

	प्रधान आयुक्त का कार्यालय, सीमा शुल्क सदन, मुन्द्रा OFFICE OF THE PRINCIPAL COMMISSIONER OF CUSTOMS, CUSTOM HOUSE: MUNDRA, KUTCH MUNDRA PORT & SPL ECONOMIC ZONE, MUNDRA-370421 ई-मेल/ E-Mail: group5-mundra@gov.in	
	A	फा /सं. FILE NO.
B	मूल आदेश सं. ORDER-IN- ORIGINAL NO.	MCH/ADC/ZDC/691/2025-26
C	द्वारा पारित किया गया PASSED BY	Dipak Zala, Additional Commissioner of Customs, Custom House, Mundra
D	आदेश की तिथि DATE OF ORDER	07-03-2026
E	जारी करने की तिथि DATE OF ISSUE	07-03-2026
F	कारण बताओ नोटिस संखं तिथि . SCN NO. & DATE	Importer requested for SCN & PH Waiver
G	नोटिसीपार्टी / आयातक/ NOTICEE/PARTY/ IMPORTER	M/s. ROHIT TRADING & COMPANY, IEC No. CRMPR7847B, F/F PVT NO-4, 3281, RAJA WALI PIPAL, MAHADEV, NEW DELHI - 110006
H	डिन DIN	20260371MO0000919291

- यह अपील आदेश संबन्धित को निःशुल्क प्रदान किया जाता है।
This Order - in - Original is granted to the concerned free of charge.
- यदि कोई व्यक्ति इस अपील आदेश से असंतुष्ट है तो वह सीमा शुल्क अपील नियमावली 1982 के नियम 6(1) के साथ पठित सीमा शुल्क अधिनियम 1962 की धारा 129A(1) के अंतर्गत प्रपत्र सीए3-में चार प्रतियों में नीचे बताए गए पते पर अपील कर सकता है-
Any person aggrieved by this Order - in - Original may file an appeal under Section 128 A of Customs Act, 1962 read with Rule 3 of the Customs (Appeals) Rules, 1982 in quadruplicate in Form C. A. -1 to:
"सीमा शुल्क आयुक्त) अपील(, चौथी मंजिल, हुडको बिल्डिंग, ईश्वर भुवन रोड, नवरंगपुरा, अहमदाबाद 380009"
"The Commissioner of Customs (Appeals), Mundra, 4TH Floor, Hudco Building, Ishwar Bhuvan Road, Navrangpura, Ahmedabad-380009."
- उक्त अपील यह आदेश भेजने की दिनांक से तीन माह के भीतर दाखिल की जानी चाहिए।
Appeal shall be filed within three months from the date of communication of this order.
- उक्त अपील के पर न्यायालय शुल्क अधिनियम के तहत 5 -/रुपए का टिकट लगा होना चाहिए और इसके साथ निम्नलिखित अवश्य संलग्न किया जाए -
Appeal should be accompanied by a fee of Rs. 5/- under Court Fee Act it must accompanied by -
- उक्त अपील पर न्यायालय शुल्क अधिनियम के तहत 5/- रुपये कोर्ट फीस स्टाम्प जबकि इसके साथ संलग्न आदेश की प्रति पर अनुसूची- 1, न्यायालय शुल्क अधिनियम, 1870 के मदसं-6 के तहत निर्धारित 0.50 पैसे की एक न्यायालय शुल्क स्टाम्प वहन करना चाहिए।
The appeal should bear Court Fee Stamp of Rs.5/- under Court Fee Act whereas the copy of this order attached with the appeal should bear a Court Fee stamp of Rs.0.50 (Fifty paisa only) as prescribed under Schedule-I, Item 6 of the Court Fees Act, 1870.
- अपील ज्ञापन के साथ ड्यूटी/ दण्ड/ जुर्माना आदि के भुगतान का प्रमाण संलग्न किया जाना चाहिये। Proof of payment of duty/fine/penalty etc. should be attached with the appeal memo.
- अपील प्रस्तुत करते समय, सीमाशुल्क (अपील) नियम, 1982 और सीमा शुल्क अधिनियम, 1962 के सभी मामलों में

पालन किया जाना चाहिए।

While submitting the appeal, the Customs (Appeals) Rules, 1982 and the Customs Act, 1962 should be adhered to in all respects.

8. इस आदेश के विरुद्ध अपील हेतु जहां शुल्क या शुल्क और जुर्माना विवाद में हो, अथवा दण्ड में, जहां केवल जुर्माना विवाद में हो, Commissioner (Appeals) के समक्ष मांग शुल्क का 7.5% भुगतान करना होगा।

An appeal against this order shall lie before the Commissioner (A) on payment of 7.5% of the duty demanded where duty or duty and penalty are in dispute, or penalty, where penalty alone is in dispute.

BRIEF FACTS OF THE CASE

M/s. ROHIT TRADING & COMPANY (IEC: CRMPR7847B) (hereinafter referred to as 'the importer' for the sake of brevity) having address at F/F PVT NO-4, 3281, RAJA WALI PIPAL, MAHADEV, NEW DELHI had filed Bill of Entry No. 7233257 (Z Type) dtd. 31.01.2026 for import of the following declared goods weighing 26350 Kgs, (G.Wt.), through Container No. SEGU6620271:

Table-A

Exchange Rate: 1 USD = 91.2 INR

S.No	CTH	Description	Quantity	UQC	Amount (USD)
1	84819090	METAL SHOWER HOSE 1MTR	29500	PCS	1180
2	84819090	METAL SHOWER HOSE 1.5 MTR	11000	PCS	660
3	84819090	FAUCET FLEXIBLE SPOUT	18000	PCS	1260
4	84819090	CHECK VALVE 1/2	29540	PCS	1181.60
5	84819090	CHECK VALVE 3/4	9090	PCS	727.20
6	84819090	CHECK VALVE 1	52200	PCS	6786
7	84819090	CHECK VALVE 1.1/4	4260	PCS	1065
8	84819090	CHECK VALVE 1.1/2	3300	PCS	1320
9	84819090	CHECK VALVE 2	1620	PCS	972
Total					15151.80

2. An intelligence was gathered by the SIIB, Mundra wherein the imported cargo was suspected as misdeclared. The above said consignment was put on hold for examination on the basis of intelligence on suspected misdeclaration/ mis-classification of goods for 100% examination. Subject consignment was examined by SIIB, Custom House, Mundra at M/s INDEV INFRA PRIVATE LIMITED Mundra under Panchnama dated 16.02.2026 in the presence of Shri Dinesh Kumar, Manager at INDEV INFRA PRIVATE LIMITED and Shri Zala Dipaksinh Sabalsinh, authorised representative of the

importer M/s Rohit Trading & Company. Shri Zala Dipaksinh Sabalsinh, explained the cargo details as per the Bill of Entry, Invoice and Packing List. The total wt. of the container as per Bill of Entry is 26350 Kgs and Wt. of the cargo found during the examination is 26770 Kgs (approx.).

2.1. Container no. and seal no. were verified and thereafter, seal cutting was allowed and goods were 100% destuffed from the containers. After destuffing of goods in the CFS, the corrugated boxes were opened on random selection basis and goods were examined. During Examinations goods were found as below :-

Table-B

Sr. No.	Description	TOTAL CARTONS	PIECES	TOTAL PIECES	Weight of One Box in KGS	Total Weight	Quantity	UQC
1	METAL SHOWER HOSE 1MTR	295	100	29500	17	5015	29500	PCS
2	METAL SHOWER HOSE 1.5 MTR	110	100	11000	20.4	2244	11000	PCS
3	FAUCET FLEXIBLE SPOUT	360	50	18000	17.7	6372	18000	PCS
4	CHECK VALVE 1/2"	67	320	21440	21.2	1420.4	29540	PCS
5	CHECK VALVE 1/2"	15	300	4500	24.6	369		
6	CHECK VALVE 1/2"	18	200	3600	21.8	392.4		
7	CHECK VALVE 3/4"	7	270	1890	28.2	197.4	9090	PCS
8	CHECK VALVE 3/4"	24	240	5760	19.2	460.8		
9	CHECK VALVE 3/4"	9	160	1440	24.4	219.6		
10	CHECK VALVE 1"	171	200	34200	23.2	3967.2	52200	PCS
11	CHECK VALVE 1"	60	180	10800	26.8	1608		
12	CHECK VALVE 1"	60	120	7200	25.6	1536		
13	CHECK VALVE 1.1/4"	6	100	600	19.8	118.8	4260	PCS
14	CHECK VALVE 1.1/4"	38	90	3420	20	760		
15	CHECK VALVE 1.1/4"	3	80	240	26.2	78.6		
16	CHECK VALVE 1.1/2"	9	80	720	23.2	208.8	3300	PCS
17	CHECK VALVE 1.1/2"	43	60	2580	25.6	1100.8		
18	CHECH VALVE 2"	9	60	540	23	207	1620	PCS
19	CHECH VALVE 2"	27	40	1080	19.6	529.2		

2.2. On the basis of examination, it is found that the goods were found mis-declared in terms of weighment.

4. **Rejection of transaction value of the imported goods and determination of the**

value of the import goods

4.1. Since during examination, items has been found mis-declared in terms of weighment, as detailed in Table-B, there appears to be reason to doubt the truth or accuracy of the value declared in relation to the impugned imported goods. Therefore, the declared assessable value of the goods cannot be considered as transaction value under the provisions of Section 14 of the Customs Act, 1962 read with the provisions of the Customs Valuation (Determination of Value of Imported Goods) Rules, 2007 (CVR, 2007) and thus, the same is liable to be rejected in terms of Rule 12 of CVR, 2007. Since the value of goods declared by importer in the subject Bill of Entry did not appear to be the true transaction value under the provisions of Section 14 of the Customs Act, 1962 read with the provisions of the CVR, 2007 and thus, the same is liable to be rejected in terms of Rule 12 of CVR, 2007.

4.2. As per Rule 3(4) of CVR, 2007, if the value cannot be determined under the provisions of sub-rule (1), the value shall be determined by proceeding sequentially through Rule 4 to 9. The subject consignment comprises unbranded items of China origin and in absence of credible data of import of similar/identical goods due to upper quality of goods and other constraints, the value of these goods cannot be determined under Rule 4 to 8 of CVR, 2007. Hence, the value is to be determined under Rule 9 (Residual method) of CVR, 2007 which is reproduced as under:

"9. Residual method.-

(1) *Subject to the provisions of rule 3, where the value of imported goods cannot be determined under the provisions of any of the preceding rules, the value shall be determined using reasonable means consistent with the principles and general provisions of these rules and on the basis of data available in India;*

Provided that the value so determined shall not exceed the price at which such or like goods are ordinarily sold or offered for sale for delivery at the time and place of importation in the course of international trade, when the seller or buyer has no interest in the business of other and price is the sole consideration for the sale or offer for sale.

(2) *No value shall be determined under the provisions ofⁿ this rule on the basis of-*

- i. *the selling price in India of the goods produced in India;*
- ii. *a system which provides for the acceptance for customs purposes of the highest of the two alternative values;*
- iii. *the price of the goods on the domestic market of the country of exportation;*
- iv. *the cost of production other than computed values which have been determined for identical or similar goods in accordance with the provisions of rule 8;*
- v. *the price of the goods for the export to a country other than India;*
- vi. *minimum customs values; or*
- vii. *arbitrary or fictitious values."*

4.3. Therefore, opinion of the Empanelled Chartered Engineer Ajayrajsinh Baldevsinh Jhala, was sought for valuation purpose. The Chartered Engineer vide CE Opinion Certificate Ref:- ABJ:INSP:CE:MUN:SIIB:NS:RTC:25-26:01 dated 16.02.2026 has provided the valuation of the declared goods as detailed below:

Table-C **(Valuation Table by CE)**

(1 USD = 91.20 INR)

Details of the goods - found after examination - as per customs panchnama/ examination report.										
Sr No.	Description	TOTAL CARTONS	PIECES	TOTAL PIECES	Weight of One Box in KGS	Total Weight	Quantity	UQC	Per Unit Suggestive Average C.I. F. Value in Bulk Quantity in USD (Approx.)	Total Suggestive Average C.I. F. Value in Bulk Quantity in USD (Approx.)
1	METAL SHOWER HOSE 1MTR	295	100	29500	17	5015	29500	PCS	0.06	1770
2	METAL SHOWER HOSE 1.5 MTR	110	100	11000	20.4	2244	11000	PCS	0.09	990
3	FAUCET FLEXIBLE SPOUT	360	50	18000	17.7	6372	18000	PCS	0.1	1800
4	CHECK VALVE 1/2 "	67	320	21440	21.2	1420.4	29540	PCS	0.06	1772.4
5	CHECK VALVE 1/2 "	15	300	4500	24.6	369				
6	CHECK VALVE 1/2 "	18	200	3600	21.8	392.4				
7	CHECK VALVE 3/4 "	7	270	1890	28.2	197.4				
8	CHECK VALVE 3/4 "	24	240	5760	19.2	460.8				
9	CHECK VALVE 3/4 "	9	160	1440	24.4	219.6				

10	CHECK V ALVE 1"	171	200	3420 0	23.2	3967.2				
11	CHECK V ALVE 1"	60	180	1080 0	26.8	1608	52200	PCS	0.145	7569
12	CHECK V ALVE 1"	60	120	7200	25.6	1536				
13	CHECK V ALVE 1.1/4"	6	100	600	19.8	118.8				
14	CHECK V ALVE 1.1/4"	38	90	3420	20	760	4260	PCS	0.3	1278
15	CHECK V ALVE 1.1/4"	3	80	240	26.2	78.6				
16	CHECK V ALVE 1.1/2"	9	80	720	23.2	208.8				
17	CHECK V ALVE 1.1/2"	43	60	2580	25.6	1100.8	3300	PCS	0.5	1650
18	CHECH VALVE 2"	9	60	540	23	207				
19	CHECH VALVE 2"	27	40	1080	19.6	529.2	1620	PCS	0.8	1296
TOTAL										

4.4. The above said CE Opinion Certificate was shared with the importer and the same has been accepted by them vide their email dated 18.02.2026 and they have further submitted that they don't want any Show Cause Notice and Personal Hearing in the matter.

5. As per the above said CE Opinion Certificate, Total Suggestive CIF value of the imported goods is 19034.4 USD (Rs. 17,35,937/-) instead of declared CIF value of 15151.80 USD (Rs. 13,81,844/-). Hence, there is difference of Rs. 3,54,093/- between the re-determined CIF value and the declared CIF value.

6. Duty Calculation:

6.1. Further, in view of above said CE Opinion Certificate, total duty payable in respect of goods covered under the subject Bill of Entry 7233257 dtd. 31.01.2026 comes to Rs. 4,81,462/- as calculated below:

Table-D

Item Sr. No. in the BE	CTH	Description of Goods	Assessable Value as per CE Report (in Rs.)	BCD (in Rs.)	SWS (in Rs.)	IGST (in Rs.)	Total Duty (in Rs.)
------------------------------	-----	----------------------	---	--------------------	--------------------	------------------	---------------------------

			Rs.)					
1	84819090	METAL SHOWER HOSE 1MTR	161424	12107	1211	31453	44771	
2	84819090	METAL SHOWER HOSE 1.5 MTR	90288	6772	677	17593	25041	
3	84819090	FAUCE T FLEXIBLE SPOUT	164160	12312	1231	31987	45530	
4	84819090	CHECK VALVE 1/2"						
5	84819090	CHECK VALVE 1/2"						
6	84819090	CHECK VALVE 1/2"	161643	12123	1212	31496	44832	
7	84819090	CHECK VALVE 3/4"						
8	84819090	CHECK VALVE 3/4"						
9	84819090	CHECK VALVE 3/4"	82901	6218	622	16153	22993	
10	84819090	CHECK VALVE 1"						
11	84819090	CHECK VALVE 1"						
12	84819090	CHECK VALVE 1"	690293	51772	5177	134504	191453	
13	84819090	CHECK VALVE 1.1/4"						
14	84819090	CHECK VALVE 1.1/4"						
15	84819090	CHECK VALVE 1.1/4"	116554	8742	874	22710	32326	
16	84819090	CHECK VALVE 1.1/2"						
17	84819090	CHECK VALVE 1.1/2"	150480	11286	1129	29321	41736	
18	84819090	CHECH VALVE 2"						
19	84819090	CHECH VALVE 2"	118195	8865	886	23030	32781	
TOTAL			1735937				481462	

In view of the above, it is found that the Total Suggestive assessable value of the imported goods is Rs. 17,35,937/- instead of declared assessable value of 13,81,844/- at the exchange rate of 1 USD=91.20 INR. Hence, there is difference of Rs. 3,54,093/- between the re-determined assessable value and the declared assessable value.

6.3 In view of the foregoing paras and investigation conducted in the matter, it is

noticed that the impugned goods have been mis-declared by the importer in terms of quantity i.e. weighment and valuation. Therefore, it appears that the importer has contravened the provisions of Section 17 and Section 46 of the Customs Act, 1962 in as much as they have failed to make correct and true declaration/information in the subject Bill of Entry. These acts of omission and commission on the part of importer has made the impugned goods having re-determined assessable value of Rs. 17,35,937/-liable for confiscation under Section 111 (l) and 111 (m) of the Customs Act, 1962 and hence, rendered the importer liable for penal action under Section 112(a)(ii) of the said Act. Furthermore, it appears that by mis-declaring the value of the subject goods under import, the importer has also short declared the duty amounting to Rs. 98,208/-.

6.4 Further, in terms of Section 46(4) of the Customs Act, 1962, the importer is required to make a declaration as to the truth of the contents of the Bill of Entry submitted for assessment of Customs duty. In the present case, it appears that the importer has tried to clear the goods by way of mis-declaration and undervaluation in order to avoid duty on higher assessable value. Hence, it appears that the importer had knowingly involved themselves in the suppression of the material facts and also indulged in mis-statement of facts. These acts of omission and commission on part of the importer have rendered them liable for penalty under Section 114AA of the Customs Act, 1962.

7. RELEVANT LEGAL PROVISIONS:

(A) RELEVANT PROVISIONS OF THE SEZ ACT, 2005 AND RULES MADE THEREUNDER:

SEZ ACT, 2005

Section 2. Definitions. – In this Act, unless the context otherwise requires, –

.....

(o) “import” means –

(i) bringing goods or receiving services, in a Special Economic Zone, by a Unit or Developer from a place outside India by land, sea or air or by any other mode, whether physical or otherwise; or

(ii) receiving goods, or services by a Unit or Developer from another Unit or Developer of the same Special Economic Zone or a different Special Economic Zone;

Section 21. Single enforcement officer or agency for notified offences. –

(1) The Central Government may, by notification, specify any act or omission made punishable under any Central Act, as notified offence for the purposes of this Act.

(2) The Central Government may, by general or special order, authorise any officer or agency to be the enforcement officer or agency in respect of any notified offence or offences committed in a Special Economic Zone.

(3) Every officer or agency authorised under sub-section (2) shall have all the corresponding powers of investigation, inspection, search or seizure as is provided under the relevant Central Act in respect of the notified offences.

Section 22. Investigation, inspection, search or seizure. —

The agency or officer, specified under section 20 or section 21, may, with prior intimation to the Development Commissioner concerned, carry out the investigation, inspection, search or seizure in the Special Economic Zone or in a Unit if such agency or officer has reasons to believe (reasons to be recorded in writing) that a notified offence has been committed or is likely to be committed in the Special Economic Zone:

Provided that no investigation, inspection, search or seizure shall be carried out in a Special Economic Zone by any agency or officer other than those referred to in sub-section (2) or sub-section (3) of section 21 without prior approval of the Development Commissioner concerned:

Provided further that any officer or agency, if so authorised by the Central Government, may carry out the investigation, inspection, search or seizure in the Special Economic Zone or Unit without prior intimation or approval of the Development Commissioner

SEZ RULES, 2006

Rule 47(5). *Refund, Demand, Adjudication, Review and Appeal with regard to matters relating to authorised operations under Special Economic Zones Act, 2005, transactions, and goods and services related thereto, shall be made by the Jurisdictional Customs and Central Excise Authorities in accordance with the relevant provisions contained in the Customs Act, 1962, the Central Excise Act, 1944, and the Finance Act, 1994 and the rules made there under or the notifications issued there under.*

NOTIFICATION NO. 2665(E) AND 2667(E) DATED 05.08.2016

S.O. 2665(E). *— In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 21 of the Special Economic Zones Act, 2005 (28 of 2005) (hereinafter referred as the Act), the Central Government hereby, notifies the offences contained in the under-mentioned sections of the Customs Act, 1962 (52 of 1962), the Central Excise Act, 1944 (1 of 1944) and the Finance Act, 1994 (32 of 1994) as offences under the Act:-*

<i>The Customs Act, 1962</i>	
1.	<i>Section 28, 28AA and 28AAA</i>
2.	<i>Section 74 and 75</i>
3.	<i>Section 111</i>
4.	<i>Section 113</i>
5.	<i>Section 115</i>
6.	<i>Section 124</i>
7.	<i>Section 135</i>
8.	<i>Section 104</i>

.....
.....

S.O. 2667(E). *— In exercise of the powers conferred by section 22 of the Special Economic Zones Act, 2005 (28 of 2005) (hereinafter referred as the Act), the Central Government authorises the jurisdictional Customs Commissioner, in respect of offences under the Customs Act, 1962 (52 of 1962) and Commissioner of Central Excise in respect of offences under the Central Excise Act, 1944 (1 of 1944) and the Finance Act, 1994 (32 of 1994) and notified under the Act, for the reasons to be recorded in writing, to carry out the investigation, inspection, search or seizure in a Special Economic Zone or Unit with prior intimation to the Development Commissioner, concerned.*

(B) RELEVANT PROVISIONS OF THE CUSTOMS ACT, 1962:**Section 2. Definitions-**

In this Act, unless the context otherwise requires,

(22) "goods" includes (a) vessels, aircrafts and vehicles; (b) stores; (c) baggage; (d) currency and negotiable instruments; and (e) any other kind of movable property;

(23) "import", with its grammatical variations and cognate expressions, means bringing into India from a place outside India;

(25) "imported goods", means any goods brought into India from a place outside India but does not include goods which have been cleared for home consumption;

(26) "importer", in relation to any goods at any time between their importation and the time when they are cleared for home consumption, includes any owner, beneficial owner or any person holding himself out to be the importer;

(39) "smuggling", in relation to any goods, means any act or omission which will render such goods liable to confiscation under section 111 or section 113.

Section 11A. Definitions-

In this Act, unless the context otherwise requires,

(a) "illegal import" means the import of any goods in contravention of the provisions of this Act or any other law for the time being in force.

Section 17. Assessment of duty. -

(1) An importer entering any imported goods under section 46, or an exporter entering any export goods under section 50, shall, save as otherwise provided in section 85, self-assess the duty, if any, leviable on such goods.

....

(4) Where it is found on verification, examination or testing of the goods or otherwise that the self-assessment is not done correctly, the proper officer may, without prejudice to any other action which may be taken under this Act, re-assess the duty leviable on such goods.

Section 46. Entry of goods on importation. -

(1) The importer of any goods, other than goods intended for transit or transshipment, shall make entry thereof by presenting electronically on the customs automated system to the proper officer a bill of entry for home consumption or warehousing in such form and manner as may be prescribed:

....

(4) The importer while presenting a bill of entry shall make and subscribe to a declaration as to the truth of the contents of such bill of entry and shall, in support of such declaration, produce to the proper officer the invoice, if any, and other such

documents relating to the imported goods as may be prescribed.

(4A) The importer who presents a bill of entry shall ensure the following, namely:

- (a) the accuracy and completeness of the information given therein;
- (b) the authenticity and validity of any document supporting it; and
- (c) compliance with the restriction or prohibition, if any, relating to the goods under this Act or under any other law for the time being in force.

Section 111. Confiscation of improperly imported goods, etc. – The following goods brought from a place outside India shall be liable to confiscation:-

.....

(m) any goods which do not correspond in respect of value or in any other particular with the entry made under this Act or in the case of baggage with the declaration made under section 77 in respect thereof, or in the case of goods under transshipment, with the declaration for transshipment referred to in the proviso to sub-section (1) of section 54;

Section 112. Penalty for improper importation of goods, etc. –

Any person,-

(a) 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, or abets the doing or omission of such an act, or

(b) who acquires possession of or is in any way concerned in carrying, removing, depositing, harbouring, keeping, concealing, selling or purchasing, or in any other manner dealing with any goods which he knows or has reason to believe are liable to confiscation under section 111,

shall be liable,-

- i.
- ii. in the case of dutiable goods, other than prohibited goods, subject to the provisions of section 114A, to a penalty not exceeding ten per cent. of the duty sought to be evaded or five thousand rupees, whichever is higher:

Section 114AA. Penalty for use of false and incorrect material. -

If a person knowingly or intentionally makes, signs or uses, or causes to be made, signed or used, any declaration, statement or document which is false or incorrect in any material particular, in the transaction of any business for the purposes of this Act, shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding five times the value of goods.

Section 125: Option to pay fine in lieu of confiscation.

(i) Whenever confiscation of any goods is authorised by this Act, the officer adjudging it may, in the case of any goods, the importation or exportation whereof is prohibited under this Act or under any other law for the time being in force, and shall, in the case of any other goods, give to the owner of the goods [or, where such owner is not known, the person from whose possession or custody such goods have been seized,] an option to pay in lieu of confiscation such fine as the said officer thinks fit:

9. Summary of Investigation Conducted:

9.1. The importer M/s.ROHIT TRADING & COMPANY (IEC: CRMPR7847B) had filed Bill of Entry No. 7233257 dtd. 31.01.2026 at Mundra Port for import of goods declared as Mix items as listed in the Bill of Entry having declared assessable value of Rs. 13,81,844/- and declared duty of Rs. 3,83,254/-. The goods were examined by the officers of SIIB and found that the items were found mis-declared in terms of quantity i.e. weightment and valuation. Further, the assessable value of the subject consignment has been re-determined as Rs.17,35,937/-on the basis of CE Opinion Certificate dated 16.02.2026 in view of Rule 9 of the CVR, 2007, on which applicable duty comes to Rs. 4,81,462/- as detailed in Table-D above resulting in differential duty of Rs. 98208/-.

9.2. The importer has thus contravened Section 17 and Section 46 of the Customs Act, 1962 and the CVR, 2007 in as much as they failed to make correct declarations in the subject Bill of Entry filed by them and correctly assess their duty liability. It further appears that the importer has tried to clear the goods by way of mis-declaration/ undervaluation in order to avoid duty on higher assessable value. Hence, it appears that the importer had knowingly involved themselves in the suppression of the material facts and also indulged in mis-statement of facts. These acts of omission and commission on the part of importer has made the subject goods having re-determined assessable value of Rs. 17,35,937/- liable for confiscation under Section 111(l) and 111 (m) of the Custom Act, 1962 and rendered the importer liable for penal action under Section 112(a) (ii) and 114 AA of the said Act.

10. The importer M/s. ROHIT TRADING & COMPANY vide their email dated 18.02.2026 has accepted the observation of mis-declaration and submitted that they are ready to pay the differential duty along with applicable penalty. Further, the importer vide their email dated 18.02.2026 has accepted the valuation report submitted by the CE and submitted that they don't want any Show Cause Notice and Personal Hearing in the matter.

PERSONAL HEARING AND SUBMISSIONS

11. The importer M/s. Rohit Trading & Company vide their letter dated 03.03.2026 submitted the following:

" We would like to inform you that we have filed the above BoE 7233257 Dated: 31-01-2026, and the said shipment was hold BY SIIB Section for examination purpose. We don't want any kind of SCN and PH in this matter.

So, we request you to kindly do the needful on priority."

DISCUSSION AND FINDINGS

12. I have carefully gone through the records of the case and Investigation Report No. 284/2025-26 dated 02.03.2026. The importer vide letter dated 03.03.2026 has requested for waiver of Show Cause Notice and personal hearing in the matter. Thus, I find that the principles of natural justice as provided under Section 122A of the Customs Act, 1962 have been complied with and I proceed to decide the case on the basis of documentary evidence available on record. The main issues to be decided are:

(i) Whether the declared assessable value of **Rs. 13,81,844/-** for the goods under Z-Bill of Entry No. 7233257 dated 31.01.2026 is liable to be rejected under Rule 12 of CVR, 2007 and re-determined as **Rs. 17,35,937/-** in terms of Rule 9 of CVR, 2007;

(ii) Whether the self-assessment done by the importer is liable to be rejected and the Bill of Entry No. 7233257 dated 31.01.2026 needs to be re-assessed under **Section 17(4)** of the Customs Act, 1962 to levy the re-determined duty;

(iii) Whether the goods are liable for confiscation under **Section 111(l)** and **Section 111(m)** of the Customs Act, 1962;

(iv) Whether penalties under **Section 112(a)(ii)** and **Section 114AA** of the Customs Act, 1962 are imposable on the importer M/s. ROHIT TRADING & COMPANY.

13.1 Regarding the first issue, I find that the importer has imported goods declared as various items as mentioned in **Table-A**, supra with declared assessable value of **Rs. 13,81,844/-** vide Bill of Entry No. 7233257 dated 31.01.2026. However, on physical examination conducted on 16.02.2026 under Panchnama, it was found that the goods were mis-declared in terms of weighment and valuation.

13.2 I find that during examination, the total weight of the cargo found was 26770 Kgs (approx.) as against the declared weight of 26350 Kgs in the Bill of Entry, thereby establishing a discrepancy in weighment. The goods were 100% destuffed from the Container and examined at M/s. INDEV INFRA PRIVATE LIMITED, SEZ Unit, Mundra in the presence of Shri Dinesh Kumar, Manager at INDEV INFRA PRIVATE LIMITED and Shri Zala Dipaksinh Sabalsinh, authorised representative of the importer. This clearly establishes that there was mis-declaration in terms of weighment of the goods.

13.3 I find that since the goods found on examination differ from the declared goods in terms of weighment, the declared value cannot be accepted as the true transaction value. The value declared by the importer does not appear to be the true transaction value under the provisions of Section 14 of the Customs Act, 1962 read with the provisions of the Customs Valuation (Determination of Value of Imported Goods) Rules, 2007.

13.4 I find that as per Rule 12 of CVR, 2007, when the proper officer has reason to doubt the truth or accuracy of the value declared in relation to any imported goods, and after receiving further information or in the absence of a response, the proper officer still has reasonable doubt about the truth or accuracy of the value so declared, it shall be deemed that the transaction value of such imported goods cannot be determined under the provisions of sub-rule (1) of rule 3. In the present case, the discrepancies found during examination give sufficient reason to doubt the declared value.

13.5 I find that as per Rule 3(4) of CVR, 2007, if the value cannot be determined under the provisions of sub-rule (1), the value shall be determined by proceeding sequentially through Rules 4 to 9. The subject consignment comprises unbranded items of China origin and in the absence of credible data of import of similar/identical goods due to the nature and quality of goods and other constraints, the value of these goods cannot be determined under Rules 4 to 8 of CVR, 2007.

13.6 I find that accordingly, the value is to be determined under Rule 9 (Residual method) of CVR, 2007. The empanelled Chartered Engineer Er. Ajayrajsinh Baldevsinh Jhala was engaged for valuation purposes and vide CE Opinion Certificate Ref:-ABJ:INSP:CE:MUN:SIIB:NS:RTC:25-26:01 dated 16.02.2026, has provided the valuation of the goods. The Chartered Engineer, based on random physical and visual examination of the goods and their present condition and quality, has determined that the total suggestive CIF value of the goods is **Rs. 17,35,937/-**. The importer vide their email dated 18.02.2026 has accepted the Chartered Engineer's valuation report.

13.7 I find that the declared assessable value was **Rs. 13,81,844/-**, whereas the re-determined assessable value as per the Chartered Engineer's report is **Rs. 17,35,937/-**, showing an undervaluation of Rs. 3,54,093/-. This undervaluation, coupled with mis-declaration in weighment, clearly establishes that the declared value is not acceptable.

13.8 In view of the above, I hold that the declared assessable value of **Rs. 13,81,844/-** is liable to be rejected under Rule 12 of CVR, 2007 and the value is re-determined at **Rs. 17,35,937/-** in terms of Rule 9 of CVR, 2007 based on the Chartered Engineer's valuation report dated 16.02.2026.

14.1 Regarding the second issue, I find that Section 17(4) of the Customs Act, 1962 provides that *"where it is found on verification, examination or testing of the goods or otherwise that the self-assessment is not done correctly, the proper officer may, without prejudice to any other action which may be taken under this Act, re-assess the duty leviable on such goods."* In the present case, I find that the self-assessment is incorrect as it is based on incorrect weighment and undervalued goods. The declared value has been rejected and re-determined as **Rs. 17,35,937/-** as discussed above. The duty liability needs to be re-calculated based on the re-determined assessable value.

14.2 I find that as per the re-determined assessable value of Rs. 17,35,937/-, the duty liability is as follows:

Item Description	Total Re-determined Value (In Rs.)	Re-determined Duty (In Rs.)	Declared Duty (In Rs.)	Differential Duty (In Rs.)
All Items as per Table-D, supra	17,35,937/-	4,81,462/-	3,83,254/-	98,208/-

14.3 Therefore, I hold that the self-assessment done by the importer under Section 17(1) is liable to be rejected and Bill of Entry No. 7233257 dated 31.01.2026 needs to be re-assessed under Section 17(4) of the Customs Act, 1962 and the total re-determined duty liability is Rs. 4,81,462/- as against the declared duty of Rs. 3,83,254/-, resulting in differential duty of **Rs. 98,208/-**.

15.1 Regarding the third issue, I find that Section 111(l) of the Customs Act, 1962 provides for confiscation of *"any dutiable or prohibited goods which are not included or are in excess of those included in the entry made under this Act, or in the case of baggage in the declaration made under section 77."* In the present case, I find that the gross weight of goods found during examination was 26,770 Kgs as against the declared gross weight of 26,350 Kgs an excess of 420 Kgs. To this extent, the goods are liable for confiscation under Section 111(l) of the Customs Act, 1962.

15.2 I find that Section 111(m) of the Customs Act, 1962 provides for confiscation of *"any goods which do not correspond in respect of value or in any other particular with the entry made under this Act or in the case of baggage with the declaration made under Section 77 in respect thereof, or in the case of goods under transshipment, with the declaration for transshipment referred to in the proviso to sub-section (1) of section 54."* In the present case, I find that the goods do not correspond with the entry made in the Bill of Entry in respect of value, as the declared assessable value of Rs. 13,81,844/- has been found to be significantly lower than the re-determined assessable value of Rs. 17,35,937/-. I find that the importer has violated Section 46(4) of the Customs Act, 1962 by not making a true declaration as to the contents of the Bill of Entry. Further, the importer has violated Section 46(4A) of the Customs Act, 1962 by not ensuring the accuracy and completeness of the information given in the Bill of Entry.

15.3 I find that the importer's acts of omission and commission have rendered the goods liable to confiscation. The mis-declaration in weighment and significant undervaluation collectively establish that the goods do not correspond with the entry made under the Act. Therefore, I hold that the goods imported vide Bill of Entry No. 7233257 dated 31.01.2026 having re-determined assessable value of Rs. 17,35,937/- are liable for confiscation under **Section 111(l)** and **Section 111(m)** of the Customs Act, 1962.

15.4 Further, I note that as per Section 125(1) of the Customs Act, 1962, in case of confiscation of goods other than prohibited goods, an option to pay fine in lieu of confiscation shall be given to the owner. In the present case, since the imported goods are not prohibited goods, I find it appropriate to give the importer an option to redeem the confiscated goods on payment of appropriate redemption fine under **Section 125** of the Customs Act, 1962.

16.1 Regarding the fourth issue, I find that Section 112(a)(ii) of the Customs Act, 1962 provides for penalty in the case of dutiable goods, other than prohibited goods, on 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. In the present case, I find that the importer has imported mis-declared and undervalued goods with differential duty liability of **Rs. 98,208/-**. The importer's acts of declaring incorrect weighment and significantly undervaluing the goods have rendered the goods liable to confiscation under Section 111(l) and Section 111(m) of the Customs Act, 1962. These acts of omission and commission attract penalty under **Section 112(a)(ii)** of the Customs Act, 1962.

16.2 I find that Section 114AA provides for penalty for "use of false and incorrect material". In the present case, I find that the importer knowingly suppressed material facts regarding the actual particulars of the goods, including mis-declaring the weighment and significantly undervaluing the goods. The importer declared a total weight of 26350 Kgs whereas the actual weight found during examination was 26770 Kgs, and declared an assessable value of Rs. 13,81,844/- as against the re-determined value of Rs. 17,35,937/-, which are material particulars affecting both duty liability and assessment. This suppression of material facts regarding weighment and significant undervaluation of Rs. 3,54,093/- constitutes use of false and incorrect material particulars in documents filed for Customs purposes, thereby attracting penalty under **Section 114AA** of the Customs Act, 1962.

16.3 Therefore, I find that penalties under Sections **112(a)(ii)** and **114AA** of the Customs Act, 1962 are imposable upon the importer M/s. ROHIT TRADING & COMPANY.

ORDER

17. In view of the foregoing discussion and findings, I pass the following order:

(i) I order to reject the declared assessable value of **Rs. 13,81,844/-** in respect of goods covered under SEZ Z-Type Bill of Entry No. 7233257 dated 31.01.2026 under Rule 12 of the Customs Valuation (Determination of Value of Imported Goods) Rules, 2007 and order re-determination of assessable value at **Rs. 17,35,937/-** (Rupees Seventeen Lakh Thirty Five Thousand Nine Hundred Thirty Seven Only) in terms of Rule 9 of CVR, 2007;

(ii) I reject the self-assessment of Bill of Entry No. 7233257 dated 31.01.2026 and order to re-assess the same under Section 17(4) of the Customs Act, 1962. The differential duty on the imported goods comes out to **Rs. 98,208/-** (Rupees Ninety Eight Thousand Two Hundred Eight Only);

(iii) I order to confiscate the imported goods covered under Bill of Entry No. 7233257 dated 31.01.2026 having re-determined assessable value of **Rs. 17,35,937/-** (Rupees Seventeen Lakh Thirty Five Thousand Nine Hundred Thirty Seven Only), under **Sections 111(l)** and **111(m)** of the Customs Act, 1962. However, I give option to the importer to redeem the said goods for home consumption under **Section 125** of Customs Act, 1962 on payment of Redemption Fine of **Rs. 1,73,000/-** (Rupees One Lakh Seventy Three Thousand Only);

(iv) I impose penalty of **Rs. 9,000/-** (Rupees Nine Thousand Only) on the importer M/s. ROHIT TRADING & COMPANY under **Section 112(a)(ii)** of Customs Act, 1962;

(v) I impose penalty of **Rs. 25,000/-** (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand Only) on the importer M/s. ROHIT TRADING & COMPANY under Section **114AA** of Customs Act, 1962.

18. This order is issued without prejudice to any other action that may be taken against the importer or any other person under the provisions of the Customs Act, 1962 or any other law for the time being in force in the Republic of India.

(Dipak Zala)
Additional Commissioner of Customs
Custom House, Mundra

To,

M/s. ROHIT TRADING & COMPANY (IEC No. CRMPR7847B)
F/F PVT NO-4, 3281, RAJA WALI PIPAL, MAHADEV,
NEW DELHI - 110006

Copy to:

1. The Deputy Commissioner, SIIB, Customs House, Mundra
2. The Deputy Commissioner, Review, Customs House, Mundra
3. The Deputy Commissioner, TRC, Custom House, Mundra
4. The Deputy Commissioner, EDI, Customs House, Mundra
5. The Deputy Commissioner, APSEZ, Mundra
6. Guard File