सीमाशुल्क(अपील) आयुक्तकाकार्यालय,

OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER OF CUSTOMS (APPEALS),अहमदाबाद AHMEDABAD,

चौथी मंज़िल 4th Floor, हडकोभवनHUDCO Bhavan, ईश्वर भुवन रोड़ IshwarBhuvan Road,

नवरंगपुरा Navrangpura, अहमदाबाद Ahmedabad – 380 009

दूरभाषक्रमांक Tel. No. 079-26589281

DIN - 20251071MN000000A6EC

क	फ़ाइलसंख्या FILE NO.	S/49-144,142/CUS/AHD/2025-26
ख	अपीलआदेशसंख्या ORDER-IN-APPEAL NO. (सीमाशुल्कअधिनियम, 1962 कीधारा 128ककेअंतर्गत)(UNDER SECTION 128A OF THE CUSTOMS ACT, 1962) :	AHD-CUSTM-000-APP-274 & 275-25-26
ग	पारितकर्ता PASSED BY	Shri Amit Gupta Commissioner of Customs (Appeals), Ahmedabad
घ	दिनांक DATE	13.10.2025
ङ	उदभूतअपीलआदेशकीसं. वदिनांक ARISING OUT OF ORDER-IN-ORIGINAL NO.	40/ADC/SRV/O&A/2025-26 dated 28.05.2025
च	अपीलआदेशजारीकरनेकीदिनांक ORDER-IN-APPEAL ISSUED ON:	13.10.2025
छ	अपीलकर्ताकानामवपता NAME AND ADDRESS OF THE APPELLANT:	(i) Shri Dharmender Hiranand Lilani, 42, Ved Bunglows, Near Kamdarnagar, Noblenagar, Nana Chiloda, Ahmedabad-382330 (ii) Ms. Aayushi Dharmender Lilani, 42, Ved Bunglows, Near Kamdarnagar, Noblenagar, Nana Chiloda, Ahmedabad-382330.

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,नईदिल्लीकोपुनरीक्षणआवेदनप्रस्तुतकरसकतेहै.
	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.
	निम्नलिखितसम्बन्धितआदेश/Order relating to :
(क)	बैगेज़केरूपमेंआयातितकोईमाल.
(a)	any goods imported on baggage.
(ख)	भारतमेंआयातकरनेहेतुकिसीवाहनमेंलादागयालेकिनभारतमेंउनकेगन्तव्यस्थानपरउतारेनगएमालयाउसगन्तव्यस्थानपरउतारेजानेकेलिएअपेक्षितमालउतारेनजानेपरयाउसगन्तव्यस्थानपरउतारेगएमालकीमात्रामेंअपेक्षितमालसेकमीहो.
(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)	सीमाशुल्कअधिनियम, 1962 केअध्यायX तथाउसकेअधीनबनाएगएनियमोंकेतहतशुल्कवापसीकीअदायगी.
(c)	Payment of drawback as provided in Chapter X of Customs Act, 1962 and the rules made thereunder.
3.	पुनरीक्षणआवेदनपत्रसंगतनियमावलीमेंविनिर्दिष्टप्रारूपमेंप्रस्तुतकरनाहोगाजिसकेअन्तर्गतउसकीजांचकीजाएगी औरउसकेसाथनिम्नलिखितकागजातसंलग्नहोनेचाहिए :
	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)	कोर्टफीएक्ट,1870केमदसं. 6 अनुसूची 1 केअधीननिर्धारितकिएगएअनुसारइसआदेशकी 4 प्रतियां,जिसकीएकप्रतिमेंपचासपैसेकीन्यायालयशुल्कटिकटलगाहोनाचाहिए.
(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)	सम्बद्धदस्तावेज़ोंकेअलावासाथमूलआदेशकी 4 प्रतियां,यदिहो
(b)	4 copies of the Order-in-Original, in addition to relevant documents, if any
(ग)	पुनरीक्षणकेलिएआवेदनकी 4 प्रतियां
(c)	4 copies of the Application for Revision.
(घ)	पुनरीक्षणआवेदनदायरकरनेकेलिएसीमाशुल्कअधिनियम, 1962 (यथासंशोधित) मेंनिर्धारितफीसजोअन्यरसीद,फीस,दण्ड,जब्तीऔरविविधमदोंकेशीर्षकेअधीनआताहैमेंरु. 200/- (रूपएदोसौमात्र)यारु.1000/-(रूपएएकहज़ारमात्र),जैसाभीमामलाहो,सेसम्बन्धितभुगतानकेप्रमाणिकचलानटी.आर.6 कीदोप्रतियां. यदिशुल्क,मांगागयाब्याज,लगायागयादंडकीराशिऔररूपएएकलाखयाउससेकमहोतोऐसेफीसकेरूपमेंरु.200/- औरयदिएकलाखसेअधिकहोतोफीसकेरूपमेंरु.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.	मदसं. 2 केअधीनसूचितमामलोंकेअलावाअन्यमामलोंकेसम्बंन्धमेंयदिकोईव्यक्तिइसआदेशसेआहतमहसूसकरताहोतोवेसीमाशुल्कअधिनियम 1962 कीधारा 129 ए (1) केअधीनफॉर्मसी.ए.-3 मेंसीमाशुल्क,केन्द्रीयउत्पादशुल्कऔरसेवाकरअपीलअधिकरणकेसमक्षनिम्नलिखितपतेपरअपीलकरसकतेहैं

	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 :	
	सीमाशुल्क, केंद्रीयउत्पादशुल्कवसेवाकरअपीलियअधिकरण,पश्चिमीक्षेत्रीयपीठ	**Customs, Excise & Service Tax Appellate Tribunal, West Zonal Bench**
	दूसरीमंज़िल,बहुमालीभवन,निकटगिरधरनगरपुल,असारवा,अहमदाबाद-380016	2nd Floor, BahumaliBhavan, 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)	अपीलसेसम्बन्धितमामलेमेंजहांकिसीसीमाशुल्कअधिकारीद्वारामांगागयाशुल्कऔरव्याजतथालगायागयादंडकीरकमपाँचलाखरूपएयाउससेकमहोतोएकहज़ाररुपए.	
(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;पांचहज़ाररुपए	
(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;दसहज़ाररुपए.	
(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,जहांकेवलदंडविवादमेंहै,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) रोकआदेशकेलिएयागलतियोंकोसुधारनेकेलिएयाकिसीअन्यप्रयोजनकेलिएकिएगएअपील : - 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

Shri Dharmender Hiranand Lilani, 42, Ved Bunglows, Near Kamdarnagar, Noblenagar, Nana Chiloda, Ahmedabad-382330 (hereinafter referred to as "the appellant - 1") and Ms. Aayushi Dharmender Lilani, 42, Ved Bunglows, Near Kamdarnagar, Noblenagar, Nana Chiloda, Ahmedabad-382330 (hereinafter referred to as "the appellant - 2") have filed the present two appeals in terms of Section 128 of the Customs Act, 1962 against Order in Original No. 40/ADC/SRV/O&A/2025-26 dated 28.05.2025 (hereinafter referred to as "the impugned order") passed by the Additional Commissioner of Customs, Ahmedabad (hereinafter referred to as "the adjudicating authority".

2. Briefly stated, facts of the case are that on the basis of profiling and suspicious movement, the appellant 1 having Indian Passport No. N9257857 and appellant 2 having Indian Passport No. W6911138 was intercepted by the officers of Customs, Air Intelligence Unit (hereinafter referred to as "AIU") on arrival at SVP International Airport, Ahmedabad from Sharjah by Air Arabia Flight No G9 418 on 06.11.2024 while they were attempting to exit through green channel without making any declaration to the Customs. The appellants were asked by the AIU Officers whether they had made any declarations to customs authorities for dutiable goods/items or wanted to declare any dutiable goods/items before customs authorities to which they replied in negative and informed that they were not carrying any dutiable items with them. Thereafter, in the presence of the panchas, the AIU officers asked appellant 1 to walk through the Door Frame Metal Detector (DFMD) machine; before passing through the said DFMD Machine, the appellant 1 was asked to remove all the metallic objects he was wearing on his body/clothes. Thereafter, the appellant 1 removed metallic objects from his body/ clothes such as mobile, purse, gold chain, golden pendant and ring etc. worn by him which were kept hidden under his garments and kept them in a plastic tray placed on the table. On being asked, the appellant 1 informed the AIU officers that the aforesaid ornaments were made of gold. Thereafter, the AIU officers asked him to pass through the Door Frame Metal Detector (DFMD) machine. When the appellant 1 passed through the DFMD Machine, no beep sound was heard indicating that there was nothing objectionable/dutiable goods/items on his body/clothes. Thereafter, in the presence of the panchas, the AIU officers asked appellant 2 to walk through the Door Frame Metal Detector (DFMD) machine; before passing through the said DFMD Machine, the appellant 2 was asked to remove all the metallic objects she was wearing on her body/clothes. Thereafter, the

appellant 2 removed metallic objects from her body/ clothes such as mobile, purse, 2 anklets etc. worn by her which were kept hidden under her trouser and kept them in a plastic tray placed on the table. On being asked, the appellant 2 informed the AIU officers that the aforesaid ornaments were made of gold. Thereafter, the AIU officer asked her to pass through the Door Frame Metal Detector (DFMD) machine. When the appellant 2 passed through the DFMD Machine, no beep sound was heard indicating that there was nothing objectionable/dutiable goods/items on her body/clothes.

2.1 The Government Approved Valuer, Shri Soni Kartikey Vasantrai, confirmed that Gold jewelleries were made of gold 999.0/24Kt and issued certificate no. 1179/2024-25 dated 06.11.2024 certifying that value of 01 Gold Chain weighing 130.010 Grams, 01 Gold Ring coated with white Rhodium weighing 21.230 Grams and 01 Gold Pendent weighing 19.390 Grams, Total weighing 170.630 Grams, each having purity of 999.0/24Kt recovered from appellant 1 and has Market Value of Rs. 13,84,134/- and Tariff Value of Rs.12,81,624/-. He further issued Certificate no. 1180/2024-25 dated 06.11.2024 indicating that the value of 02 Gold Anklets Coated with White Rhodium weighing 230.400 Grams having purity of 999.0/24Kt, recovered from appellant 2 had Market Value of Rs. 18,68,544/- and Tariff Value of Rs.17,30,564/-. Total weight all the items comes to 401.030 grams having total Market Value of Rs. 32,52,678/ and total Tariff Value of Rs.30,12,188/-. The value of the aforesaid gold ornaments had been calculated as per the Notification No. 73/2024-Customs (N.T.) dated 30.10.2024 (gold) and Notification No. 45/2024-Customs (N.T.) dated 20.06.2024 (exchange rate). The Valuation details of which are as under: -

Sl No	Name of the appellant	Certificate No	Details of gold items	Net Weight in grams	Purity	Market Value (in Rs)	Tariff Value (in Rs)
01	Appellant 1	1179/2024-25 dated 06.11.2024	01 Ring, 01 Chain and 01 Pendant	170.630	999.0/24 kt	13,84,134/-	12,81,624/-
02	Appellant 2	1180/2024-25 dated 06.11.2024	02 Anklets	230.400	999.0/24 kt	18,68,544/-	17,30,564/-
	Total			401.030	999.0/24 kt	32,52,678/-	30,12,188/-

2.2 The aforementioned gold items totally weighing 401.030 grams having purity 999.0/24kt recovered from the both the appellants had been carried and attempted to be cleared through Customs without any legitimate Import documents inside the Customs Area, therefore the same fall under the category of Smuggled Goods and stand liable for confiscation under the Customs Act, 1962. Accordingly, the said gold items were placed under seizure.

2.3 Statement of the appellant 1 was recorded on 06.11.2024 under Section 108 of the Customs Act,1962, wherein he, inter-alia, stated that he went to Dubai for travelling purpose with his daughter Miss Aayushi Dharmender Lilani on 01.11.2024 and came back on 06.11.2024. He stated that while his stay in Dubai, he bought 01 Gold Chain, 01 Gold Ring coated with white Rhodium and 01 Gold Pendent which were recovered from him alongwith 02 Gold anklets that were recovered from his daughter Miss. Aayushi Dharmender Lilani during the proceedings of Panchnama dated 06.11.2024. He further stated that he had bought these gold items for his elder daughter who was likely to get married in February 2025. He further stated that he was present during the entire panchnama proceedings dated 06.11.2024 and the fact narrated therein were true and correct. He also stated that he was aware that smuggling of gold without payment of Customs duty was an offence and he was aware of the concealed gold in the form of 01 Gold Chain, 01 Gold Ring coated with white Rhodium and 01 Gold Pendent but he did not make any declarations in this regard to evade payment of Customs duty.

2.4 Statement of the appellant 2 was recorded on 06.11.2024 under Section 108 of the Customs Act,1962, wherein she, inter-alia, stated that she went to Dubai for travelling purpose with her father Shri Dharmender Hiranand Lilani on 01.11.2024 and came back on 06.11.2024. She stated that while her stay in Dubaj, her father bought the said 02 gold anklets coated with white Rhodium and handed over to her on 05.11.2024 and asked her to wear in her ankles. She further stated that she was present during the entire panchnama proceedings dated 06.11.2024 and the fact narrated therein were true and correct. She also stated that she was aware that smuggling of gold without payment of Customs duty was an offence and she was aware of the concealed gold in the form of 02 gold anklets coated with white Rhodium but she did not make any declarations in this regard to evade payment of Customs duty.

2.5 The appellant 1 and appellant 2 had attempted to smuggle/improperly import 999.0/24 Kt. Pure gold items viz. 1 Ring, 1 Chain, 1 Pendant & 2 anklets (Rhodium Coated), having total weight 401.030 grams and having total market value of Rs.32,52,678/ 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. appellant 1 and appellant 2 have knowingly and intentionally smuggled the said gold items upon his arrival from Sharjah to Ahmedabad by Air Arabia Airlines Flight No. G9 418 on 06.11.2024 with an intent to clear these illicitly to evade payment of the Customs duty. Therefore, the aforesaid gold items viz. 1 Ring, 1 Chain, 1 Pendant & 2 anklets (Rhodium Coated) smuggled by appellant 1 and appellant 2, cannot be treated as bonafide household goods or personal effects. Shri Dharmender Liliani and Ms. Aayushi Lilani has, thus contravened the Foreign Trade Policy 2015-20 as amended and Section 11(1) of the Foreign Trade (Development and Regulation) Act, 1992. Appellant 1 and appellant 2 by not declaring the said gold items before the proper officer of the Customs have contravened the provisions of Section 77 of the Customs Act, 1962 read with Regulation 3 of Customs Baggage Declaration Regulations, 2013.

2.6 The improperly imported gold by the appellant 1 and appellant 2, without declaring it to the Customs is thus liable for confiscation under Section 111(d), 111(1), & 111(m) read with Section 2(22), (33), (39) of the Customs Act, 1962 and further read in conjunction with Section 11(3) of Customs Act, 1962. The appellant 1 and appellant 2 by the above-described acts of omission/commission and/or abetment has/have rendered themselves liable to penalty under Section 112 of Customs Act, 1962. As per Section 123 of Customs Act 1962, the burden of proving that the concerned gold items are not smuggled goods, is upon the appellant 1 and appellant 2.

2.7 The appellant 1 and appellant 2 vide letter dated 10.11.2024 and 12.12.2024 submitted request for waiver of SCN and vide letter dated 09.11.2024 the authorized representative has also requested for waiver of SCN. They have submitted that they are the owner of gold jewellery and not found involved in similar offence earlier. Due to lack of knowledge of the customs rules, they are unable to declare the same and the gold was belonged to them for their personal use.

2.8 The Adjudicating authority, vide the impugned order, has ordered for absolute confiscation of impugned gold items i.e. 01 gold ring, 01 gold chain and 01 gold pendant totally weighing 170.630 grams found in

possession of appellant 1 and 02 gold anklets of weighing 230.400 grams found in possession of appellant 2 having total weight of 401.030 grams made up of 999.0/24kt having total tariff value of Rs.30,12,188/- and market value of Rs.32,52,678/- recovered and seized from them vide Seizure Order dated 06.11.2024 under Panchnama proceedings dated 06.11.2024 under the provisions of Section 111(d), 111(1) & 111(m) of the Customs Act, 1962. The adjudicating authority has also imposed penalty of Rs. 3,00,000/- on the appellant 1 and penalty of Rs 4,50,000/- on appellant 2 under Section 112 (a)(i) and 112(b)(i) of the Customs Act,1962.

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

- The present case was made on 06/11/2024 by the Customs, Ahmedabad without giving an opportunity to the declare the goods viz. Gold item weighing 401.030 Grams to the Appellants; the fact remains that the applicant was stopped well before the Customs area and taken for check thus depriving the chance of filling the Declaration form and present the same to the Customs. Factually, the applicant was stopped well before the Immigration Counter.
- The appellant denies the allegation that the gold item was concealed in any manner. The appellants were wearing the gold items on the body. They did not conceal the gold item. Therefore, the allegation made that the same was concealed is without any substance and thus, the allegation so made is baseless to increase the gravity of the allegation. The same is not sustainable.
- The appellant respectfully submits that the quantity of gold brought by him was weighing 401.030 Grams having tariff value of Rs.30,12,188/- and market value of Rs.32,52,678/-. Thus, it can be safely concluded that such a small quantity of gold cannot be for the purpose of sale and self-enrichment. The appellant deposed before the officials that it was meant for his family requirement.
- It is further submitted that the applicant is not a part of any gold smuggling syndicate. No allegation is made in the impugned order to this effect. At no time in past and after this case, the applicant came to any adverse notice. The gold items brought were absolutely for personal and family use but the applicant was stopped well before he could declare the same. Thus, the error committed was unintended and bonafide in nature and the same has been committed for the first time a lenient was requested to be taken, however, the Ld Adjudicating Authority has imposed hefty penalties.

- The applicant respectfully pray that the gold item weighing 401.030 Grams, which was factually not concealed in any manner may kindly be ordered to be released to the applicant with payment of applicable duty and nominal penalty. In the matter, the applicant places his reliance of the following Orders of Ld R.A., Mumbai, where in more severe cases, the gold ornaments/ gold was ordered to be released with payment of duty and little penalty. The applicant prays for reduction of penalty substantially since the quantity of gold is very small, which is meant for personal use and the same was not concealed in any manner.

  i) RE- Shri Balanadukkam Muhammed Vs. Pr Commissioner of Customs, CSMIA, Mumbai RA Order No. 371/328/B/WZ/2018-RA dated 08/12/2022

  ii) RE- Commissioner of Customs, CSI Airport, Mumbai Vs. Mr Mohammed Yasar Ballor Ibrahim RA Order No. 380/84/B/WZ/2018-RA dated 01.02.2023

  iii) RE- Kasmani Asif Abdual Aziz Vs. Pr. Commissioner of Customs, Ahmedabad RA Order No. 371/306/B/WZ/2022-RA/612 dated 12.2.2024

- The appellant submits that without prejudice to the above contentions it is submitted that there are a number of judgments of the Hon'ble Apex Court, the Hon'ble High Courts and the Hon'ble Tribunal, wherein it has been held that gold is not a prohibited item and the same is restricted and therefore it should not be confiscated absolutely and option to redeem the same on redemption fine ought to be given to the person from whom it is recovered. The notice submits that some of the judgments are listed below viz.

  - Hon'ble Tribunal in the case of YAKUB IBRAHIM YUSUF V/S COMMISSIONER OF CUSTOMS, MUMBAI reported in 2011 (263) E.L.T. 685 (Tri-Mumbai) held that "confiscation-Prohibited goods-Scope of - Term prohibited goods refers to goods like arms, ammunition, addictive drugs, whose import in any circumstance would danger or be detriment to health, welfare or morals of people as whole, and makes them liable to absolute confiscation-it does not refer to goods whose import is permitted subject to restriction, which can be confiscated for violation of restrictions, but liable to be released on payment of redemption fine since they do not

cause danger or detriment to health-section 111and 125 of customs Act, 1962." (Para 5.5)

"Redemption Fine Option of Owner of goods not known- option of redemption has to be given to person from whose possession impugned goods are recovered On facts, option of redemption fine allowed to 'person who had illicitly imported gold with view to earn profit by selling it, even though he had not claimed its ownership- section 125 of customs Act, 1962." (Para 5.6)

- ❖ In union of India Vs Dhanak M. Ramji 2009 (248) E.L.T. 127 (Bom) affirmed vide 2010 (252) E.L.T. A102 (SC) it was held that gold is not a prohibited item and discretion of redemption can be exercised to the person from whom it was recovered.
- ❖ In Sapna Sanjeev Kohli Vs Commissioner of Customs, Airport, Mumbai-2008 (230) E.L.T. 305 the Tribunal observed that the frequent traveller was aware of rules and regulation and absolute confiscation of gold jewellery not warranted which may be cleared on payment of redemption fine.
- ❖ In The Commissioner of Customs, Aliganj, Lucknow vs Rajesh Jhamatmal Bhat 2022 (382) E.L.T 345 (AH) 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 up held the decision of Hon'ble Tribunal.
- ❖ In Shri Waqar v/s Commissioner of Customs (Preventive), Customs Appeal No. 70723/2019, Customs, and Excise & Service Tax Appellate Tribunal Allahabad.

- In respect of penalty the appellant submitted that the appellant belongs to a lower middle class family and the penalty imposed of Rs. 3,00,000/- and 4,50,000/- under the provisions of Section 112(a)(i) and section 112(b)(i) of the Customs Act 1962, in respect of other goods is highly excessive. The appellant had no ill intention and the goods were brought for exclusive personal use in ignorance of law and being unaware thus both the excessive penalties imposed under Section 112(a) (i) and Section 112(b)(i) may kindly be annulled with consequential relief to the applicant.
- It is submitted that the fact that gold is not a prohibited item for import is also evident from perusal of list of prohibited items for import. Therefore, also, the gold in question may be released.

4. Shri Shubham Jhajharia, Advocate, appeared for personal hearing on 08.10.2025 on behalf of the appellant. He reiterated the submissions made in the appeal memorandum.

5. 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. 01 gold ring, 01 gold chain and 01 gold pendant totally weighing 170.630 grams and valued at Rs 12,81,624/- (Tariff Value) and Rs 13,84,134/- (Market Value) found in possession of appellant 1 and 02 gold anklets of weighing 230.400 grams and valued at Rs 17,30,564/- (Tariff Value) and Rs 18,68,544/- (Market Value) found in possession of appellant 2 having total weight of 401.030 grams made up of 999.0/24kt having total tariff value of Rs.30,12,188/- and market value of Rs.32,52,678/- 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. 3,00,000/- imposed on the appellant 1 and Rs 4,50,000/- imposed on appellant 2, under Section 112(a)(i) and 112(b)(i) of the Customs Act, 1962, in the facts and circumstances of the case, is legal and proper or otherwise.

6. It is observed that on the basis of profiling and suspicious movement, the appellant 1 having Indian Passport No. N9257857 and appellant 2 having Indian Passport No. W6911138 was intercepted by the officers of Customs, Air Intelligence Unit (hereinafter referred to as "AIU") on arrival at SVP International Airport, Ahmedabad from Sharjah by Air Arabia Flight No G9 418 on 06.11.2024 while they were attempting to exit through green channel without making any declaration to the Customs. The appellants were asked by the AIU Officers whether they had made any declarations to customs authorities for dutiable goods/items or wanted to declare any dutiable goods/items before customs authorities to which they replied in negative and informed that they were not carrying any dutiable items with them. Thereafter, in the presence of the panchas, the AIU officers asked appellant 1 to walk through the Door Frame Metal Detector (DFMD) machine; before passing through the said DFMD Machine, the appellant 1 was asked to remove all the metallic objects he was wearing on

his body/clothes. Thereafter, the appellant 1 removed metallic objects from his body/ clothes such as mobile, purse, gold chain, golden pendant and ring etc. worn by him which were kept hidden under his garments and kept them in a plastic tray placed on the table. On being asked, the appellant 1 informed the AIU officers that the aforesaid ornaments were made of gold. Thereafter, the AIU officers asked him to pass through the Door Frame Metal Detector (DFMD) machine. When the appellant 1 passed through the DFMD Machine, no beep sound was heard indicating that there was nothing objectionable/dutiable goods/items on his body/clothes. Thereafter, in the presence of the panchas, the AIU officers asked appellant 2 to walk through the Door Frame Metal Detector (DFMD) machine; before passing through the said DFMD Machine, the appellant 2 was asked to remove all the metallic objects she was wearing on her body/clothes. Thereafter, the appellant 2 removed metallic objects from her body/ clothes such as mobile, purse, 2 anklets etc. worn by her which were kept hidden under her trouser and kept them in a plastic tray placed on the table. On being asked, the appellant 2 informed the AIU officers that the aforesaid ornaments were made of gold. Thereafter, the AIU officer asked her to pass through the Door Frame Metal Detector (DFMD) machine. When the appellant 2 passed through the DFMD Machine, no beep sound was heard indicating that there was nothing objectionable/dutiable goods/items on her body/clothes. The Government Approved Valuer, Shri Soni Kartikey Vasantrai, confirmed that Gold jewelleries were made of gold 999.0/24Kt and issued certificate no. 1179/2024-25 dated 06.11.2024 certifying that value of 01 Gold Chain weighing 130.010 Grama, 01 Gold Ring coated with white Rhodium weighing 21.230 Grams and 01 Gold Pendent weighing 19.390 Grams, Total weighing 170.630 Grams, each having purity of 999.0/24Kt recovered from appellant 1 and has Market Value of Rs. 13,84,134/- and Tariff Value of Rs.12,81,624/-. He further issued Certificate no. 1180/2024-25 dated 06.11.2024 indicating that the value of 02 Gold Anklets Coated with White Rhodium weighing 230.400 Grams having purity of 999.0/24Kt, recovered from appellant 2 had Market Value of Rs. 18,68,544/- and Tariff Value of Rs.17,30,564/-. Total weight all the items comes to 401.030 grams having total Market Value of Rs. 32,52,678/ and total Tariff Value of Rs.30,12,188/-. The appellant 1 and appellant 2 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 appellants recorded under Section 108 of the Customs Act, 1962 on the same day. There is no disputing the facts that the appellants had not declared possession of gold at the time of their arrival in India. Thereby, they had 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.

6.1 I find that it is undisputed that the appellants had not declared the seized gold to the Customs on their arrival in India. Further, in their statement, the appellant 1 and appellant 2 had admitted the knowledge, possession, carriage, non-declaration and recovery of the seized gold. The appellants had, in their 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 applicants 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 appellants had rendered themselves liable for penalty under Section 112 of the Customs Act, 1962.

6.2 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 relied upon by the appellants 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. 01 gold ring, 01 gold chain and 01 gold pendant totally weighing 170.630 grams and valued at Rs 12,81,624/- (Tariff Value) and Rs 13,84,134/- (Market Value) found in possession of appellant 1 and 02 gold anklets of weighing 230.400 grams and valued at Rs 17,30,564/- (Tariff Value) and Rs 18,68,544/- (Market Value) found in possession of appellant 2 having total weight of 401.030 grams made up of 999.0/24kt having total tariff value of Rs.30,12,188/- and market value of Rs.32,52,678/- are liable to confiscation and the appellant are also liable to penalty.

6.3 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.

6.4 In respect of absolute confiscation of impugned gold items i.e. 01 gold ring, 01 gold chain and 01 gold pendant totally weighing 170.630 grams and valued at Rs 12,81,624/- (Tariff Value) and Rs 13,84,134/- (Market Value) found in possession of appellant 1 and 02 gold anklets of weighing 230.400 grams and valued at Rs 17,30,564/- (Tariff Value) and Rs 18,68,544/- (Market Value) found in possession of appellant 2 having total weight of 401.030 grams made up of 999.0/24kt having total tariff value of Rs.30,12,188/- and market value of Rs.32,52,678/-, 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 Samynathan Murugesan [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)], Order No 17/2019-Cus dated 07.10.2019 in F. No. 375/06/B/2017-RA of Government of India, Ministry of Finance, Department of Revenue Revisionary Authority in the case of Abdul Kalam Ammangod Kunhamu and Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in the matter of Rameshwar Tiwari Vs. Union of India (2024) 17 Centax 261 (Del.) and other decisions in paras 24 to 25 of the impugned order, had ordered for absolute confiscation of impugned gold items i.e. 01 gold ring, 01 gold chain and 01 gold pendant totally weighing 170.630 grams and valued at Rs 12,81,624/- (Tariff Value) and Rs 13,84,134/- (Market Value) found in possession of appellant 1 and 02 gold anklets of weighing 230.400 grams and valued at Rs 17,30,564/- (Tariff Value) and Rs 18,68,544/- (Market

Value) found in possession of appellant 2 having total weight of 401.030 grams made up of 999.0/24kt having total tariff value of Rs.30,12,188/- and market value of Rs.32,52,678/-.

6.5 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 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."*

6.6 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 negatived 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 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 confirmity 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."*

6.7 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. "

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

6.9 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 excercised 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)."

6.10 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.

6.11 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.

6.12 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.

6.13 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 jewellary, 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.

6.14 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 1 and appellant 2 are habitual offender and were involved in similar offence earlier. The appellants were not a part of organised smuggling syndicate. The appellant 1 in his statement dated 06.11.2024 stated that he had bought 01 Gold Chain, 01 Gold Ring and 01 Gold Pendent which were recovered from him alongwith 02 Gold anklets that were recovered from his

daughter i.e. appellant 2 during the proceedings of Panchnama dated 06.11.2024. He further stated that he had bought these gold items for his elder daughter who was likely to get married in February 2025. Thus, the appellants were 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. 01 gold ring, 01 gold chain and 01 gold pendant totally weighing 170.630 grams and valued at Rs 12,81,624/- (Tariff Value) and Rs 13,84,134/- (Market Value) found in possession of appellant 1 and 02 gold anklets of weighing 230.400 grams and valued at Rs 17,30,564/- (Tariff Value) and Rs 18,68,544/- (Market Value) found in possession of appellant 2 having total weight of 401.030 grams made up of 999.0/24kt having total tariff value of Rs.30,12,188/- and market value of Rs.32,52,678/- is harsh. I, therefore, set aside the absolute confiscation ordered by the adjudicating authority in the impugned order and allow redemption of gold items i.e. 01 gold ring, 01 gold chain and 01 gold pendant totally weighing 170.630 grams and valued at Rs 12,81,624/- (Tariff Value) and Rs 13,84,134/- (Market Value) found in possession of appellant 1, on payment of fine of Rs. 2,50,000/- to appellant 1 and allow redemption of gold items i.e. 02 gold anklets weighing 230.400 grams and valued at Rs 17,30,564/- (Tariff Value) and Rs 18,68,544/- (Market Value) found in possession of appellant 2, on payment of fine of Rs. 3,50,000/- to appellant 2 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.

6.15 Further, in respect of imposition of penalty amounting to Rs 3,00,000/- on the appellant 1 for non-declaration of gold items i.e. 01 gold

ring, 01 gold chain and 01 gold pendant totally weighing 170.630 grams and valued at Rs 12,81,624/- (Tariff Value) and Rs 13,84,134/- (Market Value), 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. 3,00,000/- ordered by the adjudicating authority in the impugned order in respect of appellant 1 is harsh. Therefore, I reduce the penalty to Rs. 1,25,000/-.

6.16 Further, in respect of imposition of penalty amounting to Rs 4,50,000/- on the appellant 2 for non-declaration of gold items i.e. 02 gold anklets weighing 230.400 grams and valued at Rs 17,30,564/- (Tariff Value) and Rs 18,68,544/- (Market Value), 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. 4,50,000/- ordered by the adjudicating authority in the impugned order in respect of appellant 1 is harsh. Therefore, I reduce the penalty to Rs. 1,75,000/-.

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.

(AMIT GUPTA)
COMMISSIONER (APPEALS)
CUSTOMS, AHMEDABAD.

By Registered Post A.D.

F.No. S/49-144,142/CUS/AHD/2025-26 3928 Dated –13.10.2025

To,

(i) Shri Dharmender Hiranand Lilani,
42, Ved Bunglows, Near Kamdarnagar,
Noblenagar, Nana Chiloda, Ahmedabad-382330,

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

(ii) Ms. Aayushi Dharmender Lilani,
42, Ved Bunglows, Near Kamdarnagar,
Noblenagar, Nana Chiloda, Ahmedabad-382330

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, Ahmedabad.
4. Guard File