and interest are paid by the appellant and the ld. Counsel for the appellant has not challenged the duty demand and interest appropriated are sustainable. However, we set aside the penalties imposed on both the appellants."

4. Accordingly the ld. counsel states that the issue being



RK Industries. Thus, there is no irregularity in taking of Cenvat credit by this appellant vide supplementary invoice as aforementioned.

5. The learned A. R. for Revenue relied on the impugned order.

6. Having considered the rival contentions, I find that the present proceedings have been initiated by way of sequel to the proceedings initiated at Pondicherry in the case of RK Industries and Hindustan Unilever Ltd. As the proceedings at the end of RK Industries and Hindustan Unilever Ltd. stands settled vide final order of this Tribunal (supra) I hold that the allegations against this appellant also do not stand as to any irregularity in taking of Cenvat credit. Accordingly I hold that the appellant is entitled to take the Cenvat credit under dispute. Accordingly this appeal is allowed with consequential benefits to the appellant.

(Dictated in Court)

-Sd/-¹⁰

(ANIL CHOUDHARY)

Member(JUDICIAL)

Ansari

प्रमाणित प्रतिलिपि/True Copy
 सहायक पंजीकार/Asstt. Registrar
 विभागीय, उत्पाद शुल्क एवं सेवा कर
 आयकर अधिनियम/CESTAT
 38, एन.पी. रोड, बंगलूर-211001
 38, N. P. Road, Bangalore-211001

11/04/18

