



सीमाशुल्क(अपील) आयुक्तकाकार्यालय,
OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER OF CUSTOMS (APPEALS), अहमदाबाद AHMEDABAD,
चौथी मंज़िल 4th Floor, हडकोभवन HUDCO Bhavan, ईश्वर भुवन रोड IshwarBhuvan Road,
नवरंगपुरा Navrangpura, अहमदाबाद Ahmedabad – 380 009
दूरभाषक्रमांक Tel. No. 079-26589281

DIN - 20250971MN000000A616

क	फ़ाइलसंख्या FILE NO.	S/49-01/CUS/AHD/2025-26
ख	अपीलआदेशसंख्या ORDER-IN-APPEAL NO. (सीमाशुल्कअधिनियम, 1962 कीधारा 128केअंतर्गत)(UNDER SECTION 128A OF THE CUSTOMS ACT, 1962) :	AHD-CUSTM-000-APP-256-25-26
ग	पारितकर्ता PASSED BY	Shri Amit Gupta Commissioner of Customs (Appeals), Ahmedabad
घ	दिनांक DATE	15.09.2025
ङ	उद्भूतअपीलआदेशकीसं. वदिनांक ARISING OUT OF ORDER-IN-ORIGINAL NO.	14/AB/ADC/SRT-AIRPT/2024-25 dated 27.12.2024
च	अपीलआदेशजारीकरनेकीदिनांक ORDER-IN-APPEAL ISSUED ON:	15.09.2025
छ	अपीलकर्ताकानामवपता NAME AND ADDRESS OF THE APPELLANT:	Smt Sakina Asadali Noorani, Resi- Flat No. 302, Fazalbhair Manzil, Station Road, Matwa Chowk, Bhavnagar Gujarat-364001.



1.	यहप्रतिउसव्यक्तिकेनिजीउपयोगकेलिएमुफ्तमेंदीजातीहैजिनकेनामयहजारीकियागयाहै. This copy is granted free of cost for the private use of the person to whom it is issued.
2.	सीमाशुल्कअधिनियम 1962 कीधारा 129 डीडी (1) (यथासंशोधित) केअधीननिम्नलिखितश्रेणियोंकेमामलोंकेसम्बन्धमेंकोईव्यक्तिइसआदेशसेअपनेकोआहतमहसूसकरताहोतोइसआदेशकीप्राप्तिकीतारीखसे 3 महीनेकेअंदरअपरसचिव/संयुक्तसचिव

	(आवेदनसंशोधन), वित्तमंत्रालय, (राजस्वविभाग) संसदमार्ग, 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 गए माल या उस गन्तव्य स्थान पर उतारे जाने के लिए अपेक्षित माल उतारे 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)	सीमा शुल्क 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 उसके साथ निम्नलिखित का गजात 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 सीमा शुल्क अधिनियम, 1962 (यथा संशोधित) में निर्धारित फीस जो अन्य सी.डी. फीस, दण्ड, जब्ती और विविध मदों के शीर्षक के अधीन आता है में रु. 200/- (रूपए दो सौ मात्र) या रु. 1000/- (रूपए एक हजार मात्र), जैसा भी मामला हो, से सम्बन्धित भुगतान के प्रमाणिक चलान टी.आर.6 की दो प्रतियां। यदि शुल्क, मांगा गया ब्याज, 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 सीमा शुल्क अधिनियम 1962 की धारा 129 ए (1) के अधीन फॉर्म सी.ए.-3 में सीमा शुल्क, 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 :
सीमा शुल्क, केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क व सेवा कर अपील अधिकरण, पश्चिमी क्षेत्रीय पीठ	Customs, Excise & Service Tax Appellate Tribunal, West Zonal Bench



	दूसरीमंज़िल,बहुमालीभवन,निकटगिरधरनगरपुल,असारवा,अहमदाबाद-380016	2 nd Floor, Bahumali Bhavan, Nr. Girdhar Nagar Bridge, Asarwa, Ahmedabad-380 016
5.	सीमाशुल्कअधिनियम, 1962 कीधारा 129 ए (6) केअधीन,सीमाशुल्कअधिनियम, 1962 कीधारा 129 ए(1)केअधीनअपीलकेसाथनिम्नलिखितशुल्कसंलग्नहोनेचाहिए-	
	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 -	
(क)	अपीलसेसम्बन्धितमामलेमेंजहांकिसीसीमाशुल्कअधिकारीद्वारामांगागयाशुल्कऔरव्याजतथालगायागयादंडकीरकमपाँचलाखरूपएयाउससेकमहोतोएकहज़ाररूपए.	
(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;	
(ख)	अपीलसेसम्बन्धितमामलेमेंजहांकिसीसीमाशुल्कअधिकारीद्वारामांगागयाशुल्कऔरव्याजतथालगायागयादंडकीरकमपाँचलाखरूपएसेअधिकहोलेकिनरुपयेपचासलाखसेअधिकनहोतो;पाँचहज़ाररूपए	
(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 ;	
(ग)	अपीलसेसम्बन्धितमामलेमेंजहांकिसीसीमाशुल्कअधिकारीद्वारामांगागयाशुल्कऔरव्याजतथालगायागयादंडकीरकमपचासलाखरूपएसेअधिकहोतो;दसहज़ाररूपए.	
(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	
(घ)	इसआदेशकेविरुद्धअधिकरणकेसामने,मांगेगएशुल्कके 10% अदाकरनेपर,जहांशुल्कयाशुल्कएवंदंडविवादमेंहैं,यादंडके 10%अदाकरनेपर,जहांकेवलदंडविवादमेंहैं,अपीलरखाजाएगा।	
(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.	
6.	उक्तअधिनियमकीधारा 129 (ए) केअन्तर्गतअपीलप्राधिकरणकेसमक्षदायरप्रत्येकआवेदनपत्र- (क) रोकआदेशकेलिएगलतियोंकोसुधारनेकेलिएयाकिसीअन्यप्रयोजनकेलिएकिएगएअपील : - अथवा (ख) अपीलयाआवेदनपत्रकाप्रत्यावर्तनकेलिएदायरआवेदनकेसाथरुपयेपाँचसौकाशुल्कभीसंलग्नहोनेचाहिए.	
	Under section 129 (a) of the said Act, every application made before the Appellate Tribunal- (a) in an appeal for grant of stay or for rectification of mistake or for any other purpose; or (b) for restoration of an appeal or an application shall be accompanied by a fee of five Hundred rupees.	



ORDER-IN-APPEAL

Smt Sakina Asadali Noorani, Resi- Flat No. 302, Fazalbhair Manzil, Station Road, Matwa Chowk, Bhavnagar Gujarat-364001 (hereinafter referred to as "the appellant") has filed the present appeal in terms of Section 128 of the Customs Act, 1962 against Order in Original No. 14/AB/ADC/SRT-AIRPT/2024-25 dated 27.12.2024 (hereinafter referred to as "the impugned order") passed by the Additional Commissioner, Customs, Surat Airport, Surat, (hereinafter referred to as "the adjudicating authority").

2. Briefly stated, facts of the case are that on the basis of profiling, the appellant having Indian Passport No. B6649448 was intercepted by the officers of Customs, Air Intelligence Unit (hereinafter referred to as "AIU") on arrival at Surat International Airport, Surat from Sharjah by Air India Express Flight No IX 172 on 22.11.2023 while she was attempting to exit through green channel without making any declaration to the Customs. The appellant was asked by the AIU Officers whether she had made any declarations to customs authorities for dutiable goods/items or wanted to declare any dutiable goods/items before customs authorities to which she replied in negative. Upon frisking and physical search of the appellant, one Mangalsutra with two Earrings, two bangles and two rings, which appeared to be made of gold, were recovered from her possession.

2.1 Thereafter, the Customs officers scanned the baggages of the appellant through the XBIS Scanner machine located in the arrival hall of the Surat Airport. When the pink coloured backpack was passed through the XBIS scanner machine, an image showing electronic items was seen in the scanner machine. Thereafter, the said pink coloured backpack was opened and the following dutiable items were recovered therein:

Sr No	Details Of Articles Recovered	Quantity (Nos.)	Value (in Rs)
01	HP elitebook core 15 8th gen Laptop	02	90,464/- x 2 =1,80,928/-
02	I Phone 14 pro 128 GB Mobile	01	1,29,900/-

On being asked, the appellant stated that the above electronic items (laptops and mobile) were given to her by a person at Sharjah airport with the instruction to hand over the same to a person who would contact her outside Surat International Airport. The appellant also informed that the said items were not for her personal use.



2.2 The Government Approved Valuer Shri Vikasraj Juneja, after testing the said items, valuation certificate No. 20/2023 dated 23.11.2023 certifying the market value of the aforesaid gold jewellery totally weighing 221.290 grams is Rs. 13,86,758/- and its tariff value is Rs. 11,68,190/- as per Notification No. 82/2023-Cus (NT) dated 15.11.2023 and 84/2023-Cus (NT) dated 16.11.2023.

2.3 The aforesaid electronic items viz, 02 HP elitebook core 15 8th gen laptops having market value of Rs. 1,80,928/, 01 Iphone 14 pro 128 GB mobile having market value of Ra 1,29,900/- and gold jewellery viz, 01 gold mangalsutra with 02 carrings, 02 gold rings and 02 gold bangles, totally weighing 221.290 grams having market value of Rs 13,86,758 and tariff value of Rs 11,68,190/- were brought/ smuggled into India without declaring the same to the Customs authorities with an intent to evade payment of Customs duty in violation of the provisions of Customs Act, 1962. Therefore, the officers placed the above said goods under seizure under Section 110 of the Customs Act 1962 vide Seizure order dated 23 11.2023 under Panchnama dated 22/23.11.2023, on reasonable belief that the same were attempted in be smuggled into by the appellant and therefore were liable for confiscation under provisions of the Customs Act, 1962.


2.4 Statement of the appellant was recorded on 23.11.2023 under Section 108 of the Customs Act,1962, wherein she, inter-alia, stated that that this was her first visit to Dubai and she had gone there alongwith her husband for honeymoon. She further stated that one person named Mr. Shafin had met her and her husband at Sharjah airport and asked them that if they could carry a bag and some gold ornaments to Surat in lieu of some money, to which they agreed. Mr. Shafin handed over one bag containing above mentioned items and told that someone would call them at airport after reaching Surat and they had to hand over these items to that person. Mr. Shafin made payment of Rs. 20,000/- in cash to her and her husband for supplying these items to India. She wore the said ornaments and hid them under the clothes. she was aware that import of gold and other items mentioned above without payment of Customs duty was an offence, but she had intention to smuggle these items without payment of duty; that as she intended to smuggle these items (gold jewellery), she hid the same under her clothes and did not declare the same before Custom Officer.

2.5 The appellant had had actively involved herself into smuggling of gold jewellery ie. 01 gold mangalsutra with 02 earrings, 02 gold rings and 02 gold bangles totally weighing 221.290 grams having market value of Rs.

13,86,758/- and tariff value of Rs. 11,68,190/- as well as electronic items viz, 02 HP elitebook core 15 8th gen laptops having market value of Rs 1,80,928/ and 01 Iphone 14 pro 128 GB mobile having market value of Rs. 1,29,900/- into India. The appellant had improperly imported the said goods concealed in her baggage/in-person without declaring it to the Customs authorities, with a deliberate and mala fide intention to evade the payment of Customs duty and fraudulently circumventing the restrictions and prohibitions Imposed under the Customs Act, 1962 and other allied Acts, Rules and Regulations. The gold jewellery illicitly imported by her without declaration made before the proper officer of Customs with a view to smuggling the same in lieu of monetary consideration cannot be treated as bona fide household goods or personal effects. The appellant had thus contravened the provisions of Foreign Trade Policy 2015-20/2023 and Section 11(1) of the Foreign Trade (Development and Regulation) Act, 1992 read with Section 3(2) and 3(3) of the Foreign Trade (Development and Regulation) Act, 1992 and DGFT Notification No. 36/2015-2020 dated 18.12.2019. The electronic items so imported were also not for personal use but were smuggled for monetary consideration and hence the same also cannot be treated as bonafide household goods or personal effects.

2.6 The appellant had also contravened Section 77 of the Customs Act, 1962 read with Regulation 3 of the Customs Baggage Declaration Regulations, 2013 in as much as she did not declare the contents of the baggage to the Customs officer at Surat International Airport. The impugned goods improperly imported by the appellant by concealing in her baggage/in-person without declaring it to the Customs was thus liable for confiscation under Section 111(d), 111(i) and 111(j) read with Section 2(22), & 2(39) of the Customs Act, 1962 and further read in conjunction with Section 11(3) of the Customs Act, 1962. As per Section 123 of the Customs Act 1962, the burden of proving that the said goods improperly imported without declaring it to the Customs, were not smuggled goods, was upon the appellant. Thus, the appellant, by the above-described acts of omission and commission on her part had rendered herself liable to penalty under Section 112 of the Customs Act, 1962.

2.7 A Show Cause Notice was issued to the appellant proposing for confiscation of One gold Mangalsutra with Two earrings, two rings and two Gold Bangles of purity 99% totally weighing 221.290 grams having market value of Rs. 13,86,758/- and tariff value of Rs. 11,68,190/- recovered from her and seized vide Seizure order dated 23.11.2023 under Panchnama dated 22/23.11.2023 under Section 111(d), 111(i) and 111(j) of the Customs Act, 1962, for confiscation of two HP elitebook core 15 8th gen



laptops having Market value of Rs. 1,80,928/- and 01 Iphone 14 pro 128 GB mobile having market value of Rs. 1,29,900/- recovered from her and seized vide Seizure order dated 23.11.2023 under Panchnama dated 22/23.11.2023 under Section 111(d), 111(i) and 111(j) of the Customs Act, 1962 and for imposition of penalty upon the appellant under Section 112 of the Customs Act, 1962.

2.8 The Adjudicating authority, vide the impugned order, has ordered for

(i) absolute confiscation of impugned gold items i.e. One gold Mangalsutra with Two earrings, two rings and two Gold Bangles of purity 99% totally weighing 221.290 grams having market value of Rs. 13,86,758/- and tariff value of Rs. 11,68,190/- recovered from her and seized vide Seizure order dated 23.11.2023 under Panchnama dated 22/23.11.2023 under Section 111(d), 111(i) and 111(j) of the Customs Act, 1962. The adjudicating authority has also imposed penalty of Rs. 13,86,758/- on the appellant under Section 112 (b)(i) of the Customs Act, 1962.

(ii) unconditional release of one HP elitebook core 15 8th gen Laptop having market value of Rs. 90,464/-.

(iii) confiscation of the one HP elitebook core 15 8th gen Laptop having market value of Rs. 90,464/- and 01 Iphone 14 pro 128 GB mobile having market value of Rs. 1,29,900/-, seized under panchnama dated 22/23.11.2023 under Sections 111(i) and 111 (j) of the Customs Act 1962 and also gave an option to redeem the same on payment of redemption fine of Rs. 55,091/- under Section 125(1) of the Customs Act, 1962. In addition to redemption fine, the appellant would also be liable for payment of Customs duty alongwith interest and other charges in terms of Section 125(2) of the Customs Act, 1962. The adjudicating authority has also imposed penalty of Rs. 8,484/- on the appellant under Section 112 (b)(ii) of the Customs Act, 1962.

3. Being aggrieved with the impugned order, the appellant has filed the present appeal and mainly contended that;

- As regards confiscation of the goods under Section 125 of the Customs Act 1962, the Ld. Adjudicating Authority, while admitting that there is no option to the Adjudicating Authority if the goods are not prohibited, but to release the goods on payment of redemption fine, and if the goods are prohibited he has a discretion to either release the goods on payment of redemption fine or confiscate the



goods absolutely. The case laws relied upon by the adjudicating authority are not applicable in the facts and circumstances of the case.

- A reading of Paras of the findings of the adjudicating authority clearly shows that the adjudicating Authority was pre-decided to absolutely confiscate the gold in question, without applying himself to the crucial fact that he had a discretion to either permit release of gold on Redemption fine or absolutely confiscate them only when the goods were "prohibited". Though not admitting, even if for a moment it is presumed that the goods in question were prohibited, the Ld. Adjudicating Authority is required to exercise his discretion and how such discretion is to be exercised is laid down in the case of Commissioner of Customs (Air) vs P.Sinnasamy in CMA No.1638 of 2008, before the Hon High Court of Madras decided on 23 August, 2016.
- In the instant case it is very clear that the Ld. Adjudicating Authority started on a wrong premise of the fact that the Appellant in this case is a smuggler, and that he has concealed the gold in this case, all of which are erroneous findings as discussed above. Taking into consideration these erroneous findings, the Ld. Adjudicating Authority has got biased and decided that the gold in question should be absolutely confiscated and penalty imposed.
- There are plethora of Judgements both for and against the release of gold seized in Customs Cases. A combined reading of all the cases with specific reference to the policy/Rules in vogue at the relevant times, will show that depending on circumstances of each case in hand and the profile of the person involved, the goods in question may become "Prohibited" which are otherwise not listed in the prohibited categories. However, despite the goods being prohibited the same can be released or re-exported in the discretion of the Adjudicating Authority, which discretion has to be exercised as per the canons laid down by the Hon. Apex Court as discussed above. In this connection, following case laws are submitted relied upon by the appellant: -
 - (i) Yakub Ibrahim Yousuf 2011 (263) ELT-685 (Tri. Mum) and subsequently 2014-TIOL-277-CESTST-MUM.
 - (ii) ShaikJameel Pasha Vs Govt of India 1997 (91) ELT 277 (AP);
 - (iii) V.P. Hamid vs Commissioner of Customs, 1994(73)ELT 425 (Tri);



(iv) T.Elavarasan vs Commissioner of Customs(Airport) Chennai 2011 (266) ELT 167 (Mad);

(v) Union of India Vs Dhanak M. Ramji 2009 (248) ELT 127 (Bom); upheld by Hon. Supreme Court vide its judgement dated 08-03-2010, reported in 2010 (252) ELT A102 (SC)

(vi) A.Rajkumari vs CC (Chennai) 2015 (321) ELT 540 (Tri-Chennai); This case was also affirmed by the Hon. Apex Court vide 2015 (321) ELT A207 (SC).

- It is also submitted that impugned goods are not prohibited for use by the society at large and release of the same will not cause to the society and its import and / or redemption would not be dangerous or detrimental to health, welfare or morals of the people, in any circumstances.
- There is a catena of cases where the orders of absolute confiscation were successfully challenged and gold released either for re-export or on redemption fine u/s 125 of Customs Act 1962. Some of the judgements can be cited as under:
 1. S Rajgopal vs CC Trichy 2007 (219) ELT 435
 2. P.Sinnaswamy vs CC Chennai 2007 (220) ELT 308
 3. M.Arumugam vs CC Thiruchirapally 2007 (220) ELT 311
 4. Krishna Kumari vs CC Chennai 2008 (229) ELT 222.
- Following are the list of latest revision authority's orders relied upon by the appellant:

1. Order No: 58/2020-CUS(WZ)/ASRA/MUMBAI, DT. 21.05.2020 IN C/A/ Commissioner, Customs, Ahmedabad v/s ShabbirTaherallyUdaipurwala

3. Order No: 61/2020-CUS(WZ)/ASRA/MUMBAI, DT. 21.05.2020 in c/a Commissioner, Customs, Ahmedabad v/s Basheer Mohammed Mansuri

4. Order No: 126/2020 CUS(WZ)/ASRA/MUMBAI, DT. 07.08.2020 in c/a Commissioner, Customs, Ahmedabad v/s Hemant Kumar.

5. Order No: 123-124/2020-CUS(WZ)/ASRA/MUMBAI, DT.07.08.2020 in c/a Commissioner, Customs, Ahmedabad v/s Rajesh Bhimji Panchal.



6. 2019(369) E.L.T.1677(G.O.I) in c/a Ashok Kumar Verma.

7. Order No: 10/2019 CUS(WZ)/ASRA/MUMBAI, DT. 30.09.2021 in c/a FaithimthRaseea Mohammad v/s Commissioner of Customs CSI Airport Mumbai.

8. Order No. 243 & 244/2022 CUS(WZ)/ASRA/MUMBAI, DT 24.08.2022 in c/a (1) PradipSevantilal Shah (2) Rajesh Bhikhabhai Patel V/s. Pr. Commissioner of Customs, Ahmedabad.

- Coming to the penalties imposed it may be stated that since the goods in question were not prohibited, the penalty under section 112 (a) and (b) of Customs Act 1962 could not have been more than the duty involved which in this case is Rs. 13,86.758/- on the appellant.
- The appellant finally prayed for release the goods absolutely confiscated on payment of redemption fine or allow for re export and reduction in penalty.

4. Shri Rishikesh Mehra, Advocate, appeared for personal hearing on 07.08.2025 on behalf of the appellant. He reiterated the submissions made in the appeal memorandum. The advocate during personal hearing submitted that he is only contesting for absolute confiscation of gold items and related penalty and also relied upon the following case laws:

(i) OIA No. AHD-CUSTM-000-APP-332-23-24 Dated 13.12.2023 In c/a Mr. Kachhadia Mahipal Vitthalbhai V/s. Additional Commissioner of Customs Ahmedabad. (Rhodium coated Gold Case granted RF, PP).

(ii) OIA No. AHD-CUSTM-000-APP-364-23-24 DT 10.01.2024 IN c/a Mr. Ankit Kamleshkumar Shah V/s Commissioner of Customs (Appeals), Ahmedabad. (Gold Case granted RF, PP).

(iii) OIA No. AHD-CUSTM-000-APP-176-23-24 DT 25.09.2023 IN c/a Ms. Shaikh Anisa Mohammed Amin V/s Commissioner of Customs (Appeals), Ahmedabad. (Ingenious Concealment in Gold Dust/Paste Case granted RF, PP).

(iv) OIA No. AHD-CUSTM-000-APP-179-23-24 DT 26.09.2023 in c/a Mr. Shaikh Imran Abdul Salam V/s Commissioner of Customs (Appeals), Ahmedabad. (Ingenious Concealment in Gold Dust/Paste Case granted RF, PP).



(v) OIA No. AHD-CUSTOM-000-APP-161-24-25 DT 26.07.2024 in c/a Mr. Subhan Gulab Pathan V/s Commissioner of Customs (Appeals), Ahmedabad. (Ingenious Concealment in Gold Dust/Paste Case granted RF, PP).

(vi) Order No 140/2021 CUS(WZ)/ASRA/MUMBAI DT.25.06.2021 in c/a Mohammed Gulfam v/s Commissioner of Customs Ahmedabad. (Ingenious Concealed Rectum Case granted RF, PP).

(vii) Order No: 245/2021 CUS(WZ)/ASRA/MUMBAI DT.29.09.2021 in c/a Memon Anjum v/s Commissioner of Customs Ahmedabad.(Ingenious Concealed Silver Coated Case granted RF, PP).

(viii) Order No. 380/2022-CUS(WZ)/ASRA/MUMBAI DT 14.12.2022 in c/a Mr. Mohammad Murad Motiwala V/s. Pr. Commissioner of Customs, CSI Airport, Mumbai. (Ingenious Concealment in Gold Dust/Paste Case granted RF, PP).

(ix) Order No. 243 & 244/2022 CUS(WZ)/ASRA/MUMBAI DT 24.08.2022 in c/a (1) Pradip Sevantilal Shah (2) Rajesh Bhikhabhai Patel V/s. Pr. Commissioner of Customs, Ahmedabad. (Ingenious Concealment Silver/Rhodium Coated Case granted RF, PP).

(x) Order No. 516-517/2023-CUS(WZ)/ASRA/MUMBAI DT 30.06.2023 in c/a (1) Saba Parveen Irfan Khan (2) Anwar M.T. V/s. Pr. Commissioner of Customs, CSI Airport, Mumbai. (Ingenious Concealment in Gold Dust/Paste 1478.3415 grams Case granted RF, PP).



(xi) Order No. 907-909/2023-CUS(WZ)/ASRA/MUMBAI DT 12.12.2023 in c/a (1) Mr. Shahrukkhan Muniruddin Pathan (2) Mr. Rushabhbhai Pravinbhai Goswami (3) Mr. Mahendrasinh Zala V/s. Pr. Commissioner of Customs, SVPI Airport, Ahmedabad. (Gold Weighing 1778.980 grams Case granted on RF, PP).

(xii) Customs, Excise & Service Tax Appellate Tribunal (WZ) Bench at Ahmedabad. (Customs Appeal No. 11971 of 2016-SM) Final Order No. 10254/2024 dated 29.01.2024 Shri Lookman

Handwritten signature or initials.

Mohamed Yusuf V/S. CC- Ahmedabad (Ingenious Concealment Gold Case of 4999.180 grams granted RF, PP).

5. Before going into the merits of the case, I find that the appeal filed by the appellant, have been filed beyond normal period of 60 days but within the condonable period of 30 days as stipulated under Section 128(1) of the Customs Act, 1962. Appellant has requested for condoning the delay in filing the said appeals on the grounds that she was out of station and her health was also not good causing delay in filing the appeals. Therefore, taking a lenient view to meet the ends of justice, I allow the appeal, as admitted condoning the delay in filing the appeal beyond the normal period of 60 days under proviso to the Section 128(1) of the Customs Act, 1962.

6. It is observed from the grounds of appeal that the appellant is only contesting for absolute confiscation of gold items and related penalty. Therefore, my findings will be restricted for absolute confiscation of gold items and related penalty. I have gone through the facts of the case available on record, grounds of appeal and submission made by the appellant at the time of personal hearing. It is observed that the issues to be decided in the present appeal are as under;

(a) Whether the impugned order directing absolute confiscation of the impugned gold items i.e. One gold Mangalsutra with Two earrings, two rings and two Gold Bangles of purity 99% totally weighing 221.290 grams having market value of Rs. 13,86,758/- and tariff value of Rs. 11,68,190/- without giving option for redemption under Section 125(1) of Customs Act, 1962, in the facts and circumstances of the case, is legal and proper or otherwise;

(b) Whether the quantum of penalty amounting to Rs. 13,86,758/- imposed on the appellant, under Section 112(b)(i) of the Customs Act, 1962, in the facts and circumstances of the case, is legal and proper or otherwise.

6.1 It is observed that that on the basis of profiling, the appellant having Indian Passport No. B6649448 was intercepted by the officers of Customs, Air Intelligence Unit (hereinafter referred to as "AIU") on arrival at Surat International Airport, Surat from Sharjah by Air India Express Flight No IX 172 on 22.11.2023 while she was attempting to exit through green channel without making any declaration to the Customs. The appellant was asked by the AIU Officers whether she had made any declarations to customs authorities for dutiable goods/items or wanted to declare any dutiable goods/items before customs authorities to which she



replied in negative. Upon frisking and physical search of the appellant, one Mangalsutra with two Earrings, two bangles and two rings, which appeared to be made of gold, were recovered from her possession. The Government Approved Valuer Shri Vikasraj Juneja, after testing the said items, valuation certificate No. 20/2023 dated 23.11 2023 certifying the market value of the aforesaid gold jewellery totally weighing 221.290 grams is Rs. 13,86,758/- and its tariff value is Rs. 11,68,190/-. The appellant did not declare the said gold before Customs with an intention to escape payment of duty. These facts have also been confirmed in the statement of the appellant recorded under Section 108 of the Customs Act, 1962 on the same day. There is no disputing the facts that the appellant had not declared possession of gold at the time of his arrival in India. Thereby, she has violated the provisions of Section 77 of the Customs Act, 1962 read with Regulation 3 of the Customs Baggage Declaration Regulations, 2013. These facts are not disputed.

6.2 I find that it is undisputed that the appellant had not declared the seized gold to the Customs on her arrival in India. Further, in her statement, the appellant had admitted the knowledge, possession, carriage, non-declaration and recovery of the seized gold. The appellant had, in her confessional statement, accepted the fact of non-declaration of gold before Customs on arrival in India. Therefore, the confiscation of gold by the adjudicating authority was justified as the applicant had not declared the same as required under Section 77 of the Customs Act, 1962. Since the confiscation of the seized gold is upheld, the appellant had rendered herself liable for penalty under Section 112 of the Customs Act, 1962.

6.3 I have also perused the decision of the Government of India passed by the Principal Commissioner & ex officio Additional Secretary to the Government of India submitted by the appellant and other decisions also. I find that the Revisionary Authority has in all these cases taken similar view that failure to declare the gold and failure to comply with the prescribed conditions of import has made the impugned gold "prohibited" and therefore they are liable for confiscation and the appellant is consequently liable for penalty. Thus, it is held that the undeclared impugned gold items i.e. One gold Mangalsutra with Two earrings, two rings and two Gold Bangles of purity 99% totally weighing 221.290 grams having market value of Rs. 13,86,758/- and tariff value of Rs. 11,68,190/- are liable to confiscation and the appellant is also liable to penalty.



6.4 In this regard, I also rely the judgement of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Om Prakash Bhatia Vs Commissioner of Customs, Delhi 2003 (155) E.L.T. 423 (SC) wherein it is held that;

".....(a) if there is any prohibition of import or export of goods under the Act or any other law for the time being in force, it would be considered to be prohibited goods; and (b) this would not include any such goods in respect of which the conditions, subject to which the goods are imported or exported, have been complied with. This would mean that if the conditions prescribed for import or export of goods are not complied with, it would be considered to be prohibited goods. This would also be clear from Section 11 which empowers the Central Government to prohibit either 'absolutely' or 'subject to such conditions' to be fulfilled before or after clearance, as may be specified in the notification, the import or export of the goods of any specified description. The notification can be issued for the purposes specified in sub-section (2). Hence, prohibition of importation or exportation could be subject to certain prescribed conditions to be fulfilled before or after clearance of goods. If conditions are not fulfilled, it may amount to prohibited goods....."

It is apparent from the above judicial pronouncement that even though gold is not enumerated as prohibited goods under Section 11 of the Customs Act, 1962, but it is to be imported on fulfilment of certain conditions, still, if the conditions for such import are not complied with, then import of gold will fall under prohibited goods.

6.5 In respect of absolute confiscation of impugned gold items i.e. One gold Mangalsutra with Two earrings, two rings and two Gold Bangles of purity 99% totally weighing 221.290 grams having market value of Rs. 13,86,758/- and tariff value of Rs. 11,68,190/-, it is observed that the adjudicating authority in the instant case relying on the decisions of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Om Prakash Bhatia Vs Commissioner of Customs, Delhi 2003 (155) E.L.T. 423 (SC), Hon'ble Kerala High Court in the case of Abdul Razak [2012 (275) ELT 300 (Ker), Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the case of SamynathanMurugesan [2009 (247) ELT 21 (Mad)], Malabar Diamond Gallery Pvt. Ltd [2016-TIOL-1664-HC-MAD-CUS], Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the case of P Sinnasamy [2016 (344) ELT 1154 (Mad)], in paras 23 to 27 of the impugned order, had ordered for absolute confiscation of impugned gold items i.e. One gold Mangalsutra with Two earrings, two rings and two Gold Bangles of purity 99% totally weighing 221.290 grams having market value of Rs. 13,86,758/- and tariff value of Rs. 11,68,190/-.



6.6 I find that the Hon'ble CESTAT, Ahmedabad has in the case of Commr. of C. Ex., Cus. & S.T., Surat-II Vs Dharmesh Pansuriya [2018 (363) E.L.T. 555 (Tri- Ahmd)] considered the decision of Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the case of Commissioner of Customs (Air) Chennai-I Vs P. Sinnasamy [2016 (344) E.L.T. 1154 (Mad)] and the decision of Hon'ble High Court of Bombay in the case of Commissioner Vs Alfred Menezes [2009 (242) E.L.T. 334 (Bom)], and were of the view that in case of prohibited goods as defined under Customs Act, 1962, the adjudicating authority may consider imposition of fine and need not invariably direct absolute confiscation of the goods. The relevant paras are reproduced hereunder:

"8. It is the argument of the Revenue that under the aforesaid provision, once the goods in question are prohibited goods under the Act, no discretionary power is left with the adjudicating authority for imposition of fine. We are afraid that the said plea of the Revenue may not find support from the principle of law laid down by the Hon'ble Bombay High Court in the case of Alfred Menezes case (supra). Their Lordships after analyzing the said provision of Section 125 of the Customs Act observed as follows:

3. It is, therefore, clear that Section 125(1) deals with two situations (1) the importation and exportation of prohibited goods and (2) the importation and exportation of any other goods. Insofar as importation or exportation of prohibited goods, the expression used is that where the goods were confiscated, the officer "may". In the case of any other goods, which are confiscated, the officer "shall".

4. It is, therefore, clear that insofar as the prohibited goods are concerned, there is discretion in the officer to release the confiscated goods in terms as set out therein. Insofar as other goods are concerned, the officer is bound to release the goods. In the instant case, we are concerned with prohibited goods. The officer has exercised his discretion. The Tribunal [2009 (236) E.L.T. 587 (Tri. - Mum.)) has upheld the order of the adjudicating officer.

9. This principle is later followed by the Hon'ble Madras High Court recently in P. Sinnasamy's case (supra). Thus, in view of the aforesaid principle, even if the goods in question are considered as prohibited goods as defined under the Customs Act, the adjudicating authority may consider imposition of fine and need not invariably direct absolute confiscation of the goods. In these premises, thus to consider the issue raised at the bar that whether the gold bars removed from the Unit in SEZ without permission and contrary to the Circulars issued by RBI and Customs, became prohibited goods, or



AL

otherwise, in our view, becomes more an academic exercise and hence need not be resorted to.

10. The other argument advanced by the Ld. AR for the Revenue is that in view of the judgment of Hon'ble Madras High Court in P. Sinnasamy's case, discretion conferred under the provision cannot be arbitrary and it is to be exercised in judicious manner. From the finding of the Ld. Commissioner, we notice that even though he has not considered the goods as prohibited ones, observing it in the sense that these are not arms, ammunitions, narcotic substance, but after examining the fact that the gold bars were imported for its authorized use in the SEZ and after considering other extenuating circumstances, exercised discretion in directing confiscation of the gold bars removed unauthorizedly from the SEZ Unit with option to redeem the same on payment of fine. We find that in P. Sinnasamy's case (supra), the adjudicating authority has directed absolute confiscation of the gold smuggled into the country, which was set aside by the Tribunal, with a direction to the adjudicating authority to consider imposition of fine, which did not find favour from the Hon'ble High Court. Their Lordships observed that once the adjudicating authority has reasonably and correctly applied the discretion, it is not open to the Tribunal to give positive direction to the adjudicating authority to exercise option in a particular manner. Even though the facts and circumstances in the said case are different from the present one, inasmuch as in the said case the Commissioner has directed absolute confiscation, but in the present case option for payment of fine was extended by the Commissioner; however, the principle laid down therein is definitely applicable to the present case. Therefore, we do not find merit in the contention of the Revenue that the Adjudicating authority ought to have directed absolute confiscation of the seized goods."



6.7 I have also gone through the judgement of Hon'ble Tribunal in the case of Commissioner of Cus. &C.Ex., Nagpur-I Vs Mohd. Ashraf Armar [2019 (369) E.L.T. 1654 (Tri Mumbai)] wherein the Hon'ble Tribunal, after considering the decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Om Prakash Bhatia Vs Commissioner of Customs, Delhi 2003 (155) E.L.T. 423 (SC), has upheld the order of Commissioner (A) who set aside the order of absolute confiscation ordered by the adjudicating authority and allowed redemption of 1200.950 gm of concealed gold valued at Rs. 27,02,137/- on payment of fine of Rs 5,50,000/-. The relevant paras are reproduced hereunder:

"4. We have perused the case record as well as judgment passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, Delhi in Om Prakash Bhatia's case. Relevant interpretation of "prohibited goods", as made in para 9 of the said judgment is reproduced below for ready reference:

" From the aforesaid definition, it can be stated that (a) if there is any prohibition of import or export of goods under the Act or any other law for the time being in force, it would be considered to be prohibited goods; and (b) this would not include any such goods in respect of which the conditions, subject to which the goods are imported or exported, have been complied with. This would mean that if the conditions prescribed for import or export of goods are not complied with, it would be considered to be prohibited goods. This would also be clear from Section 11 which empowers the Central Government to prohibit either 'absolutely' or 'subject to such conditions' to be fulfilled before or after clearance, as may be specified in the notification, the import or export of the goods of any specified description. The notification can be issued for the purposes specified in sub-section (2). Hence, prohibition of importation or exportation could be subject to certain prescribed conditions to be fulfilled before or after clearance of goods. If conditions are not fulfilled, it may amount to prohibited goods. This is also made clear by this Court in Sheikh Mohd. Omer v. Collector of Customs, Calcutta and Others [(1970) 2 SCC 728] wherein it was contended that the expression 'prohibition' used in Section 111(d) must be considered as a total prohibition and that the expression does not bring within its fold the restrictions imposed by clause (3) of the Import (Control) Order, 1955. The Court negated the said contention and held thus: -

'...What clause (d) of Section 111 says is that any goods which are imported or attempted to be imported contrary to "any prohibition imposed by any law for the time being in force in this country" is liable to be confiscated. "Any prohibition" referred to in that section applies to every type of "prohibition". That prohibition may be complete or partial. Any restriction on import or export is to an extent a prohibition. The expression "any prohibition" in Section 111(d) of the Customs Act, 1962 includes restrictions. Merely because Section 3 of the Imports and Exports (Control) Act, 1947, uses three different expressions "prohibiting", "restricting" or "otherwise controlling", we cannot cut down the amplitude of the words "any prohibition" in Section 111(d) of the Act. "Any prohibition" means every prohibition. In other words all types of prohibitions. Restrictions is one type of prohibition. From item (I) of Schedule I, Part IV to Import (Control) Order, 1955, it is clear that



Handwritten signature or initials.

import of living animals of all sorts is prohibited. But certain exceptions are provided for. But nonetheless the prohibition continues”.

5. Going by the bare reading of the said interpretation, it can be said that in the definition of prohibited goods in terms of Section 2(33) of the Customs Act, 1962, any such goods means any such restricted and prohibited goods and not any other goods. It is in this contest the whole analyses of prohibited goods is made by the Hon'ble Apex Court and not in respect of any other goods other than prohibited and restricted goods. Gold being a permitted goods for importation, cannot be said to be restricted goods in applying such an interpretation but ceiling on the maximum quantity that could be imported could never be equated with restriction or prohibition to such importation. Admittedly, appellant's intention to evade duty by suppressing such import is apparent on record for which Commissioner (Appeals) has rightly confirmed fine and penalty under relevant provisions of the Customs Act but absolute confiscation of gold, which is permitted to be imported to India, solely on the ground that it was brought in concealment cannot be said to be in conformity to law or contradictory to decision of Hon'ble Apex Court given in Om Prakash Bhatia's case. Hence the order.

6. Appeal is dismissed and the Order-in-Original No. 1/SBA/JC/CUS/2014, dated 27-5-2014 passed by the Commissioner (Appeals) is hereby confirmed.”

6.8 It is further observed that in respect of absolute confiscation of gold bar, the judgment pronounced on 05.05.2023 in respect of Civil Misc. Review Application No. 156/2022 filed at Hon'ble High Court of Allahabad sitting at Lucknow, by the Commissioner of Customs, Lucknow is relevant wherein the Hon'ble High Court has upheld the decision of Hon'ble Tribunal who had upheld the decision of Commissioner (Appeals) that gold is not prohibited item, it should be offered for redemption in terms of Section 125 of the Customs Act, 1962 and thus rejected the review application filed by the Commissioner of Customs, Lucknow. The relevant paras of the judgment are reproduced hereunder:

“16. In the present case, the Commissioner (Appeals) has held that the gold is not a prohibited item, it should be offered for redemption in terms of Section 125 of the Act. The Tribunal has recorded that the respondents had brought impugned Gold from Bangkok to Gaya International Airport without declaring the same to Customs Authorities and there was nothing to explain as to how the Customs authorities posted at Gaya International Airport could not detect such huge quantity of gold being removed from Gaya



International Airport by passengers on their arrival and there was no explanation as to how the respondents procured gold before they were intercepted at Mughalsarai Railway Station and the Tribunal has dismissed the Appeals for the aforesaid reason and has affirmed the order passed by the Commissioner (Appeals) holding that the import of gold was not prohibited under the Foreign Trade Policy or any other law and, therefore, there is no sufficient ground for absolute confiscation of the gold.

17. Nothing was placed before this Court to challenge the finding of the Commissioner (Appeals), which was upheld by the Tribunal, that Gold is not a prohibited item, and nothing was placed before this Court to establish that this finding of the Commissioner (Appeals) was wrong or erroneous.

18. Even if the goods in question had been brought into India without following the conditions prescribed therefore and those fall within the category of prohibited condition, Section 125 of the Act provides that the Adjudicating Officer may give to the owner of such goods an option to pay fine in lieu of confiscation. Section 128 A of the Act confers powers on the Commissioner (Appeals) to pass such order, as he thinks just and proper, confirming, modifying or annulling the decision or order appealed against. In the present case, the Commissioner (Appeals) has modified the order of absolute confiscation by imposing penalty in lieu thereof, which was well within his power as per Section 128 A. The Tribunal has affirmed the order of the Commissioner (Appeals). This Court dismissed the further Appeal filed by the Department, finding no illegality in the judgment passed by the Tribunal.

19. In view of the aforesaid discussion, we are of the view that the order passed by this Court refusing to interfere with the aforesaid order passed by the Tribunal does not suffer from any error, much less from an error apparent on the face of the record.

20. The review application lacks merits and, accordingly, the same is dismissed. “

6.9 Further, It is observed that in the decision vide Order No.355/2022-CUS (WZ)/ASRA/MUMBAI, dated 07.12.2022 of the



HL

Principal Commissioner & ex-officio Additional Secretary to Government of India, the Hon'ble Revisionary Authority, after going through the details of the case wherein the passenger had brought 02 gold bars of 01 kg each and 02 gold bars of 10 tolas each totally weighing 2233.2 grams wrapped with white coloured self-adhesive marking tape and concealed in both the watch pockets of black coloured trousers worn by him, relying on various decisions of High Court and Apex Court, has allowed gold to be redeemed on payment of redemption fine. The relevant paras of the order are reproduced hereunder:

"16. Once goods are held to be prohibited, Section 125 still provided discretion to consider release of goods on redemption fine. Hon'ble Supreme Court in case of M/s Raj Grow Impex (CIVIL APPEAL NO(s). 2217-2218 of 2021 Arising out of SLP(C) Nos. 14633-14634 of 2020- Order dated 17.06.2021) has laid down the conditions and circumstances under which such discretion can be used. The same are reproduced below:

71. Thus, when it comes to discretion, the exercise thereof has to be guided by law; has to be according to the rules of reason and justice; and has to be based on the relevant considerations. The exercise of discretion is essentially the discernment of what is right and proper; and such discernment is the critical and cautious judgment of what is correct and proper by differentiating between shadow and substance as also between equity and pretence. A holder of public office, when exercising discretion conferred by the statute, has to ensure that such exercise is in furtherance of accomplishment of the purpose underlying conferment of such power. The requirements of reasonableness, rationality, impartiality, fairness and equity are inherent in any exercise of discretion; such an exercise can never be according to the private opinion.



71.1. It is hardly of any debate that discretion has to be exercised judiciously and, for that matter, all the facts and all the relevant surrounding factors as also the implication of exercise of discretion either way have to be properly weighed and a balanced decision is required to be taken.

17.1 Government further observes that there are catena of judgements, over a period of time, of the Hon'ble Courts and other forums which have been categorical in the view that grant of the option of redemption under Section 125 of the Customs Act, 1962 can be

exercised in the interest of justice. Government places reliance on some of the judgements as under:

(a) In the case of *Commissioner of Customs, Aliganj, Lucknow vs Rajesh Jhamatmal Bhat* 2022(382) E.L.T. 345 (All), the Lucknow bench of the Hon'ble High Court of Allahabad, has held at para 22 that "Customs Excise & Service Tax Appellate Tribunal, Allahabad has not committed any error in upholding the order dated 27-8-2018 passed by the Commissioner (Appeals) holding that Gold is not a prohibited item and, therefore, it should be offered for redemption in terms of Section 125 of the Act."

(b) The Hon'ble High Court of Judicature at Madras, in the judgement in the case of *ShikMastani Bi vs. Principal Commissioner of Customs, Chennai-I* [2017(345) E.L.T. 201 (Mad)] upheld the order of the Appellate Authority allowing re-export of gold on payment of redemption fine.

(c) The Hon'ble High Court of Kerala at Ernakulam in the case of *R. Mohandas vs. Commissioner of Cochin* [2016(336) E.L.T. 399 (Ker)] has, observed at para 8 that "The intention of Section 125 is that, after adjudication, the Customs Authority is bound to release the goods to any person from whose custody such goods have been seized...."

(d) Also, in the case of *Union of India vs Dhanak M Ramji* [2010(252) E.L.T. A102 (SC)], the Hon'ble Apex Court vide its judgement dated 08.03.2010 upheld the decision of the Hon'ble High Court of Judicature at Bombay [2009(248) E.L.T. 127 (Bom)], and approved redemption of absolutely confiscated goods to the passanger.

18.1 For the reasons cited above, Government finds that this is not a case of impersonation as construed by the lower authorities. Also, for the reasons cited above, it would be inappropriate to term the appellant as habitual offender. In the instant case, the impugned gold bars were kept by the applicant on his person i.e., in the pockets of the pants worn by him. Government observes that sometimes passengers resort to such innovative methods to keep their valuables / precious possessions safe. Also, considering the issue of parity and fairness as mentioned above, Government finds that this is a case of non-declaration of gold.

18.2 Government finds that all these facts have not been properly considered by the lower authorities while absolutely confiscating the (02) two FM gold bars of 1 kg each and two gold bars of 10 tolas each,



totally weighing 2233.2 grams and valued at Rs 58,26,977/-. Also, observing the ratio of the judicial pronouncements cited above, Government arrives at the conclusion that decision to grant the option of redemption would be appropriate in the facts and circumstances of the instant case. Therefore, the Government maintains confiscation of gold bars but allows the impugned gold bars to be redeemed on payment of a redemption fine.

19 The Government finds that the penalty of Rs 6,00,000/- imposed under Section 112 (a) & (b) by the original authority and upheld by the AA is commensurate with the omission and commissions committed. Government finds the quantity of the penalty as appropriate.

20. In view of the above, the Government modifies the OIA passed by the AA to the extent of absolute confiscation of the gold bars i.e. (02) two FM gold bars of 1 kg each and two gold bars of 10 tolas each, totally weighing 2233.2 grams and valued at Rs 58,26,977/- and grants an option to the applicant to redeem the same on payment of a redemption fine of Rs 12,00,000/- (Rupees Twelve Lakhs only). The penalty of Rs 6,00,000/- imposed by OAA and upheld by AA is sustained.

21 Accordingly, Revision Application is decided on the above terms."

6.10 Further, It is observed that in the recent decision vide Order No 516-517/2023-CUS (WZ)/ASRA/MUMBAI, dated 30.06.2023 of the Principal Commissioner & ex-officio Additional Secretary to Government of India, the Hon'ble Revisionary Authority, after going through the details of the case wherein the passenger was wearing brown coloured cloth belt fastened around her abdomen and when the belt was cut open resulted in recovery of brown coloured powder with water pasted in glue, purported to containing gold weighing 2800 grams (gross). The Hon'ble revisionary authority relying on various decisions of High Court and Apex Court, has allowed gold to be redeemed on payment of redemption fine. The relevant paras of the order are reproduced hereunder:

"10. Once goods are held to be prohibited, Section 125 still provided discretion to consider release of goods on redemption fine. Hon'ble Supreme Court in case of M/s Raj Grow Impex (CIVIL APPEAL NO(s). 2217-2218 of 2021 Arising out of SLP© Nos. 14633-14634 of 2020- Order dated 17.06.2021) has laid down the conditions and



circumstances under which such discretion can be used. The same are reproduced below:

71. Thus, when it comes to discretion, the exercise thereof has to be guided by law; has to be according to the rules of reason and justice; and has to be based on the relevant considerations. The exercise of discretion is essentially the discernment of what is right and proper; and such discernment is the critical and cautious judgment of what is correct and proper by differentiating between shadow and substance as also between equity and pretence. A holder of public office, when exercising discretion conferred by the statute, has to ensure that such exercise is in furtherance of accomplishment of the purpose underlying conferment of such power. The requirements of reasonableness, rationality, impartiality, fairness and equity are inherent in any exercise of discretion; such an exercise can never be according to the private opinion.

71.1. It is hardly of any debate that discretion has to be exercised judiciously and, for that matter, all the facts and all the relevant surrounding factors as also the implication of exercise of discretion either way have to be properly weighed and a balanced decision is required to be taken.

11. A plain reading of Section 125 shows that the Adjudicating Authority is bound to give an option of redemption when the goods are not subject to any prohibition. In case of prohibited goods, such as, the gold, the Adjudicating Authority may allow redemption. There is no bar on the Adjudicating Authority allowing redemption of prohibited goods. This exercise of discretion will depend on the nature of goods and the nature of prohibition. For instance, spurious drugs, arms, ammunition, hazardous goods, contaminated flora or fauna, food which does not meet the food safety standards, etc. are harmful to the society if allowed to find their way into the domestic market. On the other hand, release of certain goods on redemption fine, even though the same becomes prohibited as condition of import have not been satisfied, may not be harmful to the society at large. Thus, Adjudicating Authority can allow redemption under Section 125 of any goods which are prohibited either under the Customs Act or any other law on payment of fine.

12.1 Government further observes that there are catena of judgements, over a period of time, of the Hon'ble Courts and other forums which have been categorical in the view that grant of the option of redemption under Section 125 of the Customs Act, 1962 can be



Handwritten signature or initials.

exercised in the interest of justice. Government places reliance on some of the judgements as under:

(a) In the case of Commissioner of Customs, Aliganj, Lucknow vs Rajesh Jhamatmal Bhat 2022(382) E.L.T. 345 (All), the Lucknow bench of the Hon'ble High Court of Allahabad, has held at para 22 that "Customs Excise & Service Tax Appellate Tribunal, Allahabad has not committed any error in upholding the order dated 27-8-2018 passed by the Commissioner (Appeals) holding that Gold is not a prohibited item and, therefore, it should be offered for redemption in terms of Section 125 of the Act."

(b) The Hon'ble High Court of Judicature at Madras, in the judgement in the case of ShikMastani Bi vs. Principal Commissioner of Customs, Chennai-I [2017(345) E.L.T. 201 (Mad)] upheld the order of the Appellate Authority allowing re-export of gold on payment of redemption fine.

(c) The Hon'ble High Court of Kerala at Ernakulam in the case of R. Mohandas vs. Commissioner of Cochin [2016(336) E.L.T. 399 (Ker)] has, observed at para 8 that "The intention of Section 125 is that, after adjudication, the Customs Authority is bound to release the goods to any person from whose custody such goods have been seized...."

(d) Also, in the case of Union of India vs Dhanak M Ramji [2010(252) E.L.T. A102 (SC)], the Hon'ble Apex Court vide its judgement dated 08.03.2010 upheld the decision of the Hon'ble High Court of Judicature at Bombay [2009(248) E.L.T. 127 (Bom)], and approved redemption of absolutely confiscated goods to the passanger.

12.2 Government, observing the ratios of the above judicial pronouncements, arrives at the conclusion that decision to grant the option of redemption would be appropriate in the facts and circumstances of the instant case.

13 Government notes that the quantity of impugned gold dust (converted into bars) under import, is neither substantial nor in commercial quantity. The appellant claimed ownership of the impugned gold and stated that the same was brought for marriage purpose. There are no other claimants of the said gold. There is no allegation that the appellants are habitual offenders and was involved in similar offence earlier. The fact of the case indicates that it is a case of non-declaration of gold, rather than a case of smuggling for commercial considerations.



The absolute confiscation of the impugned gold, leading to dispossession of the gold in the instant case is therefore harsh and not reasonable. Government considers granting an option to the appellant to redeem the gold on payment of a suitable redemption fine, as the same would be more reasonable and judicious.

14. *In view of above, the Government modifies the impugned order of the Appellate Authority in respect of the impugned gold seized from the appellant. The seized gold from the appellant 1 i.e. impugned gold bars weighing 1417.6189 grams with purity of 994.40% and 01 muster weighing 19.1384 grams with purity of 981.40%, totally weighing 1478.3415 grams and totally valued at Rs 41,07,735/- is allowed to be redeemed on payment of a fine of Rs 8,10,000/- (Rupees Eight Lakh Ten Thousand only)."*

6.11 Further, the Principal Commissioner & ex-officio Additional Secretary to Government of India in the Order No 380/2022-CUS (WZ)/ASRA/MUMBAI, dated 14.12.2022, wherein the applicant was carrying 270 grams of gold dust which has been ingeniously concealed by pasting it with glue in between two t shirt worn by him, had finally held that since the appellant is not a habitual offender and was not involved in the similar offence earlier and it is a case of non-declaration of gold, rather than a case of smuggling for commercial considerations. With this observation absolute confiscation was set aside and gold was allowed to be redeemed on payment of redemption fine

6.12 Further, the Principal Commissioner & ex-officio Additional Secretary to Government of India in the Order No 67/2023-CUS (WZ)/ASRA/MUMBAI, dated 30.01.2023, on recovery of two gold bars of 01 kg each and 02 gold bars of 10 tolas each concealed in the pant worn, totally weighing 2232 grams valued at Rs 58,23,846/- upheld the decision of Appellate Authority allowing redemption of gold bars on payment of redemption fine of Rs 11,00,000/- and upheld the penalty of Rs 6,00,000/- imposed by the Original Adjudicating Authority and upheld by the Appellate Authority observing that the concealment was not ingenious, the passenger was not habitual offender and involved in the similar offence earlier, there was nothing on record that he was part of an organised smuggling syndicate. The Government found that this was a case of non-declaration of gold and held that absolute confiscation of the impugned gold leading to dispossession of gold would be harsh and not reasonable. With this observation the order of Appellate Authority granting an option to redeem the gold on payment of redemption fine was upheld.



6.13 Further, the Hon'ble High Court of Allahabad in the case of Commissioner of Customs, Aliganj, Lucknow Versus Rajesh Jhamatmal Bhat [2022 (382) ELT 345 (All)] had upheld the decision of Hon'ble Tribunal wherein the Hon'ble Tribunal had upheld the decision of Commissioner (Appeal) wherein 4076 grams of gold bars recovered from the specially designed cavities made in the shoes, valued at Rs. 1,09,98,018/- was allowed to be redeemed on payment of redemption fine and penalty. The Hon'ble Tribunal had reduced the redemption fine from 25,00,000/- to Rs 15,00,000/- and penalty was also reduced from 10,00,000/- to 5,00,000/- as ordered by the Commissioner (Appeal). The Hon'ble High Court observing that gold was not prohibited under the Foreign Trade Policy or any other law for the time being in force and, therefore, there is no sufficient ground for absolute confiscation of the gold upheld the decision of Hon'ble Tribunal.

6.14 Further, the Principal Commissioner & ex-officio Additional Secretary to Government of India in the recent decision vide Order No 68/2024-CUS (WZ)/ASRA/MUMBAI, dated 24.01.2024, in the case of Mr Kasmani Asif Abdul Aziz wherein the passenger had kept three gold kadiwali chains and two gold pendants in a transparent plastic pouch kept in pant pocket totally weighing 1200 grams of 24 kt having 999.0 purity valued at Rs. 35,22,816/- (Tariff value) and Rs. 39,02,400/- (Market value) had finally held that since quantum of gold is not commercial and the applicant was in possession of invoice for purchase of gold jewellery, concealment was not ingenious, the passenger is not a habitual offender and was not involved in the similar offence earlier and not a part of organised smuggling syndicate, it is a case of non-declaration of gold, rather than a case of smuggling for commercial considerations. With this observation absolute confiscation was set aside and gold was allowed to be redeemed on payment of redemption fine.

6.15 In view of above decisions of the Principal Commissioner & ex-officio Additional Secretary to Government of India, I am of the considered view that in present case also there is no allegation that the appellant is habitual offender and was involved in similar offence earlier. The appellant was not a part of organised smuggling syndicate. The appellant during adjudication as recorded in the impugned order has denied the allegation that she had carried the gold for any monetary consideration and claimed ownership of the gold and other goods and redemption of the goods on payment of reasonable fine and penalty. The appellant was not a carrier. There is nothing on record to suggest that the concealment was ingenious. The investigation of the case has not brought any smuggling angle but the



investigation suggest that this is case of non-declaration of gold with intention of non-payment of Customs duty. Further, a copy of appeal memorandum was forwarded to the adjudicating authority for his comment and submission of case laws on similar matter but no reply was received till date. The fact of the present case also indicates that it is a case of non-declaration of gold, rather than a case of smuggling for commercial consideration. The absolute confiscation of impugned gold, leading to dispossession of the gold in the instant case is, therefore, harsh. Therefore, following the decisions of Principal Commissioner & ex-officio Additional Secretary to Government of India, the decision of Hon'ble High Court of Allahabad sitting at Lucknow in the Civil Misc Review Application No 156/2022 filed by Commissioner of Customs, Lucknow, and the decision of Hon'ble Tribunal, Ahmedabad and Mumbai as detailed in the above paras, I am of the considered view that the absolute confiscation of impugned gold items i.e. One gold Mangalsutra with Two earrings, two rings and two Gold Bangles of purity 99% totally weighing 221.290 grams having market value of Rs. 13,86,758/- and tariff value of Rs. 11,68,190/- is harsh. I, therefore, set aside the absolute confiscation ordered by the adjudicating authority in the impugned order and allow redemption of impugned gold items i.e. One gold Mangalsutra with Two earrings, two rings and two Gold Bangles of purity 99% totally weighing 221.290 grams having market value of Rs. 13,86,758/- and tariff value of Rs. 11,68,190/-, on payment of fine of Rs.2,25,000/- in addition to the duty chargeable and any other charges payable in respect of the goods as per Section 125(2) of the Customs Act, 1962.

6.16 Further, in respect of imposition of penalty amounting to Rs 13,86,758/- on the appellant for non-declaration of of impugned gold items i.e. One gold Mangalsutra with Two earrings, two rings and two Gold Bangles of purity 99% totally weighing 221.290 grams having market value of Rs. 13,86,758/- and tariff value of Rs. 11,68,190/-, following the decisions of Principal Commissioner & ex-officio Additional Secretary to Government of India, the decision of Hon'ble High Court of Allahabad sitting at Lucknow in the Civil Misc Review Application No 156/2022 filed by Commissioner of Customs, Lucknow, and the decision of Hon'ble Tribunal, Ahmedabad, Mumbai and Allahabad as detailed in the above paras, I am of the considered view that penalty of Rs. 13,86,758/- ordered by the adjudicating authority in the impugned order is harsh. Therefore, I reduce the penalty to Rs. 1,00,000/-.



6.17 The fine and penalty of the above amount will not only eliminate any profit margin, if any, but will also have a positive effect on the applicant to ensure strict compliance of law in future.

7. In view of above the appeal filed by the appellant is disposed off in the above terms.



सत्यापित/ATTESTED

अधीक्षक/SUPERINTENDENT

सीमा शुल्क (अपील), अहमदाबाद.
CUSTOMS (APPEALS), AHMEDABAD.

By Registered Post A.D.

F.No. S/49-01/CUS/AHD/2025-26

To,

Dated -15.09.2025

- 3454
- (i) Smt Sakina Asadali Noorani,
Resi- Flat No. 302, Fazalbhahi Manzil,
Station Road, Matwa Chowk,
Bhavnagar Gujarat-364001,
 - (ii) Rishikesh J Mehra, B/1103, Dev Vihaan,
Behind 3rd Eye Residency, Motera Stadium Road,
Motera, Sabarmati, Ahmedabad-380005

Copy to:

1. The Principal Chief Commissioner of Customs Gujarat, Customs House, Ahmedabad.
2. The Principal Commissioner of Customs, Customs, Ahmedabad.
3. The Joint/Additional Commissioner of Customs, Surat International Airport, Surat.
4. Guard File