प्रधान आयुक्त का कार्यालय, सीमा शुल्क ,अहमदाबाद

"सीमा शुल्क भवन ,"पहली मंजिल ,पुराने हाईकोर्टके सामने ,नवरंगपुरा ,अहमदाबाद – 380 009.
दूरभाष :(079) 2754 4630**E-mail:** cus-ahmd-adj@gov.inफैक्स :(079) 2754 2343

PREAMBLE

A	फ़ाइलसंख्या/ File No.	:	VIII/10-13/SVPIA-D/O&A/HQ/2024-25
B	कारणबताओनोटिससंख्या–तारीख / Show Cause Notice No. and Date	:	Waiver of SCN by the Pax.
C	मूलआदेशसंख्या/ Order-In-Original No.	:	**14/ADC/VM/O&A/2024-25**
D	आदेशतिथि/ Date of Order-In-Original	:	**24.04.2024**
E	जारीकरनेकीतारीख/ Date of Issue	:	**24.04.2024**
F	द्वारापारित/ Passed By	:	**Vishal Malani**, Additional Commissioner, Customs, Ahmedabad.
G	आयातककानामऔरपता / Name and Address of Importer / Passenger	:	To, **Shri Lokesh Kalal,** S/o Chunnilal Kalal, Village – Rajpur, Dist. Dungarpur, Rajasthan - 314001.

(1)	**यह प्रति व्यक्ति के उपयोग के लिए निःशुल्क प्रदान किया जाता है जिन्हे यह जारी किया जाता है।**
(2)	**कोई भी व्यक्ति इस आदेश से स्वयं को असंतुष्ट पाता है तो वह इस आदेश के विरुद्ध अपील इस आदेश की प्राप्त किया तारीख के ६० दिनों के भीतर आयुक्त कार्यालय, सीमा शुल्क (अपील), ४वि मंज़िल, हुडको भवन, ईश्वर भुवन मार्ग, नवरंगपुरा, अहमदाबाद में कर सकता है।**
(3)	**अपील के साथ केवल पांच (५.00) रुपये पे न्यायलय शुल्क टिकिट लगा होना चाहिए और इसके साथ होना चाहिए:**
(i)	**अपील की एक प्रति और;**
(ii)	**इस प्रति या इस आदेश की कोई प्रति के साथकेवल पांच (५.00) रुपये पे न्यायलय शुल्क टिकिट लगा होना चाहिए।**
(4)	**इस आदेश के विरुद्ध अपील करने इच्छुक व्यक्ति को ७.५% अधिकतम १० करोड़ शुल्क हम करना होगा जहां शुल्क या ड्यूटी और जुर्माना विवाद में है या जुर्माना जहां इस तरह की दंड विवाद में है और अपील के साथ इस तरह के भुगतान का प्रमाण पेश करने में असफल रहने पर सीमा शुल्क अधिनियम, १९६२ के धरा १२९ के प्रावधानों का अनुपालन नहीं करने के लिए अपील को खारिज कर दिया जायेगा।**

Brief facts of the case :

On the basis of suspicious movement, the officials intercepted (01) Pax namely **Shri Lokesh Kalal** S/o Shri ChunniLal Kalal who was suspected to be carrying high value dutiable goods and therefore a thorough search of all the baggage of the passenger as well as his personal search was required to be carried out. In presence of the panchas, the AIU officers intercepted one passenger along with his baggage when the said passenger was trying to exit the Green Channel at arrival hall of terminal 2 of Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel International Airport (SVPI), Ahmedabad. On being asked about his identity by the AIU officers, the passenger identifies himself as Shri Lokesh Kalal showing his Passport bearing No. N340089. On scrutinizing the baggages of the passenger it is noticed that one of the baggage is cross signed marked by the belt officer. As, the size of the baggage was larger than the capacity of BSM installed at green channel, and hence, the passenger was requested to scan his baggages at BSM machine installed at the Red Channel. Accordingly, the panchas along with passenger and AIU officers went to the Red Channel. Further, the AIU officers also introduced other batch officers namely Smt. Komal Patel, Deputy Commissioner, Shri Sumit K Yadav, Inspector, Shri Suresh K Ellena, Superintendent. The baggages of the passenger were scanned at BSM installed at Red Channel. During scanning of baggage, some dark coloured image was noticed in one of the baggages, further, the baggage was opened and 02 gold bars were found in the baggage. The weight of the gold bars was 845.500 gms.

2. Further, the above said passenger was brought to the AIU office situated at green channel for further process. In the presence of the panchas, the AIU Officers asked him whether he was carrying any other dutiable goods or foreign currency or any restricted goods, in reply he denied, thereafter, the AIU officers informed him that they would be conducting his personal search. Here, the AIU officers offered their personal search to him but he denied. Thereafter, the AIU officers asked him whether he wanted to be checked in front of executive magistrate or Superintendent of Customs, in reply he gave his consent to be searched in front of the Superintendent of Customs.

3. Thereafter, the officers, first asked Shri Lokesh Kalal to remove all the metallic items, Purse, Ring and jewellery etc. from his body and passed through the Door Frame Metal Detector (DFMD). He placed his mobile, wallet etc. in the plastic tray and passed through the DFMD machine. On passing through the DFMD the Panchas and officers did not notice/ hear beep sound from the machine.

4. Further, in front of the Panchas, the officers asked the passenger about the 02 gold bars which were found in his baggage, in reply of which he stated that both the gold bars belonged to him. Therefore, in order to ensure the correctness of purity, weight and value of the gold recovered from the possession of Shri Lokesh Kalal, the Government approved valuer was required to be called. After sometime, one person appeared at the AIU office who introduced himself as Shri Soni Kartikey Vasantrai, Government Approved Valuer. In presence of the panchas, the Government Approved Valuer showed that he had brought his laptop, weighing scale and testing kit.

5. After testing the said recovered gold from Shri Lokesh Kalal, he confirmed that the said recovered gold contain 02 Gold Bars (marking as Sam 1 KILO FINE GOLD, SAM MELTER ASSAYER UAE BM 230807) weighing 845.500 gms having purity 999.0 24Kt. Shri Soni Kartikey Vasantrai, Government Approved Valuer after detailed examination and testing submitted Valuation Report dated 01.02.2024 of Shri Lokesh Kalal, wherein he provided weighment of recovered gold, market value and tariff value. The Tariff Value was determined in terms of Customs Notification No. 09/2024-Customs (N.T.) dated 01.02.2024 (Gold) and Notification No. 04/2024-Customs (N.T.) dated 18.01.2024 (Exchange Rate). The report is as below mentioned:

Name of Passenger	Details of Article/ Items	PCS/ NOS	Net Weight (In Grams)	Purity	Market Value (In Rs.)	Tariff Value (In Rs.)
Shri Lokesh Kalal	02 Gold Cut Bars	02	845.500	999.0 24KT	54,98,287/-	47,07,254/-

6. The Government Approved Valuer informe that the gold recovered form Shri Lokesh Kalal is totally weighing 845.500 Grams

are of 24 KT (999.0 Purity) is having Tariff Value of **Rs.47,07,254/-** (Rupee Forty-Seven Lakhs Seven Thousand Two Hundred and Fifty-Four only) and market value of **Rs.54,98,287/-** (Rupee Fifty-Four Lakhs Ninety-Eight Thousand Two Hundred Eighty-Seven only). The Market Value is calculated as per the Notification No. 09/2024-Customs (N.T.) dated 01.02.2024 (Gold) and Notification No. 04/2024-Customs (N.T.) dated 18.01.2024 (Exchange Rate).

7. A Statement of the said passenger was recorded under Section 108 of the Customs Act, 1962; wherein he admitted to have attempted to smuggle goods into India i.e. 845.500 grams of gold cut bars of 24kt. and having purity 999.0 concealed inside the clothes in a carton box by Shri Lokesh Kalal with an intent of illicitly clearing the said gold and to evade Customs duty by way of adopting the modus operandi of smuggling the said gold as recorded under panchnama dated 01.02.2024.

8. In view of the above, the said gold weighing 845.500 grams seized under panchnama dated 01.02.2024 was to be treated as "smuggled goods" as defined under Section 2(39) of Customs Act, 1962. The said pax had conspired to smuggle the said gold into India. The offence committed had been admitted by the said passenger in his statement recorded on 01.02.2024 under Section 108 of the Customs Act, 1962. Therefore, he committed an offence punishable under Section 135 (1) (a) & (b) of the Customs Act, 1962 and therefore, was arrested under Section 104 of the Customs Act, 1962.

9. Further, as per Section 104 (6) & (7) of the Customs Act, 1962, the offence committed by the above passenger was a bailable offence, therefore, the passenger was given bail on certain conditions mentioned in Bail Bond.

10. LEGAL PROVISIONS RELEVANT TO THE CASE:

a) As per para 2.26 of Foreign Trade Policy 2015-20 Bona-fide household goods and personal effects may be imported as part of passenger baggage as per limits, terms and conditions thereof in Baggage Rules notified by Ministry of Finance.

b) As per Section 3(2) of the Foreign Trade (Development and Regulation) Act, 1992 the Central Government may by Order

make provision for prohibiting, restricting or otherwise regulating, in all cases or in specified classes of cases and subject to such exceptions, if any, as may be made by or under the Order, the import or export of goods or services or technology.

c) As per Section 3(3) of the Foreign Trade (Development and Regulation) Act, 1992 AII goods to which any Order under sub-section (2) applies shall be deemed to be goods the import or export of which has been prohibited under section 11 of the Customs Act, 1962 (52 of 1962) and all the provisions of that Act shall have effect accordingly.

d) As per Section 11(1) of the Foreign Trade (Development and Regulation) Act, 1992 no export or import shall be made by any person except in accordance with the provisions of this Act, the rules and orders made thereunder and the foreign trade policy for the time being in force.

e) As per Section 11(3) of the Customs Act, 1962 Any prohibition or restriction or obligation relating to import or export of any goods or class of goods or clearance thereof provided in any other law for the time being in force, or any rule or regulation made or any order or notification issued thereunder, shall be executed under the provisions of that Act only if such prohibition or restriction or obligation is notified under the provisions of this Act, subject to such exceptions, modifications or adaptations as the Central Government deems fit.

f) As per Section 2(3) — "baggage" includes unaccompanied baggage but does not include motor vehicles

g) As per Section 2(22), of Customs Act, 1962 definition of 'goods' includes-

a. vessels, aircrafts and vehicles;
b. stores;
c. baggage;
d. currency and negotiable instruments; and
e. any other kind of movable property;

h) As per Section 2(33) of Customs Act 1962, prohibited goods means any goods the import or export of which is subject to any prohibition under this Act or any other law for the time being in force.

i) As per Section 2(39) of the Customs Act 1962 '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 of the Customs Act 1962.

j) As per Section 77 of the Customs Act 1962 the owner of baggage shall, for the purpose of clearing it, make a declaration of its contents to the proper officer.

k) As per Section 110 of Customs Act, 1962 if the proper officer has reason to believe that any goods are liable to confiscation under this Act, he may seize such goods.

l) Any goods which are imported or attempted to be imported or brought within the Indian customs waters for the purpose of being imported, contrary to any prohibition imposed by or under this Act or any other law for the time being in force shall be liable to confiscation under section 111(d) of the Customs Act, 1962.

m) Any dutiable or prohibited goods required to be mentioned under the regulation in an arrival manifest, import manifest or import report which are no so mentioned are liable to confiscation under Section 111(f) of the Customs Act 1962.

n) Any dutiable or prohibited goods found concealed in any manner in any package either before or after the unloading thereof are liable to confiscation under Section 111(i) of the Customs Act, 1962.

o) Any dutiable or prohibited goods removed or attempted to be removed from a customs area or a warehouse without the permission of the proper officer or contrary to the terms of such permission are liable to confiscation under Section 111(j) of the Customs Act, 1962.

p) 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 are liable to confiscation under Section 111(l) of the Customs Act, 1962.

q) 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 transhipment, with the declaration for transhipment referred to in the proviso to sub-section (1) of section 54 are liable to confiscation under Section 111(m) of the Customs Act, 1962.

r) As per Section 112 of the Customs Act, 1962 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, harboring, keeping, concealing, selling or purchasing or in any manner dealing with any goods which he know or has reason to believe are liable to confiscation under Section 111, shall be liable to penalty.

s) As per Section 119 of the Customs Act, 1962 any goods used for concealing smuggled goods shall also be liable for confiscation.

t) As per Section 123 of the Customs Act, 1962 (1) where any goods to which this section applies are seized under this Act in the reasonable belief that they are smuggled goods, the

burden of proving that they are not smuggled goods shall be-

(a) in a case where such seizure is made from the possession of any person –

(i) on the person from whose possession the goods were seized;

and

(ii) if any person, other than the person from whose possession the goods were seized, claims to be the owner thereof, also on such other person;

(b) in any other case, on the person, if any, who claims to be the owner of the goods so seized.

(2) This section shall apply to gold, and manufactures thereof, watches, and any other class of goods which the Central Government may by notification in the Official Gazette specify.

u) As per Customs Baggage Declaration Regulations, 2013 all passengers who come to India and having anything to declare or are carrying dutiable or prohibited goods shall declare their accompanied baggage in the prescribed form.

CONTRAVENTION AND VIOLATION OF LAWS

11. It therefore appears that:

a) Shri Lokesh Kalal had actively involved himself in the instant case of smuggling of gold into India. Shri Lokesh Kalal had improperly imported 02 gold cut bars, totally weighing **845.500** grams made of 24kt/ 999.00 purity gold, having **tariff value of Rs.47,07,254/-** (Rupees Fourty-Seven Lakhs Seven Thousand Two Hundred Fifty-Four only) and **market value of Rs.54,98,287/-** (Rupees Fifty-Four Lakhs Ninety-Eight Thousand Two Hundred Eighty-Seven only) by concealing in the form of gold cut bars concealed in the Checked-in baggage, without declaring it to the Customs. He opted for Green Channel to exit the Airport with a deliberate 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. Therefore, the improperly imported 02 gold cut bars, by the passenger, by way of concealment without declaring it to the Customs on arrival in India cannot be treated as bonafide household goods or personal effects. Shri Lokesh Kalal has thus contravened the Foreign Trade Policy 2015-20 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.

b) By not declaring the value, quantity and description of the goods imported by him, the said passenger has violated the provisions of Baggage Rules, 2016, read with the Section 77 of the Customs Act, 1962 and Regulation 3 of the Customs Baggage Declaration Regulations, 2013.

c) The improperly imported gold by the passenger, Shri Lokesh Kalal, found concealed without declaring it to the Customs is thus liable for confiscation under Section 111(d), 111(f), 111(i), 111(j), 111(l) & 111(m) read with Section 2 (22), (33), (39) of the Customs Act, 1962 and further read in conjunction with Section 11(3) of the Customs Act, 1962.

d) Shri Lokesh Kalal, by his above-described acts of omission/ commission and/ or abetment on his part has rendered himself liable to penalty under Section 112 of the Customs Act, 1962.

f) As per Section 123 of the Customs Act, 1962, the burden of proving that the said improperly imported gold, totally weighing 845.500 grams having tariff value of Rs.47,07,254/- and market value of Rs.54,98,287/- by way of concealment in the form of gold cut bars, concealed in the Checked-in baggage, without declaring it to the Customs, are not smuggled goods, is upon the passenger and the Noticee, Shri Lokesh Kalal.

12. The passenger, Shri Lokesh Kalal vide his letter dated 06.02.2024, forwarded through Shri Rishikesh J Mehra, Advocate submitted that he is cooperating in investigation and claiming the ownership of the gold recovered from him. He understood the charges levelled against him. He requested to adjudicate the case without issuance of Show Cause Notice.

13. PERSONAL HEARING:

Personal Hearing in this case was held on 17.04.2024. Shri Rishikesh J Mehra, Advocate appeared for personal hearing. Shri Rishikesh Mehra submitted written submissions dated 06.02.2024 and reiterated the same. He submitted that his client is NRI and is residing in Kuwait since 2016 and doing labour work in Kuwait. He is an eligible passenger coming after more than six months' stay at abroad. He also submitted that the gold was purchased by him from his personal savings and borrowed money from his friends. He reiterated that his client brought Gold for his personal and family use. He submitted copies of gold purchase bills (i) No. 52997 dated 28.01.2024 issued by M/s. Al-Najma Daulia Gold Jewellery, Kuwait, (ii) No. 52998 dated 28.01.2024 issued by M/s. Al-Najma Daulia Gold Jewellery, Kuwait showing legitimate purchase of the said gold in the name of the passenger and Noticee. This is the first time he brought gold, i.e. 02 cut gold bars. Due to ignorance of law the gold was not declared by the passenger. He further submitted that his client is ready to pay applicable Customs Duty, fine and penalty and requested for Re-Export release of seized gold. He requested to take lenient view in the matter and allow to release the gold on payment of reasonable fine and penalty.

DISCUSSION & FINDINGS:

14. I have carefully gone through the facts of the case and submissions made by the Advocate of the passenger/ Noticee during the personal hearing. I find that the passenger had requested for waiver of Show Cause Notice. The request for non-issuance of written Show Cause Notice is accepted in terms of the first proviso to Section 124 of the Customs Act, 1962 and accordingly, the matter is taken up for decision on merits.

15. In the instant case, I find that the main issues that are to be decided is whether the 02 gold cut bars (1 big & 12 small), of 24Kt/ 999.0 purity, totally weighing 845.500 grams and having tariff value of Rs.47,07,254/- (Rupees Twenty-Two Lakhs Fifty-Seven Thousand Thirty-Two only) and market value of Rs.54,98,287/- (Rupees Fifty-

Four Lakhs Ninety-Eight Thousand Two Hundred Eighty-Seven only) carried by the passenger, which was seized vide Seizure Order dated 01.02.2024 under the Panchnama proceedings dated 01.02.2024 on the reasonable belief that the said goods were smuggled into India, is liable for confiscation under Section 111 of the Customs Act, 1962 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Act') or not and whether the passenger is liable for penalty under the provisions of Section 112 of the Act or not.

16. I find that the passenger Shri Lokesh Kalal, was asked by the Customs officers whether he was having anything dutiable to declare to the Customs, to which he had replied that he has nothing to declare. On scanning of his baggage, it was found that the passenger has concealed/ hide gold cut bars totally weighing 845.500 grams in in the Checked-in baggage. The passenger admitted to have smuggled the said gold by concealing/ hiding in the form of gold cut bars in the Checked-in baggage in his baggage. On testing and valuation, the government approved valuer confirmed that the said recovered gold is of purity 999.0/24Kt., totally weighting 845.500 Grams ('the said gold' for short) having Tariff value of Rs.47,07,254/- and Market value of Rs.54,98,287/-. The said gold was seized under the provisions of the Customs Act, 1962, under Panchnama proceedings dated 01.02.2024.

Hence, I find that the passenger was well aware about the fact that the gold is dutiable item and he intentionally wanted to clear the same without payment of Customs duty which is also admitted by him in his statement dated 01.02.2024. Further, the Baggage Rules, 2016 nowhere mentions anything about import of gold in commercial quantity. It simply mentions the restrictions on import of gold which are found to be violated in the present case. Ignorance of law is not an excuse but an attempt to divert adjudication proceedings.

17. In this regard, I find that the Customs Baggage Rules, 2016 nowhere mentions about carrying gold in commercial quantity. It simply mentions about the restrictions on gold carried by the

international passengers. Further, the Hon'ble Apex Court in Om Prakash Bhatia case reported at 2003 (155) ELT 423 (SC) has held that if importation and exportation of goods are subject to certain prescribed conditions, which are to be fulfilled before or after clearance of goods, goods would fall within the ambit of 'prohibited goods' if such conditions are not fulfilled. In the instant case, the passenger had concealed/ hidden the gold and did not declare the same even after asking by the Customs officers until the same was detected. Hence, I find that in view of the above-mentioned case citing, the passenger by his act of concealing the gold with an intention of clearing the same illicitly from Customs area by not declaring the same to Customs has held the impugned gold liable for confiscation under Section 111 of the Customs Act, 1962.

18. I find that the said gold was placed under seizure vide Seizure Order dated 01.02.2024 under Panchnama proceedings dated 01.02.2024. The seizure was made under Section 110 of the Customs Act, 1962 on a reasonable belief that the said goods were attempted to be smuggled into India and liable for confiscation. In the statement recorded on 01.02.2024, the passenger had admitted that he did not want to declare the seized gold carried by him to the Customs on his arrival in the SVPI Airport so that he could clear it illicitly and evade the payment of Customs duty payable thereon. It is also on record that the Government Approved Valuer has tested and certified that the said gold was made of 24Kt/999.0 purity, totally weighing 845.500 Grams, having tariff value of Rs.47,07,254/- and market value of Rs.54,98,287/-. The recovered gold was accordingly seized vide Seizure Order dated 01.02.2024 under Panchnama proceedings dated 01.02.2024 in the presence of the passenger and the Panchas.

19. I also find that the passenger had neither questioned the manner of the Panchnama proceedings at the material time nor controverted the facts detailed in the Panchnama during the course of recording his statement. Every procedure conducted during the Panchnama by the Officers was well documented and made in the presence of the Panchas as well as the passenger. In fact, in his statement, he has clearly admitted that he was aware that import of gold without payment of

Customs duty was an offence but as he wants to save Customs duty, he had concealed the same with an intention to clear the gold illicitly to evade Customs duty and thereby violated provisions of the Customs Act, the Baggage Rules, the Foreign Trade (Development & Regulations) Act, 1992, the Foreign Trade (Development & Regulations) Rules, 1993 and the Foreign Trade Policy, 2015-2020.

20. Further, the passenger has accepted that he had not declared the said gold concealed/ hidden on his arrival to the Customs Authorities. It is clear case of non-declaration with an intent to smuggle the gold. Accordingly, there is sufficient evidence to say that the passenger had kept the said gold which was in his possession and failed to declare the same before the Customs Authorities on his arrival at SVPIA, Ahmedabad. The case of smuggling of gold recovered from his possession and which was kept undeclared with intent of smuggling the same and in order to evade payment of Customs duty is conclusively proved. Thus, it is proved that the passenger violated Section 77, Section 79 of the Customs Act for import/ smuggling of gold which was not for bonafide use and thereby violated Rule 11 of the Foreign Trade Regulation Rules 1993, and para 2.26 of the Foreign Trade Policy 2015-20. Further, as per Section 123 of the Customs Act, 1962, gold is a notified item and when goods notified thereunder are seized under the Customs Act, 1962, on the reasonable belief that they are smuggled goods, the burden to prove that they are not smuggled, shall be on the person from whose possession the goods have been seized.

18. From the facts discussed above, it is evident that the passenger had carried the said gold weighing 845.500 grams, while arriving from Kuwait to Ahmedabad, with an intention to smuggle and remove the same without payment of Customs duty, thereby rendering the said gold of 24Kt/999.00 purity totally weighing 845.500 grams, liable for confiscation, under the provisions of Sections 111(d), 111(f), 111(i), 111(j), 111(l) & 111(m) of the Customs Act, 1962. By concealing the said gold and not declaring the same before the Customs, it is established that the passenger had a clear intention to smuggle the gold clandestinely with the deliberate intention to evade payment of

Customs duty. The commission of above act made the impugned goods fall within the ambit of 'smuggling' as defined under Section 2(39) of the Act.

19. It is seen that the Noticee had not filled the baggage declaration form and had not declared the said gold which was in his possession, as envisaged under Section 77 of the Act read with the Baggage Rules and Regulation 3 of Customs Baggage Declaration Regulations, 2013. It is also observed that the imports were also for non-bonafide purposes. Therefore, the said improperly imported gold weighing 845.500 grams concealed by the passenger without declaring it to the Customs on arrival in India cannot be treated as bonafide household goods or personal effects. The passenger has thus contravened the Foreign Trade Policy 2015-20 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.

20. It is, therefore, proved that by the above acts of contravention, the passenger has rendered the said gold weighing 845.500 grams, recovered, and seized from the passenger vide Seizure Memo/ Order dated 01.02.2024 under Panchnama proceedings dated 01.02.2024, liable to confiscation under the provisions of Sections 111(d), 111(f), 111(i), 111(j), 111(l) & 111(m) of the Customs Act, 1962. By using the modus of gold concealed/ hidden, it is observed that the passenger was fully aware that the import of said goods is offending in nature. It is therefore very clear that he has knowingly carried the gold and failed to declare the same on his arrival at the Airport. It is seen that he has involved himself in carrying, keeping, concealing, hiding and dealing with the impugned goods in a manner which he knew or had reasons to believe that the same is liable to confiscation under the Act. It is, therefore, proved beyond doubt that the passenger has committed an offence of the nature described in Section 112 of the Customs Act, 1962 making him liable for penalty under Section 112 of the Customs Act, 1962.

21. I also find that the passenger has submitted that the gold was brought by him, for his personal and family use. The gold was

purchased by him from Kuwait and requested to allow release of gold on payment of redemption fine, Duty and penalty. He submitted copies of gold purchase bills (i) No. 52997 dated 28.01.2024 issued by M/s. Al-Najma Daulia Gold Jewellery, Kuwait, (ii) No. 52998 dated 28.01.2024 issued by M/s. Al-Najma Daulia Gold Jewellery, Kuwait showing legitimate purchase of the said gold in the name of the passenger and Noticee.

22. In this regard, I find that based on suspicious movement of Shri Lokesh Kalal, he was intercepted at green channel when he was trying to exit through green channel. At the time of scanning of his checked-in baggage, it was found that the passenger has concealed/ hide 02 gold cut bars, totally weighing 845.500 grams concealed in the Checked-in baggage. Hence, I find that the passenger was well aware about the fact that the gold is dutiable item and he intentionally wanted to clear the same without payment of Customs duty which is also admitted by him in his statement dated 01.02.2024. Further, the Baggage Rules, 2016 nowhere mentions anything about import of gold in commercial quantity. It simply mentions the restrictions on import of gold which are found to be violated in the present case. Ignorance of law is not an excuse but an attempt to divert adjudication proceedings.

23. I find that the passenger confessed of carrying the said gold of 845.500 grams, concealed/ hidden are made up of 24 Kt. gold having purity 999.0 and attempted to remove the said gold from the Airport without declaring it to the Customs Authorities violating the para 2.26 of the Foreign Trade Policy 2015-20 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 further read in conjunction with Section 11(3) of the Customs Act, 1962 and the relevant provisions of Baggage Rules, 2016 and Customs Baggage Declaration Regulations, 2013. As per Section 2(33) "prohibited goods" means any goods the import or export of which is subject to any prohibition under this Act or any other law for the time being in force but does not include any such goods in respect of which the conditions subject to which the goods are permitted to be imported

or exported have been complied with. The improperly imported gold by the passenger without following the due process of law and without adhering to the conditions and procedures of import have thus acquired the nature of being prohibited goods in view of Section 2(33) of the Act.

24. It is quite clear from the above discussions that the impugned gold was concealed/ hidden and not declared to the Customs with the sole intention to evade payment of Customs duty. The record before me shows that the passenger did not choose to declare the prohibited/ dutiable goods and opted for green channel Customs clearance after arriving from foreign destination with the wilful intention to smuggle the impugned goods. The said gold totally weighing 845.500 grams, having Tariff Value of Rs.47,07,254/- and Market Value of Rs.54,98,287/- recovered and seized from the passenger vide Seizure Memo/ Order dated 01.02.2024 under the Pachamama proceedings dated 01.02.2024. Despite having knowledge that the said gold/ goods had to be declared and such import is an offence under the Act and Rules and Regulations made under it, the passenger had attempted to remove the said gold, totally weighing 845.500 grams by deliberately not declaring the same by him on arrival at the Airport with the wilful intention to smuggle the impugned gold into India. I, therefore, find that the passenger has committed an offence of the nature described in Section 112(a) & 112(b) of the Customs Act, 1962 making him liable for penalty under the provisions of Section 112 of the Customs Act, 1962.

25. I further find that the gold is not on the list of prohibited items but import of the same is controlled. The view taken by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Om Prakash Bhatia however in very clear terms lay down the principle that if importation and exportation of goods are subject to certain prescribed conditions, which are to be fulfilled before or after clearance of goods, non-fulfilment of such conditions would make the goods fall within the ambit of 'prohibited goods'. This makes the gold seized in the present case "prohibited goods" as the passenger, trying to smuggle it, was not eligible passenger to bring it in India or import gold into India in baggage. The

said gold, totally weighing 845.500 grams, made up of 24 Kt. gold having purity 999.0, in the form of gold cut bars, was recovered from his possession and was kept undeclared with an intention to smuggle the same and evade payment of Customs duty. By using this modus, it is proved that the goods are offending in nature and therefore prohibited on its importation. Here, conditions are not fulfilled by the passenger.

26. In view of the above discussions, I hold that the said gold weighing 845.500 grams, carried and undeclared by the passenger with an intention to clear the same illicitly from the Airport and evade payment of Customs duty are liable for absolute confiscation. Further, the passenger has carried the said gold by concealing/ hidden to evade payment of Customs duty, to earn easy money. In the instant case, I am therefore, not inclined to use my discretion to give an option to redeem the said gold on payment of redemption fine, as envisaged under Section 125 of the Act.

27. Further, before the Hon'ble Kerala High Court in the case of Abdul Razak [2012(275) ELT 300 (Ker)], the petitioner had contended that under the Foreign Trade (Exemption from application of rules in certain cases) Order, 1993, gold was not a prohibited item and can be released on payment of redemption fine. The Hon'ble High Court held as under:

> *"Further, as per the statement given by the appellant under Section 108 of the Act, he is only a carrier i.e. professional smuggler smuggling goods on behalf of others for consideration. We, therefore, do not find any merit in the appellant's case that he has the right to get the confiscated gold released on payment of redemption fine and duty under Section 125 of the Act."*

28. In the case of Samynathan Murugesan [2009 (247) ELT 21 (Mad)], the Hon'ble High Court upheld the absolute confiscation, ordered by the adjudicating authority, in similar facts and circumstances. Further, in the said case of smuggling of gold, the Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the case of Samynathan Murugesan reported at 2009 (247) ELT 21(Mad) has ruled that as the goods were prohibited and there was concealment, the Commissioner's order for absolute confiscation was upheld.

29. Further, I find that in a recent case decided by the Hon'ble High Court of Madras reported at 2016-TIOL-1664-HC-MAD-CUS in respect of Malabar Diamond Gallery Pvt. Ltd., the Court while holding gold jewellery as prohibited goods under Section 2(33) of the Customs Act, 1962 had recorded that "restriction" also means prohibition. In Para 89 of the order it was recorded as under :

> *89. While considering a prayer for provisional release, pending adjudication, whether all the above can wholly be ignored by the authorities, enjoined with a duty, to enforce the statutory provisions, rules and notifications, in letter and spirit, in consonance with the objects and intention of the Legislature, imposing prohibitions/ restrictions under the Customs Act, 1962 or under any other law, for the time being in force, we are of the view that all the authorities are bound to follow the same, wherever, prohibition or restriction is imposed, and when the word, "restriction", also means prohibition, as held by the Hon'ble Apex Court in Om Prakash Bhatia's case (cited supra).*

30. The Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the matter of Commissioner of Customs reported in (AIR), CHENNAI-I Versus P. SINNASAMY 2016 (344) E.L.T. 1154 (Mad.) held-

> *Tribunal had arrogated powers of adjudicating authority by directing authority to release gold by exercising option in favour of respondent - Tribunal had overlooked categorical finding of adjudicating authority that respondent had deliberately attempted to smuggle 2548.3 grams of gold, by concealing and without declaration of Customs for monetary consideration - Adjudicating authority had given reasons for confiscation of gold while allowing redemption of other goods on payment of fine - Discretion exercised by authority to deny release, is in accordance with law - Interference by Tribunal is against law and unjustified –*
>
> *Redemption fine - Option - Confiscation of smuggled gold - Redemption cannot be allowed, as a matter of right - Discretion conferred on adjudicating authority to decide - Not open to Tribunal to issue any positive directions to adjudicating authority to exercise option in favour of redemption.*

31. In 2019 (370) E.L.T. 1743 (G.O.I.), before the Government of India, Ministry of Finance, [Department of Revenue - Revisionary Authority]; Ms. Mallika Arya, Additional Secretary in Abdul Kalam Ammangod Kunhamu vide Order No. 17/2019-Cus., dated 07.10.2019 in F. No. 375/06/B/2017-RA stated that it is observed that C.B.I. & C. had issued instruction vide Letter F. No. 495/5/92-Cus. VI, dated 10.05.1993 wherein it has been instructed that "in respect of gold seized for non-declaration, no option to redeem the same on

redemption fine under Section 125 of the Customs Act, 1962 should be given except in very trivial cases where the adjudicating authority is satisfied that there was no concealment of the gold in question".

32. Given the facts of the present case before me and the judgements and rulings cited above, the said 02 gold cut bars, made up of 24 Kt. gold having purity 999.0 totally weighing 845.500 grams carried by the passenger is, therefore, liable to be confiscated absolutely. I, therefore, hold in unequivocal terms that gold cut bars, totally weighing 845.500 grams, placed under seizure would be liable to absolute confiscation under Section 111(d), 111(f), 111(i), 111(j), 111(l) & 111(m) of the Customs Act, 1962.

33. I further find that the passenger had involved himself and abetted the act of smuggling of the said gold cut bars carried by him. He has agreed and admitted in his statement that he travelled with said gold, totally weighing 845.500 grams from Kuwait to Ahmedabad. Despite his knowledge and belief that the gold carried by him is an offence under the provisions of the Customs Act, 1962 and the Regulations made under it, the Passenger attempted to smuggle the said gold of 845.500 grams by concealing/ hiding in the form of gold cut bars. Thus, it is clear that the passenger has concerned himself with carrying, removing, keeping, concealing and dealing with the smuggled gold which he knows very well and has reason to believe that the same are liable for confiscation under Section 111 of the Customs Act, 1962. Therefore, I find that the passenger is liable for penal action under Section 112(a)(i) of the Act and I hold accordingly.

34. Accordingly, I pass the following Order:

ORDER

(i) I order absolute confiscation of the impugned gold, in the form of 02 gold cut bars of 999.0/ 24Kt. purity gold having total weight of **845.500 Grams** hidden in his baggage concealed in the Checked-in baggage and having total tariff value of **Rs.47,07,254/-** (Rupees Fourty-Seven Lakhs Seven Thousand Two Hundred Fifty-Four only) and market value of **Rs.54,98,287/-** (Rupees Fifty-Four Lakhs Ninety-

Eight Thousand Two Hundred Eighty-Seven only) recovered and seized from the passenger **Shri Lokesh Kalal** vide Seizure Order dated 01.02.2024 under Panchnama proceedings dated 01.02.2024 under the provisions of Section 111(d), 111(f), 111(i), 111(j), 111(l) & 111(m) of the Customs Act, 1962;

(ii) I impose a penalty of **Rs.18,00,000/-** (Rupees Eighteen Lakhs Only) on Shri Lokesh Kalal under the provisions of Section 112(a)(i) of the Customs Act, 1962.

35. This order is issued without prejudice to any other action that may be taken against the passenger/ Noticee or any other person(s) concerned with said goods under the Customs Act, 1962, or any other law for the time being in force in India.

24/4/24

(Vishal Malani)
Additional Commissioner
Customs, Ahmedabad

F. No. VIII/10-11/SVPIA-A/O&A/HQ/2024-25 Date: 24.04.2024
DIN: 20240471MN0000888D56

BY SPEED POST A.D.

To,
Shri Lokesh Kalal,
S/o Chunnilal Kalal,
Village – Rajpur, Dist. Dungarpur,
Rajasthan - 314001.

Copy to:

(i) The Principal Commissioner of Customs, Ahmedabad. (Kind Attn: RRA Section).
(ii) The Dy./Asstt. Commissioner of Customs (AIU), SVPIA, Ahmedabad.
(iii) The Dy./Asstt. Commissioner of Customs (Prosecution), Ahmedabad.
(iv) The Dy./Asstt. Commissioner of Customs (TRC), Ahmedabad.
(v) The System In charge, Customs HQ, Ahmedabad for uploading on official web-site i.e. http://www.ahmedabadcustoms.gov.in.
(vi) Guard File.