

**IN THE CUSTOMS, EXCISE & SERVICE TAX APPELLATE  
TRIBUNAL, KOLKATA**

REGIONAL BENCH – COURT NO.2

**Customs Appeal No. 75123 of 2023**

(Arising out of Order-in-Original No.03/CUS/CC(P)/WB/2022-23 dated 30.11.2022 passed by the Commissioner of Customs (Prev.), W. B.)

**M/s. Steel Authority of India Limited**

(Finance and Accounts Department  
Burnpur Works, Burnpur, Burdwan-713325, West Bengal)

**Appellant**

*VERSUS*

**Commissioner of Customs (Preventive), Kolkata**

(Custom House, 15/1, Strand Road, Kolkata-700001)

**Respondent**

**APPEARANCE :**

MR. Deepro Sen & Ms. Payal Bharwani, both Advocate for the Appellant  
Mr. S. Debnath, Authorized Representative for the Respondent

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. R. MURALIDHAR, MEMBER (JUDICIAL)**

**HON'BLE MR. K. ANPAZHAKAN, MEMBER (TECHNICAL)**

**FINAL ORDER NO.77818/2025**

Date of Hearing : 24<sup>th</sup> November 2025

Date of Decision : 24<sup>th</sup> November 2025

**PER R. MURALIDHAR**

The brief facts of the case are that the appellant had filed the impugned Bills of Entry for clearance of import consignments declared as "PCC Lime 0/20MM (Quicklime)". For the goods imported vide the aforesaid Bills of Entry, the appellant had sought to classify the same under Chapter Sub-Heading 2522 1000. However, the Assessing Officer assessed the aforesaid goods by varying the classification to Chapter Sub-Heading 2825 9090.

2. The appellant challenged the assessment of the aforementioned Bills of Entry as done by the lower authority before the Ld. Commissioner of Customs (Appeals), 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Custom House, 15/1, Strand Road, Kolkata – 700 001, who vide the orders impugned herein, has rejected their appeals.

3. Being aggrieved, the appellant has filed the present appeals before the Tribunal.

4. The Ld. Counsel appearing on behalf of the appellant submits that the issue involved in these appeals is no longer *res integra* as an identical issue has already been examined and dealt with by this Tribunal in *Final Order No. 76709-76712 of 2025 dated 03.07.2025 in Customs Appeal No. 75369 of 2021 & ors. [CESTAT, Kolkata] (cit. 2025 (7) TMI 648 - CESTAT, Kolkata]* wherein the impugned goods have been held to be rightly classifiable under Customs Tariff Item No. 2522 1000. It is thus their prayer that the impugned orders be set aside.

5. On the other hand, the Ld. Authorized Representatives of the Revenue justified the assessment of the Bills of Entry by classifying the goods in question under Customs 2825 9090, as done by the authorities below. Accordingly, they prayed that the impugned orders be upheld by rejection of the instant appeals.

6. Heard both sides and perused the records placed before us.

7. Admittedly, the appellant is engaged in the process of manufacture of paper, for which it is *inter alia* using Precipitated Calcium Carbonate (PCC) in slurry form. The appellant imports Quicklime in lump form (described by the appellant as 'PCC lime' – lime for processing into PCC) and processes the same in its PCC plant to obtain PCC in slurry form, for use in the above manufacturing process as a filler. It is the case of the Revenue that the goods imported by the appellant merits classification under the Customs Tariff Item No. 2825 9090, which assessee seeks to classify the same under Customs Tariff Item No. 2522 1000.

7.1. In this regard, we find that the appellant has furnished a Table indicating the Calcium Oxide (CaO) content in respect of the impugned consignments, which shows that the Calcium Oxide (CaO) content for the goods under import in these cases is between as '87.20%' to '90.50%'. For ease of reference, the said Table submitted by the appellant is reproduced below:-

Sl. No.	Bill of Entry No. and date	RCL Test Report No.	Percentage of CaO
1	4979007 dated 29.01.2018	RCL/SL/3615 dated 12.02.2018	90.50%
2	5117200 dated 08.02.2018	RCL/SL/3671 dated 02.03.2018	89.50%
3	5736275 dated 26.03.2018	RCL/SL/3776 dated 06.04.2018	88.40%
4	5947481 dated 12.04.2018	RCL/SL/3948 dated 01.06.2018	88.80%
5	5947488 dated 12.04.2018	RCL/SL/3847 dated 02.05.2018	89.10%
6	6471623 dated 22.05.2018	RCL/SL/5048 dated 04.07.2018	88.80%
7	6576475 dated 29.05.2018	RCL/SL/5146 dated 01.08.2018	89.50%
8	6576987 dated 29.05.2018	RCL/SL/5078 dated 10.07.2018	89.40%
9	6663465 dated 04.06.2018	RCL/SL/5286 dated 06.11.2018	89.40%
10	6666511 dated 05.06.2018		
11	6669267 dated 05.06.2018	RCL/SL/5219 dated 01.09.2018	89.20%
12	8646379 dated 29.10.2018	RCL/SL/5374 dated 03.12.2018	88.60%
13	9029557 dated 28.11.2018	RCL/SL/5414 dated 12.12.2018	88.50%
14	9254247 dated 14.12.2018	RCL/SL/5472 dated 01.01.2019	88.80%
15	9590067 dated 10.01.2019	RCL/SL/5574 dated 01.02.2019	89.10%
16	2025574 dated 12.02.2019	RCL/SL/5672 dated 01.03.2019	89.30%
17	2414226 dated 14.03.2019	RCL/SMS/2019-20/0001 dated 01.04.2019	88.70%
18	2664329 dated 01.04.2019	RCL/SMS/2019-20/0051 dated 11.05.2019	88.90%
19	3696995 dated 18.06.2019	RCL/SMS/2019-20/0176 dated 01.07.2019	89.50%
20	4032756 dated 12.07.2019	RCL/SMS/2019-20/0264 dated 06.08.2019	89.40%
21	4413117 dated 08.08.2019	RCL/SMS/2019-20/0359 dated 03.09.2019	89.50%
22	4701630 dated 30.08.2019	RCL/SMS/2019-20/0485 dated 14.10.2019	89.30%
23	5064154 dated 26.09.2019	RCL/SMS/2019-20/0561 dated 08.11.2019	89.10%
24	5409308 dated 23.10.2019	RCL/SMS/2019-20/0627 dated 01.12.2019	88.50%

7.2. From the above, it transpires that the Calcium Oxide (CaO) content of the goods in question is less than 98%.

8. We find that an identical issue has already been examined by this Tribunal in the appellant's own case in *Final Order No. 76709-76712 of 2025 dated 03.07.2025 in Customs Appeal No. 75369 of 2021 & ors. [CESTAT, Kolkata] (cit. 2025 (7) TMI 648 – CESTAT, Kolkata)*, wherein by relying on the decision of the Tribunal at Bangalore in the case of *M/s. JWS Steel Ltd. v. Commissioner of Customs, Cochin [2025 (5) TMI 455 – CESTAT, Bangalore]*, this Tribunal has rejected the Revenue's classification of the goods in question i.e., 'Quicklime', under Customs Tariff Item No. 2825 9090 and held the same to be rightly classifiable

under Customs Tariff Item No. 2522 1000, as adopted by the assessee. The relevant observations of this Tribunal in the aforesaid decision read thus: -

*"5. We find that a similar issue has been examined by this Tribunal in the case of M/s. JSW Steel Ltd. v. Commissioner of Customs, Cochin [2025 (5) TMI 455 CESTAT, Bangalore] (Final Order No. 20529 of 2025 dated 28.04.2025 in Customs Appeal No. 21776 of 2016) wherein the Tribunal observed as under: -*

*"5. Heard both sides. The only issue to be decided is whether the product "Quick Lime" imported by the appellant falls under CTH 2522.10 or 2825.9090 of the Customs Tariff 1985. The classification by the Revenue is based on the Lab Test Results report which says that the sample is in the form of white lumps and powder, composed of mainly Calcium Oxide (Quick Lime) along with small amounts of compounds of Iron. Magnesium, Manganese, etc.; available CaO 92.2% and based on the fact that the Chapter 25 includes mineral products in the crude state or washed, crushed, ground, powdered, or concentrated by floatation, magnetic separation or other mechanical or physical process and heat treatments like roasting, fusion or calcination are not allowed.*

*6. Let's examine the relevant Chapter Headings and the reasoning given by the Commissioner (Appeals) in the impugned order. The period of dispute is from September 2015 to November 2015. During this period the relevant tariff headings were as follows:*

#### **SECTION V-MINERAL PRODUCTS**

*Chapter 25: Salt; sulphur; earths and stone, plastering materials, lime and cement*

*Notes:*

*1. Except where their context or Note 4 to this Chapter otherwise requires, the headings of this Chapter cover only products which are in the crude state or which have been washed (even with chemical substances eliminating the impurities without changing the structure of the product), crushed, ground, powdered, levigated, sifted, screened, concentrated by flotation, magnetic separation or other mechanical or physical processes (except crystallization), but not products that have been roasted, calcined, obtained by mixing or subjected to processing beyond that mentioned in each heading.*

*2522 Quicklime, Slaked Lime and Hydraulic Lime, other than Calcium Oxide and Hydroxide of Heading 2825*

2522 10 00 - Quicklime

2522 20 00-Slaked lime

2522 30 00-Hydraulic lime

*The Commissioner (Appeals) rejected the classification of the product under CTH 2522 on the ground that it is calcined product which is excluded as per Note 1 reproduced above and classified the same under CTH 2825 as separately defined compound.*

*7. Now, let's see Chapter Heading 28, which is reproduced below:*

*Chapter 28: Inorganic chemicals, organic or inorganic compounds of precious metals, of rare-earth metals, of radioactive elements or of isotopes.*

*Notes:*

*1. Except where the context otherwise requires, the headings of this Chapter apply only to:*

*a) separate chemical elements and separate chemically defined compounds, whether of not containing impurities:*

*2825 90-Other.*

*2825 90 10-- Tin oxide*

*2825 90 20 Cadmium oxide*

*2825 90 40 Calcium hydroxide*

*2825 90 50-Ammonium hydroxide*

*2825 90 90- Other*

*8. As per the HSN Notes, Chapter 2522 which includes "Quick Lime" is explained as.*

*Quicklime (an impure calcium oxide) is obtained by calcining limestone containing very little or no clay. It combines very rapidly with water, giving off considerable heat and producing slaked lime (calcium hydroxide) is usually employed for soil improvement or in the sugar industry.*

*Hydraulic lime is obtained by low temperature calcinations of limestone containing sufficient clay (although usually less than 20%) to ensure that the product sets under water. Hydraulic lime differs from natural cement in that it still contains appreciable amounts of un combined quicklime, which may be slaked with water."*

*This heading excludes purified calcium oxide and calcium hydroxide heading 2825.*

*Similarly, the HSN notes at Chapter heading 2825 explains as follows:*

*(11) Calcium oxide, hydroxide and peroxide. This heading covers only the Oxide (CaO) and the hydroxide (Ca (OH)<sub>2</sub>), in the pure state (i.e., containing practically no clay, iron oxide, manganese oxide, etc.), such as the product obtained by calcining precipitated calcium carbonate.*

*The heading also covers fused lime obtained by fusing ordinary quicklime in an electric furnace. This product has a high degree of purity (approximately 98% calcium oxide); it is crystalline and generally colourless. It is used, in particular, for refractory linings for furnaces, in the manufacture of crucibles and for addition to concrete, in small pieces, to increase its resistance to wear. Calcium peroxide (CaO<sub>2</sub>) is a white or yellowish powder, hydrated (usually with 8 H<sub>2</sub>O), sparingly soluble in water. Used as a bactericide and as a detergent, in medicine and in the preparation of cosmetics.*

*Quicklime (calcium oxide) and slaked lime (calcium hydroxide) are excluded (heading 2522)*

*9. Based on the above Tariff Headings and the Explanation given in the HSN Notes, it is very clear that "Quick Lime" is classifiable under CTH 2522 unless the chemical analysis proves that it has purity of 98% calcium oxide. Admittedly, in the present case, the purity is only 92%. Moreover, there is a specific classification of the product "Quick Lime" under CTH 2522 1000 while the classification prompted by Revenue is 2825 9090 is only a 'Residuary Entry', and taking into consideration the Interpretative Rules of Classification, specific heading is to be preferred to the residuary entry unless it is established that the product is pure calcium oxide. The decision in the case of CCE, Hyderabad-III vs. Bhadradi Minerals Pvt Limited (supra) relied upon by the appellant has been brushed aside only on the ground that the product there was 80%, on the same analogy that the calcium oxide with purity less than 98% does not merit classification under CTH 2825.*

*10. This Tribunal in the case of M/s. Viraj Profiles Limited vs. Commissioner of Customs (Preventive), Mumbai: 2023 (10) TMI 1260 CESTAT Mumbai dated 20.10.2023 in an identical set of facts observed as:*

*14.2 From the test reports of samples of imported goods, which are relied upon documents in the adjudication proceedings, we find that the chemical test conducted by the Central Revenue Control Laboratory (CRCL), Jawaharlal Nehru Custom House, on*

the samples of imported goods and its report dated 18.04.2018 indicate that the description of the goods as 'white lumps of irregular shapes & sizes along with waste powder. It is mainly composed of calcium oxide (quick lime) along with traces of Iron & Silicious matter'. On the percentage of chemical composition, the report stated that available lime 93.8%. Further, one another such chemical testing of imported goods by CRCL in report dated 16.05.2018, indicate that the imported goods contain '92.27% of calcium oxide and 0.96% of magnesium oxide'. Further, the HSN explanatory notes in the second para of B(11) also specify that calcium oxide of high degree of purity i.e., app. 98% or more would alone gets covered under the scope of sub-heading 2825. As seen from the test reports, the content of calcium oxide or lime is much less than the requisite 98%. Thus, we are of the considered view that in terms of the HSN explanatory notes, both on account of presence of specified material making it not in pure state and the composition of calcium oxide not upto the requisite 98% making it not a product of high degree, would not enable the imported goods to be classified under sub-heading 2825.

18. We also find that on similar issue of classification of quick lime the Co-ordinate Bench of the Tribunal in the case *Jindal Stainless (Hisar) Ltd. (supra)* had decided the appropriate classification of quick lime under chapter 25. The relevant paragraphs in the said order is extracted below:

"4. We have gone through rival submissions. It is seen that the goods imported by the appellant have purity in the range 95-97% as stated in the SCN. Certificated produced by the appellant shows the range to be slightly below that.

4.1 The heading 2522 reads as following:

"25.22- Quicklime, slaked lime and hydraulic lime, other than calcium oxide and hydroxide of heading 28.25."

2522.10-Quicklime"

It is seen that it specifically covers Quicklime under sub heading 25 22.10. Chapter note 1 of chapter 25 prescribes as follows:

"Quicklime (an impure calcium oxide) is obtained by calcining limestone containing very little or no clay. It combines very rapidly with water, giving off considerable heat and producing slaked lime (Calcium hydroxide) The heading excludes purified calcium oxide and calcium hydroxide (heading 28.25)."

The HSN also prescribes as follows:

"1. Except where their context..... otherwise requires..... but not products that have been roasted, calcined, obtained by mixing or subjected to processing beyond that mentioned in each heading."

4.2 It is seen that Revenue has relied on the decision of the Tribunal in the case of Nuchem Industries Pvt. Ltd. (supra) which was upheld by Hon'ble Apex Court. It is seen that the said decision has been given in the context of Central Excise duties At the material time. Central Excise Tariff was not aligned to HSN. Learned Counsel for the appellant pointed out that the Central excise Tariff was align with HSN only with effect from 20.03.1990. He pointed out that this distinction has been specifically examined by Tribunal in the case of Bhadradi Minerals Pvt. Ltd. (supra) in para 5.1 and 5.2. In view of above, it is apparent that the said decision would render in different circumstances and, therefore, cannot be relied as binding precedent.

4.3 It is seen that the decision of Tribunal in the case of Bhadradi Minerals Pvt. Ltd. (supra) has been rendered in practically identical circumstances. The said decision relies on the HSN explanatory notes 11 under chapter heading 2825. The said chapter note provides as follows:

"5.3 HSN Explanatory Note under Tariff Heading 28.25 also excludes Calcium Oxide which has a purity less than 98% from Chapter 28 in view of the fact that what is covered under 28.25 is Calcium Oxide of purity 98%. The relevant Chapter Note is reproduced below:

"(11) Calcium Oxide, Hydroxide and Peroxide: This Heading covers only the oxide (CaO) and the hydroxide (CaOH), in the pure state (ie, containing practically no clay, iron oxide, manganese oxide, etc.) such as the product obtained by calcining precipitated calcium carbonate:

The Heading also covers fused lime obtained by fusing ordinary quicklime in an electric furnace. This product has a high degree of purity (approximately) 98% calcium oxide: it is crystalline and generally colourless. It is used, in particular, for refractory linings for furnaces, in the manufacture of crucibles and for addition to concrete, in small pieces, to increase in resistance to water.

Calcium peroxide (CaO) is a white or yellowish powder, hydrated (usually with 8 H<sub>2</sub>O) sparingly soluble in water. Used as a bactericide and as a detergent, in medicine and in the preparation of cosmetics.

Quicklime (calcium oxide) and slaked lime (calcium Hydroxide) are excluded (heading 25.22)"

In the instant case, it is not in dispute that what is imported has purity less than 98%. Therefore, the decision squarely applies to the facts of the case.

4.4 Revenue has relied on the Advance Ruling Authority given in the case of M/s Lhoist India Pvt. Ltd. (*supra*) wherein burnt lime having 94-96% CaO was held to be classifiable under chapter heading 2825. The facts in the said case were significantly different. The said decision has been passed without taking note of chapter note 11 to chapter 28. Moreover, in the said decision, Hon'ble Justice PV Reddy chairman of the authority has observed as follows:

"22. This is perhaps a rare case in which the applicant has come forward to pay duty for its product under Tariff Item 2825 90 90 instead of claiming duty relief available for quick lime. Apparently, the applicant being convinced of the correct classification, would like to avert the risk of availing the benefit the strength of decisions rendered in a different context and then facing a backlash at a later stage."

From the above it is apparent that the facts and circumstances were significantly different.

5. As a result of above observations, we find that the ratio of decisions of Tribunal in the case of M/s Bhadradi Minerals Pvt. Ltd. is applicable to the facts of the instant case. Therefore, the product is rightly classified under chapter 25. The appeal is consequently allowed."

19. In view of the foregoing detailed discussions, analysis and findings recorded in the above paragraphs, we conclude that the imported goods 'quicklime' would be appropriately classifiable under Customs Tariff Item 2522 10 00 and not as 'other' under the Customs Tariff Item 2825 90 90, as claimed by Revenue".

11. In the present case as discussed above, the chemical analysis clearly states that the purity is only 92% and accordingly, the product "Quick Lime" is rightly classifiable under CTH 2522 1000. Accordingly, the impugned order is set aside and appeal is allowed with consequential relief, if any, as per law.

6. Admittedly, in the Bills of Entry filed, the purity of Calcium Oxide is less than 98% and therefore, the product in question i.e., Quicklime, is rightly classifiable under Customs Tariff Item No.25221000, following the decision in the case of M/s. JSW Steel Ltd. (*supra*).

7. In view of this, we do not find any merit in the impugned orders and accordingly, the same are set aside.

8. In the result, the appeals are allowed, with consequential relief, if any."

8.1. From the decision cited supra, we find that the Bench has observed that HSN Explanatory Note under Tariff Heading 28.25 excludes Calcium Oxide which has a purity less than 98% from Chapter 28, in view of the fact that what is covered under 28.25 is Calcium Oxide of purity 98% and thus, Calcium Oxide having purity of 98% or more would alone get covered under the scope of sub-heading 28.25. As seen from the test reports, the content of Calcium Oxide or lime in respect of the impugned goods is less than the requisite 98%. Therefore, classification of the impugned goods by the Revenue under the Chapter Sub-Heading 2825 9090 is not sustainable, as the purity is less than 98% in all these cases.

8.2. Considering the fact that the factual matrix of the above cited case is identical to that of the cases on hand and the Revenue having failed to bring any evidence to the contrary on record, we do not see any reason to deviate from the above view already expressed by the Tribunal in the decision cited supra. Accordingly, by following the ratio of the aforesaid decision, we hold that the goods in question are rightly classifiable under Customs Tariff Item No. 2522 1000, as claimed by the appellant-assessee and we reject the reclassification of the impugned goods under the Chapter Sub-Heading 2825 9090, by the Revenue.

9. In view of the above, we do not find any merit in the impugned orders and consequently, the same are set aside.

10. In the result, the appeals are allowed. The appellant shall be entitled to consequential reliefs, if any, as per law.

(Operative part of the order was pronounced in the open court.)

**Sd/-**  
**(R. Muralidhar)**  
**Member (Judicial)**

**Sd/-**  
**(K. Anpazhakan)**  
**Member (Technical)**

