



सीमा शुल्क(अपील) आयुक्त का कायालिय, अहमदाबाद

OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER OF CUSTOMS (APPEALS), AHMEDABAD,  
चौथी मंज़िल 4th Floor, हडको भवन HUDCO Bhawan, ईश्वर भुवन रोड Ishwar Bhuvan Road  
नवरंगपुरा Navrangpura, अहमदाबाद Ahmedabad – 380 009  
दूरभाष क्रमांक Tel. No. 079-26589281

DIN – 20250971MN000000F2E6


क	फ़ाइल संख्या FILE NO.	S/49-144/CUS/AHD/24-25
ख	अपील आदेश संख्या ORDER-IN-APPEAL NO. (सीमा शुल्क अधिनियम, 1962 की धारा 128क के अंतर्गत)(UNDER SECTION 128A OF THE CUSTOMS ACT, 1962) :	AHD-CUSTM-000-APP-270-25-26
ग	पारितकर्ता PASSED BY	Shri Amit Gupta Commissioner of Customs (Appeals), Ahmedabad
घ	दिनांक DATE	26.09.2025
ड	उद्भूत अपील आदेश की सं. व दिनांक ARISING OUT OF ORDER-IN-ORIGINAL NO.	OIO No.: SRT/CUS/ICD-SACHIN/DC/09/2021- 22 dt. 22.07.2021 passed by the Deputy Commissioner of Customs, ICD-Sachin, Surat
च	अपील आदेश जारी करने की दिनांक ORDER- IN-APPEAL ISSUED ON:	26.09.2025
छ	अपीलकर्ता का नाम व पता NAME AND ADDRESS OF THE APPELLANT:	M/s. Adarsh Textiles, F-7, Narayan Nagar Industrial Estate, Parvat Gam, Surat – 395 006



1	यह प्रति उस व्यक्ति के निजी उपयोग के लिए मुफ्त में दी जाती है जिनके नाम यह जारी किया गया है।
	This copy is granted free of cost for the private use of the person to whom it is issued.
2.	सीमाशुल्क अधिनियम 1962 की धारा 129 डी डी (1) (यथा संशोधित) के अधीन निम्नलिखित श्रेणियों के मामलों के सम्बन्ध में कोई व्यक्ति इस आदेश से अपने को आहत महसूस करता हो तो इस आदेश की प्राप्ति की तारीख से 3 महीने के अंदर अपर सचिव/संयुक्त सचिव (आवेदन संशोधन), वित्त मंत्रालय, (राजस्व विभाग) संसद मार्ग, नई दिल्ली को पुनरीक्षण आवेदन प्रस्तुत कर सकते हैं।
	Under Section 129 DD(1) of the Customs Act, 1962 (as amended), in respect of the following categories of cases, any person aggrieved by this order can prefer a Revision Application to The Additional Secretary/Joint Secretary (Revision Application), Ministry of Finance, (Department of Revenue) Parliament Street, New Delhi within 3 months from the date of communication of the order.
	निम्नलिखित सम्बन्धित आदेश/Order relating to :
(क)	बैगेज के रूप में आयातित कोई माल।
(a)	any goods imported on baggage
(ख)	भारत में आयात करने हेतु किसी वाहन में लादा गया लेकिन भारत में उनके गन्तव्य स्थान पर उतारे न गए माल या उस गन्तव्य स्थान पर उतारे जाने के लिए अपेक्षित माल उतारे न जाने पर या उस गन्तव्य स्थान पर उतारे गए माल की मात्रा में अपेक्षित माल से कमी हो।
(b)	any goods loaded in a conveyance for importation into India, but which are not unloaded at their place of destination in India or so much of the quantity of such goods as has not been unloaded at any such destination if goods unloaded at such destination are short of the quantity required to be unloaded at that destination.
(ग)	सीमाशुल्क अधिनियम, 1962 के अध्याय X तथा उसके अधीन बनाए गए नियमों के तहत शुल्क वापसी की अदायगी।
(c)	Payment of drawback as provided in Chapter X of Customs Act, 1962 and the rules made thereunder.
.3	पुनरीक्षण आवेदन पत्र संगत नियमावली में विनिर्दिष्ट प्रारूप में प्रस्तुत करना होगा जिसके अन्तर्गत उसकी जांच की जाएगी और उस के साथ निम्नलिखित कागजात संलग्न होने चाहिए :
	The revision application should be in such form and shall be verified in such manner as may be specified in the relevant rules and should be accompanied by :
(क)	कोर्ट फी एक्ट, 1870 के मद सं. 6 अनुसूची 1 के अधीन निर्धारित किए गए अनुसार इस आदेश की 4 प्रतियां, जिसकी एक प्रति में पचास पैसे की न्यायालय शुल्क टिकट लगा होना चाहिए।
(a)	4 copies of this order, bearing Court Fee Stamp of paise fifty only in one copy as prescribed under Schedule 1 item 6 of the Court Fee Act, 1870.
(ख)	सम्बद्ध दस्तावेजों के अलावा साथ मूल आदेश की 4 प्रतियां, यदि हो
(b)	4 copies of the Order-in-Original, in addition to relevant documents, if any
(ग)	पुनरीक्षण के लिए आवेदन की 4 प्रतियां
(c)	4 copies of the Application for Revision.
(घ)	पुनरीक्षण आवेदन दायर करने के लिए सीमाशुल्क अधिनियम, 1962 (यथा संशोधित) में निर्धारित फीस जो अन्य रसीद, फीस, दण्ड, जब्ती और विविध मदों के शीर्ष के अधीन आता है में रु. 200/- (रूपए दो सौ मात्र) या रु.1000/- (रूपए एक हजार मात्र), जैसा भी मामला हो, से सम्बन्धित मुगतान के प्रमाणिक चलान टी.आर.6 की दो प्रतियां। यदि शुल्क, मांगा गया व्याज, लगाया गया दंड की राशि और रूपए एक लाख या उससे कम हो तो ऐसे फीस के रूप में रु.200/- और यदि एक लाख से अधिक हो तो फीस के रूप में रु.1000/-।
(d)	The duplicate copy of the T.R.6 challan evidencing payment of Rs.200/- (Rupees two Hundred only) or Rs.1,000/- (Rupees one thousand only) as the case may be, under the Head of other receipts, fees, fines, forfeitures and Miscellaneous Items being the



	fee prescribed in the Customs Act, 1962 (as amended) for filing a Revision Application. If the amount of duty and interest demanded, fine or penalty levied is one lakh rupees or less, fees as Rs.200/- and if it is more than one lakh rupees, the fee is Rs.1000/-.				
4.	मद सं. 2 के अधीन सूचित मामलों के अलावा अन्य मामलों के सम्बन्ध में यदि कोई व्यक्ति इस आदेश से आहत महसूस करता हो तो वे सीमाशुल्क अधिनियम 1962 की धारा 129 ए (1) के अधीन फॉर्म सी.ए.-3 में सीमाशुल्क, केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क और सेवा कर अपील अधिकरण के समक्ष निम्नलिखित पते पर अपील कर सकते हैं				
	In respect of cases other than these mentioned under item 2 above, any person aggrieved by this order can file an appeal under Section 129 A(1) of the Customs Act, 1962 in form C.A.-3 before the Customs, Excise and Service Tax Appellate Tribunal at the following address :				
	<table border="0"> <tr> <td style="vertical-align: top;">सीमाशुल्क, केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क व सेवा कर अपीलिय अधिकरण, पश्चिमी क्षेत्रीय पीठ</td> <td><b>Customs, Excise &amp; Service Tax Appellate Tribunal, West Zonal Bench</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>दूसरी मंजिल, बहुमाली भवन, निकट गिरधरनगर पुल, असारवा, अहमदाबाद-380016</td> <td>2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, Bahumali Bhavan, Nr.Girdhar Nagar Bridge, Asarwa, Ahmedabad-380 016</td> </tr> </table>	सीमाशुल्क, केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क व सेवा कर अपीलिय अधिकरण, पश्चिमी क्षेत्रीय पीठ	<b>Customs, Excise &amp; Service Tax Appellate Tribunal, West Zonal Bench</b>	दूसरी मंजिल, बहुमाली भवन, निकट गिरधरनगर पुल, असारवा, अहमदाबाद-380016	2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor, Bahumali Bhavan, Nr.Girdhar Nagar Bridge, Asarwa, Ahmedabad-380 016
सीमाशुल्क, केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क व सेवा कर अपीलिय अधिकरण, पश्चिमी क्षेत्रीय पीठ	<b>Customs, Excise &amp; Service Tax Appellate Tribunal, West Zonal Bench</b>				
दूसरी मंजिल, बहुमाली भवन, निकट गिरधरनगर पुल, असारवा, अहमदाबाद-380016	2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor, Bahumali Bhavan, Nr.Girdhar Nagar Bridge, Asarwa, Ahmedabad-380 016				
5.	<p>सीमाशुल्क अधिनियम, 1962 की धारा 129 ए (6) के अधीन, सीमाशुल्क अधिनियम, 1962 की धारा 129 ए (1) के अधीन अपील के साथ निम्नलिखित शुल्क संलग्न होने चाहिए-</p> <p>Under Section 129 A (6) of the Customs Act, 1962 an appeal under Section 129 A (1) of the Customs Act, 1962 shall be accompanied by a fee of -</p> <p>(क) अपील से सम्बन्धित मामले में जहां किसी सीमाशुल्क अधिकारी द्वारा मांगा गया शुल्क और व्याज तथा लगाया गया दंड की रकम पाँच लाख रूपए या उससे कम हो तो एक हजार रुपए.</p> <p>(a) where the amount of duty and interest demanded and penalty levied by any officer of Customs in the case to which the appeal relates is five lakh rupees or less, one thousand rupees;</p> <p>(ख) (ख) अपील से सम्बन्धित मामले में जहां किसी सीमाशुल्क अधिकारी द्वारा मांगा गया शुल्क और व्याज तथा लगाया गया दंड की रकम पाँच लाख रूपए से अधिक हो लेकिन रूपये पचास लाख से अधिक न हो तो; पाँच हजार रुपए</p> <p>(b) where the amount of duty and interest demanded and penalty levied by any officer of Customs in the case to which the appeal relates is more than five lakh rupees but not exceeding fifty lakh rupees, five thousand rupees ;</p> <p>(ग) अपील से सम्बन्धित मामले में जहां किसी सीमाशुल्क अधिकारी द्वारा मांगा गया शुल्क और व्याज तथा लगाया गया दंड की रकम पचास लाख रूपए से अधिक हो तो; दस हजार रुपए.</p> <p>(c) where the amount of duty and interest demanded and penalty levied by any officer of Customs in the case to which the appeal relates is more than fifty lakh rupees, ten thousand rupees</p> <p>(घ) इस आदेश के विरुद्ध अधिकरण के सामने, मांगे गए शुल्क के 10% अदा करने पर, जहां शुल्क या शुल्क ग्रंथ दंड विवाद में हैं, या दंड के 10% अदा करने पर, जहां केवल दंड विवाद में हैं, अपील रखा जाएगा ।</p> <p>(d) An appeal against this order shall lie before the Tribunal on payment of 10% of the duty demanded where duty or duty and penalty are in dispute, or penalty, where penalty alone is in dispute.</p>				
6.	<p>उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 129 (ए) के अन्तर्गत अपील प्राधिकरण के समक्ष दायर प्रत्येक आवेदन पत्र- (क) रोक आदेश के लिए या गलतियों को सुधारने के लिए या किसी अन्य प्रयोजन के लिए किए गए अपील : - अथवा (ख) अपील या आवेदन पत्र का प्रत्यावर्तन के लिए दायर आवेदन के साथ रूपये पाँच सौ का शुल्क भी संलग्न होने चाहिए.</p> <p>Under section 129 (a) of the said Act, every application made before the Appellate Tribunal-</p> <p>(a) in an appeal for grant of stay or for rectification of mistake or for any other purpose; or</p> <p>(b) for restoration of an appeal or an application shall be accompanied by a fee of five Hundred rupees.</p>				



Order-In-Appeal

M/s. Adarsh Textiles, F-7, Narayan Nagar Industrial Estate, Parvat Gam, Surat – 395 006 (hereinafter referred to as “the Appellant”) have filed the present appeal against the Order-In-Original No. : OIO No.: SRT/CUS/ICD-SACHIN/DC/09/2021-22 dt. 22.07.2021 ( herein after referred to as “the impugned order” ) passed by the Deputy Commissioner of Customs, ICD-Sachin, Surat ( herein after referred to as “the “adjudicating authority”).

2. Facts of the case, in brief, are that the Appellant had imported Capital Goods machinery, i.e., 04 sets of Computerised Embroidery Machine under EPCG Licence No.: 5230007460, dated 01.09.2010 by saving Customs Duty amount of Rs. 6,29,995/- (Actual Duty Utilization of Rs. 3,10,085/-) under the cover of the below mentioned Bill of Entry at a concessional rate of duty @ 3% by availing the benefit of exemption available under Notification No. 103/2009 - Cus., dated 11.09.2009. The details of import are as per Table – I below:

TABLE - I

Sr. No.	Bill of Entry No. & Date	Number of machinery cleared	Duty saved / available as per EPCG Licence (In Rs.)	Total Duty Foregone / Debited at the time of clearance (In Rs.)	Bank Guarantee Amount (In Rs.)
1.	645/10-11 dated 23.09.2010	03	6,29,995/-	2,34,612/-	Rs.50,000/-/-
2	774/10-11 dated 23.10.2010	01	3,95,383/-	74,473/-	
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>04</b>		<b>3,10,085/-</b>	

2.1 Against the said EPCG Licence No.: 5230007460, dated 01.09.2010, the Appellant had executed a Bond dated 23.09.2010 before the Deputy/Assistant Commissioner of Customs, ICD – Sachin, Surat for an amount of Rs. 16,00,000/- backed by a Bank Guarantee No.: 10726 BG00005, dated 13.09.2010 for Rs. 50,000/- issued by the Karnataka Bank, Ring Road, Surat. They had undertaken to fulfill the export obligation as specified in the Notification and the licence.

2.2 The said machinery, i.e., 04 sets of Computerised Embroidery Machine imported under the aforesaid EPCG Licence were installed at their premises, as per the Installation Certificate dated 25.11.2010 issued by the Chartered Engineer, Dr. P J Gandhi, Surat certifying the receipt of the goods imported and its installation.

2.3 As per the conditions of Notification No. 103/2009 - Cus., dated 11.09.2009, the Appellant was required to fulfill the export obligation on FOB basis equivalent to Eight times the duty saved on the goods imported as specified on the Licence and

/



Authorization, within a period of Eight years from the date of issuance of EPCG Licence In the instant case, the EPCG Licence was issued to the Appellant on 01.09.2010 and accordingly, they were required to fulfill export obligation by 31.08.2018, i.e., within a period of Eight years from the date of issuance of Licence or Authorization and submit the Export Obligation Discharge Certificate (EODC) issued by the Regional DGFT Authority before the jurisdictional Customs authorities.

2.4 On completion of First Block of 1-6 years, a letter dated 27.12.2017 was issued to the Appellant requesting them to submit evidences regarding export to the extent of 50% of the total export obligation. However, the said letter was returned undelivered by the Postal Authority. Subsequently, letters dated 07.02.2020, 21.02.2020 and 28.07.2020 were issued to the Appellant requesting them to furnish the copy of EODC or any extension issued by the Regional Authority, DGFT, Surat for fulfillment of export obligation. However, the Appellant had not responded to any of the above correspondences.

2.5 Since, no response was received from the Appellant, letters dated 29.01.2020 and 20.07.2020 were written to the Foreign Trade Development Officer, DGFT, Surat requesting to inform the present status of the said Licence and whether the appellant had approached their office for granting further extension for fulfillment of export obligation and whether the appellant submitted the export documents for EODC against the aforesaid EPCG Licence No.: 5230007460, dated 01.09.2010. In response, the Joint Director, Directorate General of Foreign Trade, Surat vide their mail dated 31.07.2020 and 21.08.2020, submitted that the appellant had not submitted export documents and the appellant were issued "Refusal Orders" & put under defaulters List.

2.6 In view of the above, it appeared that the Appellant had failed to fulfill the export obligation as specified in the Licence and did not comply with the mandatory condition of the Notification No. 103/2009 - Cus., dated 11.09.2009, the condition of EPCG Licence and also the conditions of the Bond executed and furnished by them. The Appellant neither produced the EODC issued by the DGFT, Surat nor could produce any documents showing extension granted by them for fulfillment of export obligation. Therefore, the Appellant was liable to pay Customs Duty not paid (i.e. saved) by them amounting to Rs. 3,10,085/- at the time of import / clearance along with interest at the applicable rate, in terms of conditions of the said Notification read with condition of the Bond executed by them read with Section 143 of the Customs Act, 1962. Further, the Bank Guarantee No.: 10726 BG00005, dated 13.09.2010 for Rs. 50,000/- issued by the Karnataka Bank, Ring Road, Surat furnished by them against the aforesaid EPCG Licence EPCG Licence No.: 5230007460, dated 01.09.2010 appeared liable to be encashed and deposited in the Government Exchequer.



2.7 Accordingly, a Show Cause Notice under F.No.: ICD/Sachin/871/10-11 dtd. 24.08.2020 was issued to the Appellant, proposing as to why:

- i. The benefit of concessional rate of duty @ 3% for EPCG Scheme under Notification No. 103/2009-Cus., dated 11.09.2009 on the imported 04 sets of Computerised Embroidery Machine in their name, should not be denied;
- ii. Customs Duty amounting to Rs. 3,10,085/- being the duty foregone at the time of import under EPCG Licence should not be demanded and recovered from them along with interest in terms of Notification No. 103/2009-Cus., dated 11.09.2009 as amended, read with the conditions of Bond executed and furnished by them in terms of Section 143 of the Customs Act, 1962 by enforcing the terms of the said Bond. Further, why the Bank Guarantee No.: 10726 BG00005, dated 13.09.2010 for Rs. 50,000/- backed against the Bond, should not be appropriated and adjusted towards the duty liability as mentioned above;
- iii. The imported Capital goods should not be held liable for confiscation under Section 111 (o) of the Customs Act, 1962 read with the conditions of Bond executed in terms of Section 143 of the Customs Act, 1962 read with Customs Notification No. 103/2009-Cus., dated 11.09.2009 as amended from time to time;
- iv. Penalty should not be imposed under Section 112 (a) and Section 117 of the Customs Act, 1962;

2.8 The Adjudicating Authority, vide the impugned order, has passed order as detailed below:

- i. He disallowed the benefit of concessional rate of duty @ 3% for EPCG Scheme under Notification No. 103/2009-Cus., dated 11.09.2009 on the subject machinery imported in the name of the Appellant;
- ii. He confirmed the demand of Customs Duty amounting to Rs. 3,10,085/- being the duty foregone at the time of import of Capital Goods under EPCG Licence in terms of Notification No. 103/2009-Cus., dated 11.09.2009 as amended, read with the conditions of Bond executed along with interest and ordered the same to be recovered in terms of Section 143 of the Customs Act, 1962 by enforcing the terms of the above mentioned Bond;
- iii. He confiscated the subject imported Capital goods under Section 111 (o) of the Customs Act, 1962 read with the conditions of Bond executed in terms of Section 143 of the Customs Act, 1962 read with Customs Notification No. 103/2009 - Cus., dated 11.09.2009. However, he gave an option to redeem the said goods on payment of redemption fine of Rs. 62,000/- under Section 125 of the Customs Act, 1962;
- iv. He ordered to appropriate the amount of Rs. 50,000/- by encashment of the Bank Guarantee No.: 10726 BG00005, dated 13.09.2010 for Rs. 50,000/- issued by the




Karnataka Bank, Surat submitted by the Appellant, towards the confirmed duty liability;

- v. He imposed penalty of Rs. 3,10,085/- upon the Appellant under Section 112 (a) of the Customs Act, 1962;
- vi. He imposed penalty of Rs. 31,000/- upon the Appellant under Section 117 of the Customs Act, 1962;

3. Being aggrieved with the impugned order passed by the adjudicating authority, the Appellant have filed the present appeal. The Appellant have, inter-alia, raised various contentions and filed detailed submissions in their Appeal memorandum dt. 02.08.2024 and further submission dt. 09.09.2025, as given below in support of their claims:

- The appellant was denied the benefit of concessional duty @3% under the EPCG Scheme without being afforded a reasonable opportunity of hearing. The impugned order was passed in contravention of the principles of natural justice and is therefore arbitrary and unsustainable in law. The Ld. DC ought to have provided an opportunity to the appellant to explain the nonfulfillment of the export obligation before denying the benefit and proceeding with the imposition of duty, penalty, and fine.
- The appellant could not fulfill the stipulated export obligation due to severe financial hardship, low market demand, and recessionary conditions. The factory premises were sealed, and operations were completely halted for reasons beyond the appellant's control. These were not intentional defaults but unavoidable failures stemming from external adverse conditions.
- The appellant never received any show cause notice or intimation regarding the proceedings. The Ld. DC has failed to ensure proper service of notice and has proceeded ex-parte, without making any effort to contact or ascertain the status of the appellant, despite the fact that the factory was sealed. This constitutes a gross violation of the principles of natural justice.
- The impugned order and/or SCN does not invoke Section 28 of the Customs Act, 1962. Further, the SCN appears to be issued beyond the prescribed period from the relevant date, thereby being barred by limitation. In the absence of a specific invocation of Section 28 and without meeting the requirement of limitation, the demand is not legally tenable.
- The Ld. DC has failed to appreciate that there was no malafide intention or mens-reas on the part of the appellant. The appellant had no intention to evade duty and would have complied with the export obligation had there been timely and proper communication from the authorities.
- The imposition of penalty under Section 112(a) and redemption fine is wholly



unwarranted under the facts and circumstances of the case. In absence of any fraudulent conduct or misrepresentation, such penal consequences cannot be sustained. The appellant reiterates that had proper communication been made, compliance would have been ensured.

- The appellant places reliance on the decision of the Hon'ble CESTAT, Kolkata in Commissioner of Customs (Port), Kolkata vs. M/s. B.R. Marbles Pvt. Ltd. wherein the Tribunal has clearly held that nonfulfillment of export obligation due to circumstances beyond control does not warrant imposition of penalty, fine, or interest. Similar views were taken in Sanghi Industries Ltd. vs. CC (Export Promotion), Mumbai and Taurus Novelties Ltd. vs. CC, Bangalore. The ratio of these decisions squarely applies to the appellant's case. Thus, in a number of judgments, a lenient view was taken in similar cases and the imposition of fines and penalties were deleted.


#### PERSONAL HEARING:

4. Personal hearing in the matter was held on 10.09.2025 in virtual mode. Ms. Ruchika Shah , CA, appeared for hearing on behalf of the Appellant. She reiterated the submissions made in the appeal memorandum.

#### DISCUSSION & FINDINGS:

5. I have carefully gone through the appeal memorandum as well as records of the case and the submission made on behalf of the Appellant during the course of hearing. The issue to be decided in the present appeal is whether the impugned order passed by the adjudicating authority disallowing the benefit of concessional rate of duty under Notification No. 103/2009 - Cus., dated 11.09.2009, confirming the demand of duty along with interest, confiscating of the Capital goods under Section 111 (o) of the Customs Act, 1962 and imposing penalty upon the Appellant under Sections 112 (a) and 117 of the Customs Act, 1962, in the facts and circumstances of the case, is legal and proper or otherwise.

6. The Appellant has filed the present appeal on 02.08.2024. In the Form C.A.-1, the date of communication of the Order-In-Original dated 22.07.2021 has been shown as 01.07.2024. Therefore, as per the appellant submission, the appeal has been filed within normal period of 60 days, as stipulated under Section 128 (1) of the Customs Act, 1962. It is important to clarify that the appellant in the Statements of the facts dt. 02.08.2025 mentioned that the impugned order has been served to him on 01.07.2024 by hand delivery. Further, letter dt. 11/09/2024 was written, accompanying copy of appeal filed by the appellant to the DC, Customs, ICD-Sachin, Surat to furnish various information, however, till date no reply in the matter is received. Therefore, in the absence

of any reply in the matter, the submission of the appellant regarding the date of receipt of the impugned order is accepted.

The Appellant has submitted copy of the T.R.6 Challan No. 18/24-25 dt. 05.07.2024 for Rs. 23,260/- towards payment of pre-deposit calculated @ 7.5% of the disputed amount of Customs duty of Rs. 3,10,085/- under the provisions of Section 129E of the Customs Act, 1962. As the appeal has been filed within the stipulated time-limit and complies with the requirement of Section 129E of the Customs Act, 1962, the appeal has been admitted and being taken up for disposal on merits.

7. The appellant, in the memorandum of appeal and written submissions, has contended that the adjudicating authority failed to observe the principles of natural justice, inasmuch as no opportunity of personal hearing or to present his case was afforded to him prior to the passing of the impugned order.

In this regard, on perusal of the impugned order, it is observed that personal hearing in the matter was given to the appellant on 28.12.2020, 18.01.2021 and 01.02.2021 to represent their case before the adjudicating authority. All the letters of PH were returned back undelivered by the postal authority. The adjudicating authority observed that the appellant was given ample opportunities to appear for personal hearing and plead their case. However, neither the appellant nor any of their representatives have appeared for hearing on stipulated dates. Also, no communication, whatsoever, has been received from the appellant in the matter. I have carefully gone through the aforesaid Show Cause Notice and relevant case records I find that the noticee was given ample opportunities to appear for personal hearing and plead their case. However, neither the noticee nor any of their representatives have appeared for hearing on stipulated dates. Also, no communication, whatsoever, has been received from the noticee in the matter. All the letters communicating the PH dates were returned back undelivered by the Postal Authority. Neither any reply has been filed by the appellant nor they or any of their representative have appeared for personal hearing. The case laws of Hon'able High Court Delhi in the case of M/s Saketh India Ltd VS UOI 2002(143) ELT 274(Del), and Hon'able High Court Karnataka in the case of M/s Doddaballapur Spinnings Mills Ltd VS ACCE 1992 (61) ELT 539(Kar) and Hon'able Supreme Court in Chairman, Board of Mining Examination VS Ramjee (AIR 1977 S C 965) have been quoted in the impugned order in the matter of natural justice.

From the above, I find that the adjudicating authority had afforded sufficient opportunity to the appellant to present his case and file a defence reply. It is also a matter of record that no preliminary reply to the show cause notice was submitted by the appellant. Therefore, I find no merit in the appellant's contention that the principles of natural justice were not observed by the adjudicating authority while passing the impugned order.

It is not under dispute, that the Appellant have not fulfilled their export obligation inasmuch as they have not submitted the Export Obligation Discharge



Certificate evidencing the fulfillment of the export obligation in respect of the EPCG License No. 5230007460, dated 01.09.2010 issued by the DGFT. It is further observed from the records of the case that the Appellant have not been able to submit the EODC before the appellate authority as well.

It is pertinent to mention that in view of non-submission of the EODC, the Appellant is not entitled to the benefit of the Notification *ibid*. In view of the above, I agree with the observations and findings of the adjudicating authority and do not find any justification to interfere with the findings in the impugned order passed by the adjudicating authority.


7.2 It is further observed that the appellant submitted in his appeal memorandum that they couldnot fulfilled the stipulated export obligation due to severe financial hardship, low market demand and recessionary conditions. Their factory were sealed and operations were halted completely for reasons beyond control of appellant.

I find that the appellant's claims are unsubstantiated, as no evidence has been provided to demonstrate that their factory was sealed or that production activities were halted.

The adjudicating authority has noted in his order that the appellant was asked through letters dated 27.12.2017, 07.02.2020, 21.02.2020, and 28.07.2020 to submit the EODC or extension granted by DGFT, Surat. However, all letters were returned undelivered. As per DGFT's replies dated 31.07.2020 and 21.08.2020, the firm failed to submit export documents, leading to issuance of Refusal Orders and inclusion in the defaulters list. Notification No. 103/2009-Customs dated 11.09.2009 places the obligation on the appellant to produce evidence and proof to the satisfaction of the Deputy Commissioner of Customs, that the export obligation has been fulfilled, however, the appellant has not produced any proof inspite of letters and mail as stated above. Therefore, above claim of the appellant is not sustainable in the eyes of law.

7.3 It is further observed that the appellant submitted that the impugned order and SCN do not invoke Section 28 of the Customs Act, 1962 and appear to be issued beyond the prescribed limitation period. Hence, the demand is not legally sustainable.

It has been already held in the above paragraph that the Appellant have failed to fulfill the exemption condition as envisaged under Notification No. 103/2009 – Cus., dated 11.09.2009. Hence, I am of the considered view that the violation which has been alleged and upheld by the adjudicating authority in the impugned order is correct inasmuch as the conditions laid down in the Notification *ibid* have not been fulfilled by the Appellant. Accordingly, the demand of Customs duty, interest and penalty ordered by the adjudicating authority for the violation of the Notification No. 103/2009 – Cus., dated 11.09.2009 is correct and in accordance with the law. Further, I do not find any infirmity



in the findings of the adjudicating authority and accordingly, the contention of the Appellant is legally not sustainable and accordingly are rejected.

7.4 As regard the issue of confiscation of the subject Capital Goods, the adjudicating authority in the impugned order has held that:

" 20.

.....

*In the instant case the goods were imported availing concessional rate of duty on the condition that the goods will be put to use for manufacture and export of specified goods achieving certain value addition within a specified period. The noticee has failed to fulfill the conditions by not exporting the goods of required value within the stipulated period, hence, they are no longer eligible for the concessional rate of duty and the duty liability has to be discharged in full without availing the said benefit. For the same conduct, the goods also became liable to confiscation under the provisions of Section 111(0). The duty liability arises on account of importation. The liability to confiscation or fine is for violation of the conditions of the Importation. The act of importation and the conditions of importation are two different aspects and for violation of each of them, separate consequences would follow. In the instant case, the duty liability has been imposed for the import of the goods and the goods have been confiscated for violating the terms and conditions of importation. In this regard it would also be helpful to refer to the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Sheshank Sea Foods Pvt. Ltd. V. UOI, 1996 (88) ELT 626 (S.C.), wherein the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that Section 111(0) of the Customs Act, provides for confiscation of exempted goods when conditions of exemption is not observed. After careful consideration of the facts and circumstances, as proposed in the above show cause notice and after a detailed deliberation, I have already held that if the goods have been imported at a concessional rate of duty, subject to fulfillment of certain conditions and such conditions are violated, then the duty concession would not be available at all.....*

*Therefore, I hold the imported Machine under reference, is liable for confiscation under section 111(0) of the Customs Act, 1962 read with conditions of Bond executed in terms of section 143 of the Customs Act, 1962 read with Customs Notification No. 103/2009 dated 11.09.2009 as amended from time to time."*

In this regard, it is relevant to refer to the Section 111 (o) of the Customs Act, 1962, which is reproduced below for ease of reference:

**"111. Confiscation of improperly imported goods, etc.**

*The following goods brought from a place outside India shall be liable to confiscation:*

*(a).....*



*[Handwritten signature]*

(b).....

.....

(o) *any goods exempted, subject to any condition, from duty or any prohibition in respect of the import thereof under this Act or any other law for the time being in force, in respect of which the condition is not observed unless the non-observance of the condition was sanctioned by the proper officer;"*

On perusal of the above legal provision, it is observed that this sub-clause is applicable in respect of any goods which were exempted subject to certain condition and upon violation of such condition, the said goods shall be liable for confiscation.

It has been already held in the above paragraph that the Appellant have failed to fulfill the exemption condition as envisaged under Notification No. 103/2009 – Cus., dated 11.09.2009. Hence, I am of the considered view that the violation which has been alleged and upheld by the adjudicating authority in the impugned order is correct inasmuch as the conditions laid down in the Notification *ibid* have not been fulfilled by the Appellant. Accordingly, the confiscation ordered by the adjudicating authority for the violation of the Notification No. 103/2009 – Cus., dated 11.09.2009 is correct and in accordance with the law. In view of the above, I do not find any infirmity in the findings of the adjudicating authority with regard to the confiscation of the subject goods under Section 111 (o) of the Customs Act, 1962.

7.5 As regards the penalty under Section 112 (a) of the Customs Act, 1962, it is observed on perusal of the plain text of the Section 112 (a) of the Customs Act, 1962, that any person, who, in relation to any goods, does or omits to do any act which act or omission would render such goods liable to confiscation under Section 111, shall be liable to penalty. It has been already held in above paragraph that the subject goods are liable for confiscation under Section 111 (o) of the Customs Act, 1962. In this context, it is relevant to refer to the judgment of Hon'ble Tribunal, Mumbai in the case of *Vijaybhai Vs. Commissioner of Customs, Airport, Mumbai - 2014 (313) E.L.T. 506 (Tri. - Mumbai)*, wherein the Hon'ble Tribunal has held that once the goods are found liable to confiscation under Section 111, penalty under Section 112 is consequential. The relevant para of the order is reproduced below: -

**"9.27 The last issue for consideration is regarding the penalties to be imposed on the appellants. Once the goods are found liable to confiscation under Section 111, penalty under Section 112(a) is consequential. It is a settled position in law that for imposition of penalty under Section 112(a), there is no requirement of mens rea. In the present case mens rea is clearly evident from the documentary evidences available on record and also from the statements of the appellants. Penalties of Rs. 70 lakhs and Rs. one crore has been imposed on the appellants M/s. Vijaybav and M/s. Deepali Exports**



respectively. Considering the fact that all these frauds have been committed to save the premium on REP licences which is on an average 3% of the value of the licences and also considering the fact that 3% of the face value of the forged licences far exceeds the penalties imposed, we do not find it necessary or appropriate to interfere with the penalties imposed on these two appellants. In the facts and circumstances of the case, the penalties imposed cannot be said to be harsh or excessive. As regards the penalties of Rs. 80 lakhs and Rs. 1 crore imposed on M/s. Vaibhav Exports and M/s. Pushpak Impex, 3% of the value of imports on the basis of forged licences works out to Rs. 42 lakhs and Rs. 36 lakhs. Therefore, in respect of these two appellants, we reduce the penalties from Rs. 80 lakhs and Rs. 1 crore to Rs. 42 lakhs and Rs. 36 lakhs respectively. Since all the firms are proprietary firms, there is no need to impose separate penalties on the firm as well as their proprietors. Therefore, we set aside the penalties imposed on Gyanchand Jain, Rajesh Jain, Hiralal Uttamchand Jain and Kamlesh Khicha"

Further, it is pertinent to mention that mens rea is not a pre-requisite for imposition of the penalty under Section 112 (a) of the Customs Act, 1962. It is relevant to refer to the observation of the Hon'ble CESTAT, Mumbai Bench in case of Shipping Corporation of India [2014 (312) E.L.T. 305 (Tri.-Mumbai)] wherein, it is held that :

**"6.17** ..... However penalty under Section 112(a) is sustainable as the said section does not require any mens rea on the part of the appellants and mere violation of the statutory provisions would suffice. The decisions of the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of Gujarat Travancore Agency v. CIT [(1989) 177 ITR 455 (S.C.) = 1989 (42) E.L.T. 350 (S.C.)] and Chairman, SEBI v. Sriram Mutual Fund & Anr. [2006-TIOL-72-SC-SEBI] refer and ratio of the same would apply. ...."

(emphasis supplied)

Similarly, in case of Imperial Trading LLC [2005 (181) E.L.T. 29 (Tri.-Mumbai)], it is held that :

**"11.** The Commissioner imposed a penalty of Rs. 2.00 lakhs on the importing firm under Section 112(a) of the Customs Act. The appellant, M/s. Impex Enterprises, caused the import of goods which are liable to confiscation under Section 111. Mens rea is not a necessary ingredient for imposing a penalty under Section 112(a) of the said Act. However, having regard to the circumstances of the case, we reduce the penalty to Rs. 1.00 lakh."

(emphasis supplied)

In view of the above, I am of the considered view that the Appellant is liable to penalty under Section 112 (a) of the Customs Act, 1962. Accordingly, I agree with the observations and findings of the adjudicating authority and I uphold the impugned order imposing penalty upon the Appellant under Section 112 (a) of the Customs Act, 1962 and reject the contention of the Appellant.



7.6 As regards penalty under Section 117 of the Customs Act, the same is reproduced below for ease of reference:-


*"117. Penalties for contravention, etc., not expressly mentioned. — Any person who contravenes any provision of this Act or abets any such contravention or who fails to comply with any provision of this Act with which it was his duty to comply, where no express penalty is elsewhere provided for such contravention or failure, shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding one lakh rupees."*

On perusal of the above legal provision, it emerges that the penalty under this act can be imposed on any person for contravention of any provision of the Act or abetting any such contravention or failing to comply with any provision of the Act with which it was his duty to comply for which no express penalty is provided.

7.7 In the instant case, it is observed that the adjudicating has imposed penalty upon the Appellant under Section 112 of the Customs Act for violations of the conditions of the Notification No. 103/2009 - Cus., dated 11.09.2009, as they had failed to submit the EODC in respect of EPCG License No. 5230007460, dated 01.09.2010. No other contravention has been mentioned in the impugned order. As penalty has already been imposed under the Section 112 of the Customs Act, 1962 for this contravention, in my considered view no penalty under Section 117 of the Customs Act, 1962 can be imposed. In view of the above, the penalty imposed upon the Appellant under Section 117 of the Customs Act, 1962 is legally not sustainable, and is liable to be set aside.


8. In view of the discussions made above, the appeal filed by the Appellant is disposed off in below terms:

- i. The impugned order disallowing the benefit of concessional rate of duty @ 3% for EPCG Scheme under Notification No. 103/2009-Cus., dated 11.09.2009 on the subject machinery imported in the name of the Appellant is upheld;
- ii. The impugned order confirming the demand of Customs Duty amounting to Rs. 3,10,085/- being the duty foregone at the time of import of Capital Goods under EPCG Licence in terms of Notification No. 103/2009-Cus., dated 11.09.2009, along with interest is upheld;
- iii. The impugned order confiscating the subject imported Capital goods under Section 111 (o) of the Customs Act, 1962 and subsequently imposing redemption fine under Section 125 (1) of the Customs Act, 1962 is upheld;
- iv. The impugned order appropriating the amount of Rs. 50,000/- by encashment of the Bank Guarantee No.: 10726 BG00005, dated 13.09.2010 for Rs. 50,000/- issued by the Karnataka Bank, Ring Road, Surat towards the confirmed duty demand is upheld;
- v. The impugned order imposing penalty of Rs. 3,10,085/- under Section 112 (a) of the Customs Act, 1962 is upheld;




vi. The impugned order imposing penalty of Rs. 31,000/- under Section 117 of the Customs Act, 1962 is set aside;

09. Accordingly, the appeal filed by the Appellant is disposed off in above terms.

  
(Amit Gupta)  
Commissioner (Appeals),  
Customs, Ahmedabad

F. No. S/49-144/CUS/AHD/2024-25  
3692

Date: 26.09.2025

**By Registered Post A.D**

To,  
M/s. Adarsh Textiles,  
F-7, Narayan Nagar Industrial Estate,  
Parvati Gam, Surat – 395 006.

Copy to:

1. The Chief Commissioner of Customs Gujarat, Custom House, Ahmedabad.
2. The Principal Commissioner of Customs, Custom House, Ahmedabad.
3. The Assistant Commissioner of Customs, ICD-Sachin, Surat.
4. Guard File.



सत्यापिता/ATTESTED  
  
अधीक्षक/SUPERINTENDENT  
सीमा शुल्क (अपील), अहमदाबाद,  
CUSTOMS (APPEALS), AHMEDABAD.