

**IN THE CUSTOMS, EXCISE AND SERVICE TAX  
APPELLATE TRIBUNAL  
WEST ZONAL BENCH AT MUMBAI**

**APPEAL NOS: E/89162 to 89164/2013**

[Arising out of Order-in- Original Appeal No: AV(212-216)184,185,186,187,188/2013 dated 24<sup>th</sup> July 2013 passed by the Commissioner of Central Excise & Customs (Appeals), Aurangabad.]

Gopal Satyanarayan Mundada  
Rajesh Radheshyam Lodha  
Satish Rathi

*...Appellants*

*versus*

Commissioner of Central Excise & Customs  
Aurangabad

*...Respondent*

Appearance:

Shri GR Gadekar, Advocate for appellant

Shri AB Kulgod, Assistant Commissioner (AR) for respondent

**CORAM:**

**Hon'ble Shri C J Mathew, Member (Technical)**

|                          |                   |
|--------------------------|-------------------|
| <b>Date of hearing:</b>  | <b>28/07/2017</b> |
| <b>Date of decision:</b> | <b>28/07/2017</b> |

**ORDER NO: A/ 92323-92325 / 2017**

The issue in these appeals against the orders-in-appeal no. AV(212-216)184,185,186,187,188/2013 dated 24<sup>th</sup> July 2013 is the rejection by the Commissioner of Central Excise (Appeals), Aurangabad on the ground that the condition of pre-deposit had not been complied with.

2. It is seen that both Shri Gopal Satyanarayan Mundada and Rajesh Radheshyam Lodha have since complied with the requirement of pre-deposit. On enquiry, it is seen that Shri Satish Rathi had, by challan dated 7<sup>th</sup> August 2014, also complied with the directions of pre-deposit as prescribed by the Tribunal. Consequently the appeals against the impugned orders are admitted for disposal.

3. Heard the Learned Counsel appearing for appellants and Learned Authorised Representative .

4. The first appellate authority has not had an opportunity to dispose the appeals on merit. The condition of pre-deposit now complied with for achievement of appeals before the Tribunal suffices to erase the non-compliance at the time of filing the appeal before the first appellate authority.

5. Accordingly, the matters are remanded to the original authority for decision on merit after granting opportunity to the appellants to be heard in their defence.

*(Pronounced in Court)*

**(C J Mathew)**  
**Member (Technical)**