

**IN THE CUSTOMS, EXCISE & SERVICE TAX
APPELLATE TRIBUNAL, CHENNAI
(VIRTUAL HEARING)**

Excise Appeal No.40009 of 2017

(Arising out of Order-in-Appeal No.331/2016 (CXA – II) dated 31.8.2016 passed by the Commissioner of Central Excise (Appeals – II), Chennai)

M/s. Sun Pharmaceuticals Industries Ltd.

Appellant

Sathammal Village, Karunkuzhi Post
Madhuranthagam Taluk
Kancheepuram District – 603 303.

Vs.

Commissioner of GST & Central Excise

Respondent

Chennai Outer Commissionerate
12th Main Road, Anna Nagar
Chennai – 600 040.

APPEARANCE:

CMA Ashok B. Nawal for the Appellant

Shri M. Selvakumar, Authorized Representative for the Respondent

CORAM

Hon'ble Shri M. Ajit Kumar, Member (Technical)

Hon'ble Shri Ajayan T.V., Member (Judicial)

Final Order No. 40588/2025

Date of Hearing : 06.03.2025

Date of Decision: 06.06.2025

Per M. Ajit Kumar,

This appeal is filed against common Order in Appeal No. 331/2016 (CXA – II) dated 31.8.2016 passed by the Commissioner of Central Excise (Appeals – II), Chennai.

2. Brief facts of the case are that the appellant had been clearing the goods 'Danazol' without payment of duty by claiming exemption under Sl. No. 47A of the Notification No. 4/2006-CE dated 1.3.2006. However, the department felt that the impugned goods would get covered under Sl. No. 47B of the said Notification according to which

when the goods are used elsewhere other than the factory of production, exemption shall be allowed only if the procedure laid down in the Central Excise (Removal of Goods at Concessional Rate of Duty for Manufacture of Excisable Goods) Rules, 2001 is followed. Since the appellant had cleared the product 'Danazol' to other manufacturers like M/s. Arvind Remedies without following the above Rules, it appeared that the appellant was not eligible for exemption under Notification No. 4/2006-CE ibid. Therefore, Show Cause Notice for the period from April 2012 to December 2012 was issued to the appellant denying the exemption. After due process of law, the adjudicating authority vide Order in Original No. 29/2014-CE dated 30.4.2014 dropped the demand made for the period from April 2011 to March 2012. Aggrieved by the said orders department filed an appeal before Commissioner (Appeals), who vide the common impugned order set aside the adjudication order and confirmed the demand of duty of Rs.12,45,010/-. The penalty was however set aside holding that the issue was interpretational one. Aggrieved against the duty demand, the appellant is now before the Tribunal.

3. No cross-objection has been filed by the respondent-department.

4. We have heard Shri Ashok B. Nawal, Consultant for the appellant and learned Shri M. Selvakumar, Authorized Representative) for the Respondent.

5. Shri Ashok B. Nawal, learned consultant for the appellant submitted that the Appellant cleared product 'Danazol' to Arvind Remedies Silvassa without payment of duty by claiming exemption under Sl.No.47 (A) of Notification 4/2006-CE with NIL rate of duty without fulfilling any condition. However, the benefit of the said

notification was denied to them by the Ld. Commissioner (Appeals) vide the impugned order as he was of the opinion that the product Danazol being a 'bulk drug' would be covered under Sl. No. 47B of Notification No. 4/2006-CE and not under Sl. No. 47A ibid claimed by the appellants, as the heading covered only 'drugs or medicines'. While goods falling under Sl. No. 47A are exempt from duty unconditionally, goods falling under Sl. No. 47B are exempt from duty subject to fulfillment of certain conditions, which the appellant failed to meet, whereby the impugned order has confirmed the demand for duty while setting aside the penalties. The consultant has relied on the following judgments of the Tribunal in support of his stand that the term 'drug' has to be considered to include 'bulk drug' and the impugned goods are entitled for the benefit of the Notification 4/2006-CE dated 1.3.2006 under Sl. No. 47A. He prayed that the impugned order may be set aside with consequential relief.

- a. Aurobindo Pharma Ltd. Vs. CCE, Hyderabad reported in 2009 (247) ELT 206 (Tri. Bang.)
 - b. Astrix Laboratories Ltd. Vs. CCE, Hyderabad reported in 2009 (233) ELT 372 (Tri. Bang.)
 - c. Dr. Reddy's Laboratories Ltd. Vs. CCE, Hyderabad reported in 2010 (251) ELT 447 (Tri. Bang.)
 - d. CCE, Hyderabad Vs. Hetero Drugs Ltd. reported in 2010 (262) ELT 490 (Tri. Bang.)
 - e. Final Order No. 40939 & 40940/2023 dated 19.10.2023 in the appellant's own case for the earlier period
6. Learned AR Shri M. Selvakumar reiterated the findings of the Ld. Commissioner (Appeals).
7. Two issues arise for consideration:-

(i) Whether the product 'Danazol' which is a 'bulk drug' would fall under Sl. No. 47A of Notification No. 4/2006-CE dated 1.3.2006 or it has to be considered as 'drug or medicine' which falls under Sl. No. 47B of the said Notification.

(ii) In case the goods fall under Sl. No. 47A of Notification No. 4/2006-CE dated 1.3.2006 and are unconditionally exempted, whether the common input credit used in the exempted product would be reversible as per Rule 6(3) of CENVAT Credit Rules, 2004.

8. We find that the issue at Sl. No. (i) as to whether 'Danazol' is eligible for the exemption under Sl. No. 47A of Notification No.4/2006-CE is no longer res integra as has been decided by a host of judgments of this Tribunal cited by the appellant and listed above. The judgments have held that since the term 'bulk drugs' and 'drug and medicines' have not been defined in the Notification, the definition as per Drugs (Price Control) Order, 1995 is relevant. As per Drugs (Price Control) Order, 1995, the term 'drug' have been defined to include 'bulk drug' and formulations. An identical matter was decided by a Division Bench of this Tribunal in the appellant's own case [Final Order Nos. 40939 and 40940/2023 dated 19.10.2023]. The Bench speaking through Shri M. Ajit Kumar, Member (Technical) held as under:-

"8. Two issues arise for consideration:-

(i) Whether the product 'Danazol' which is a 'bulk drug' would fall under Sl. No. 47A of Notification No. 4/2006-CE dated 1.3.2006 or it has to be considered as 'drug or medicine' which falls under Sl. No. 47B of the said Notification.

(ii) In case the goods fall under Sl. No. 47A of Notification No. 4/2006-CE dated 1.3.2006 and are unconditionally exempted, whether the common input credit used in the exempted product would be reversible / duty payable to the percentage of value of the exempted goods as per Rule 6(3) of CENVAT Credit Rules, 2004.

9. We find that the issue at Sl. No. (i) as to whether 'Danazol' is eligible for the exemption under Sl. No. 47A of Notification No.4/2006-CE is no longer res integra as has been decided by host of judgments of this Tribunal stated by the appellant and listed above. The judgments have held that since the term 'bulk drugs' and 'drug and medicines' have not been defined in the Notification, the definition as per Drugs (Price Control) Order, 1995 is relevant. As per Drugs (Price Control) Order, 1995, the term 'drug' have been defined to include 'bulk drug' and formulations. Thus, the said judgments put in mathematical terms could be understood as meaning that while 'drug' is a superset, 'bulk drugs' is the subset, whereby 'bulk drugs' are covered by the term 'drugs'. Hence, it is for the appellant to choose which ever Sl no of the exemption is more favourable to him. Judicial discipline requires us to follow the ratio of the above judgments. We hence find that the appellant is entitled to the benefit of unconditional exemption from tax as per Sl. No. 47A of Notification No. 4/2006-CE dated 1.3.2006.

10. As regards the second issue, it is seen that the department had followed a two-pronged strategy. Initially Show Cause Notices were issued to the appellant denying unconditional exemption for 'Danazol' under Sl. No. 47A of Notification No.4/2006-CE. Subsequently, they took the stand that the appellant is entitled for the benefit of Sl. No. 47A of Notification No. 4/2006-CE dated 1.3.2006, however, the appellant is required to reverse the credit/ pay the amount demanded as a percentage of sale value of the exempted goods 'Danazol', as per law during the relevant period, under Rule 6(3) of CENVAT Credit Rules, 2004. We find that there has been some confusion in the minds of the department and they have blown hot and cold on the same issue at different points of time. Now that we have held that the appellant is eligible for the exemption under Sl. No. 47A of Notification No. 4/2006-CE dated 1.3.2006, the goods are unconditionally exempt from payment of duty. We find that the appellant has also stated in the reply to the Commissioner (Appeals) as recorded at para 18 of the impugned order that they have already reversed the CENVAT credit involved on 'Danazol'. That being so, we find that the exemption has been correctly availed by them. We however permit the department to verify the mathematical accuracy of the claims of reversal made by the appellant and demand the excess credit taken or refund the excess reversal of credit made by the appellant if any. Needless to say that in case of a demand, the appellant may be given an opportunity to explain the reversal of credit made by them."

Judicial discipline requires that we follow the order of a Bench of co=equal strength decided on identical facts.

9. We accordingly set aside the impugned order and allow the appellant the benefit of Sl. No. 47A of Notification No. 4/2006-CE dated 1.3.2006 for the product 'Danazol'. Credit reversed by the appellant under Rule 6(3) of CENVAT Credit Rules, 2004 is subject to verification

by the department on the issues as mentioned above. The appellant is eligible for consequential relief, if any, as per law. Appeal is disposed of on the above terms.

(Order pronounced in open court on 06.06.2025)

(AJAYAN T.V.)
Member (Judicial)

(M. AJIT KUMAR)
Member (Technical)

Rex