OIO No:229/ADC/SRV/O&A/2024-25
F. No: VIII/10-136/SVPIA-A/O&A/HQ/2024-25

प्रधान आयुक्त का कार्यालय, सीमा शुल्क, अहमदाबाद

"सीमाशुल्कभवन", पहलीमंजिल , पुरानेहाईकोर्टकेसामने, नवरंगपुरा, अहमदाबाद – 380009.

दूरभाष: (079) 2754 4630,**E-mail:** cus-ahmd-adj@gov.in, फैक्स: (079) 2754 2343

DIN: 20250171MN0000888DFA

PREAMBLE

A	फ़ाइलसंख्या/ File No.	:	VIII/10-136/SVPIA-A/O&A/HQ/ 2024-25
B	कारणबताओनोटिससंख्या–तारीख / Show Cause Notice No. and Date	:	VIII/10-136/SVPIA-A/O&A/HQ/ 2024-25 dated 11.07.2024
C	मूलआदेशसंख्या/ Order-In-Original No.	:	**229/ADC/SRV/O&A/2024-25**
D	आदेशतिथि/ Date of Order-In-Original	:	**17.01.2025**
E	जारीकरनेकीतारीख/ Date of Issue	:	**17.01.2025**
F	द्वारापारित/ Passed By	:	**Shree Ram Vishnoi**, Additional Commissioner, Customs, Ahmedabad
G	आयातककानामऔरपता / Name and Address of Importer / Passenger	:	**Ms. Uma Madanlal Joshi**, 9/A, Khodiyar Nagar, Nr. Rambalram Nagar, Chandlodia, Ahmedabad, Pin:-382481
(1)	यह प्रति उन व्यक्तियों के उपयोग के लिए निःशुल्क प्रदान की जाती है जिन्हे यह जारी की गयी है।		
(2)	कोई भी व्यक्ति इस आदेश से स्वयं को असंतुष्ट पाता है तो वह इस आदेश के विरुद्ध अपील इस आदेश की प्राप्ति की तारीख के 60 दिनों के भीतर आयुक्त कार्यालय, सीमा शुल्क अपील)चौथी मंज़िल, हुडको भवन, ईश्वर भुवन मार्ग, नवरंगपुरा, अहमदाबाद में कर सकता है।		
(3)	अपील के साथ केवल पांच (5.00) रुपये का न्यायालय 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 साथ केवल पांच (5.00) रुपये का न्यायालय शुल्क टिकिट लगा होना चाहिए।
(4)	इस आदेश के विरुद्ध अपील करने इच्छुक व्यक्ति को 7.5 % (अधिकतम 10 करोड़) शुल्क अदा 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, 1962 की धारा 129 के प्रावधानों का अनुपालन नहीं करने के लिए अपील को खारिज कर दिया जायेगा।

Brief facts of the case:

Ms. Uma Madanlal Joshi, hereinafter referred to as the said "passenger/ Noticee"), residing at 9/A, Khodiyar Nagar, Nr. Rambalram Nagar, Chandlodia, Ahmedabad, Pin - 382481, holding an Indian Passport No. Y9785275 arrived from Dubai to Ahmedabad by Spice Jet Airline Flight No. SG16 (Seat No:12F) at Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel International Airport (SVPIA), Terminal-2, Ahmedabad. On the basis of specific Input Ms. Uma Madanlal Joshi, who arrived by Spice Jet Airline Flight No. SG16 (Seat No:12F) on 07.02.2024 from Dubai to Ahmedabad at Terminal 2 of Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel International Airport (SVPI), Ahmedabad was intercepted by the officers of DRI, AZU, Ahmedabad/ Air Intelligence Unit (AIU), SVPI Airport, Customs, Ahmedabad when she was trying to exit through Green Channel at arrival hall of Terminal 2 of Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel International Airport (SVPI) Ahmedabad. Accordingly two independent Panchas were called for passenger's personal search and examination of her baggages under Panchnama proceedings dated 07/08.02.2024.

2. In presence of the Panchas on being asked about her identity by the DRI/ AIU officers, the passenger identified herself as Ms. Uma

Madanlal Joshi and showed her Indian Passport bearing No. Y9785275 and that she had travelled from Dubai to Ahmedabad on 07.02.2024 having Boarding Pass which showed that she has arrived by Spice Jet Airline Flight No. SG16 (Seat No:12F) on 07.02.2024 at SVPI Airport, Ahmedabad. The DRI/ AIU officers asked Ms. Uma Madanlal Joshi, if she has anything to declare, in reply to which she denied. The DRI/ AIU officers informed the passenger that he along with his accompanied officers would be conducting her personal search and detailed examination of her baggage. Thereafter, the DRI/ AIU officers asked the passenger whether she wanted to be checked in front of an Executive Magistrate or Superintendent of Customs, in reply to which the passenger gave her consent for personal search in front of the Superintendent of Customs.

2.1 In presence of two independent Panchas the DRI/ AIU officers asked the said passenger to pass through the Door Frame Metal Detector (DFMD) Machine installed near the green channel in the Arrival Hall of Terminal 2 building, after removing all metallic objects from her body/ clothes. The passenger removed all the metallic objects such as mobile, belt etc. and kept in a plastic tray and passed through the DFMD Machine, however, no beep sound was heard indicating that there was nothing objectionable/ metallic substance on her body/ clothes. Thereafter, the said passenger, the Panchas and the officers of DRI/ AIU moved to the AIU Office located opposite Belt No. 2 of the Arrival Hall, Terminal-2, SVPI Airport, Ahmedabad alongwith the baggage of the passenger. The DRI/ AIU officers checked the baggage of the passenger, however nothing objectionable was found. The officers again asked the said passenger if she is having anything dutiable which is required to be declared to the Customs to which the passenger denied.

2.2 In presence of the Panchas, the AIU Officers questioned and interrogated the said passenger and upon sustained interrogation, the passenger finally confessed that she was carrying three capsules containing semi-solid substance concealed inside her body i.e. rectum. Thereafter, the passenger Ms. Uma Madanlal Joshi was taken to the washroom in the arrival hall of Terminal 2, where she removed three capsules containing gold paste from her rectum. In presence of the Panchas it is found that the said capsules were covered with black coloured adhesive tape. The weight of the said black colour capsules was measured, which came to approximately 944.530 grams. In presence of the Panchas the DRI/ AIU officers took the photograph of the said capsules which was as under:

2.3 Thereafter, the DRI/ AIU officers called the Government Approved Valuer and informed him that three black-coloured capsules containing semi-solid substance consisting of gold and chemical mix had been recovered from a passenger and the passenger informed that it is of gold in semi solid/ paste form and hence, he was needed to come to the Airport for testing and Valuation of the said material. In reply, the Government Approved Valuer informed the DRI/ AIU officers that the testing of the said material is only possible at his workshop as gold has to be extracted from such semi solid/ paste form by melting it and also informed the address of his workshop. Thereafter the Panchas along with the passenger and the DRI/ AIU officers left the Airport premises in a Government Vehicle and reached at the premises of the Government Approved Valuer located at Shree Ambica Touch, Gold Sook Complex, Near Iscon Arcade, C.G. Road, Ahmedabad.

2.4 On reaching the above referred premises, the DRI/ AIU officers introduced the Panchas as well as the passenger to one person named Shri Kartikey Vasantrai Soni, Government Approved Valuer. In presence of the Panchas, after weighing the said semi solid substance covered with black coloured adhesive tape on her weighing scale, Shri Kartikey Vasantrai Soni informed that the said three capsules containing gold paste wrapped in black coloured adhesive tape is weighing 944.530 grams. Thereafter, Shri Kartikey Vasantrai Soni led the officers, the Panchas and the passenger to the furnace. Thereafter, Shri Kartikey Vasantrai Soni started the process of converting the said semi solid material into solid gold, accordingly the black coloured tape of the capsules was removed and brown coloured substance packed in transparent tape was obtained and put

into the furnace and upon heating the said substance turned into liquid material. The said substance in liquid state was taken out of furnace, and poured in a mould and after cooling for some time, it became golden coloured solid metal in form of a bar. After completion of the procedure, the Government Approved Valuer informed that gold bar weighing **891.980** grams having purity 999.0 is derived from the 944.530 grams of capsules containing gold paste and chemical mix. After testing the said golden coloured metal, the Government Approved Valuer confirmed that it is of pure gold. Further, he informed that the Market Value of the said recovered gold bar having net weight of 891.980 grams derived from Semi Solid substance Material Consisting of Gold & Chemical Mix is **Rs.57,69,327/-** (Rupees Fifty-Seven Lakhs Sixty-Nine Thousand Three Hundred and Twenty-Seven only) and Tariff Value is **Rs.49,57,170/-** (Rupees Forty-Nine Lakhs Fifty-Seven Thousand One Hundred and Seventy only). The value of the gold bar was calculated as per the Notification No. 09/2024-Customs (N.T.) dated 31.01.2024 (gold) and Notification No. 10/2024-Customs (N.T.) dated 01.02.2024 (exchange rate). The details of the Valuation of the said gold bar is tabulated in below table:

S.No.	Details of items	Pcs	Gross weight in gram	Net weight in gram	Purity	Market Value in Rs.	Tariff Value in Rs.
1	Gold Bar	01	944.530	891.98	999.0, 24 Kt	57,69,327/-	49,57,170/-

3. In presence of the Panchas the DRI/ AIU officers placed the recovered gold bar derived from brown Semi Solid substance Material consisting of Gold & chemical mix on a table and took a photograph of which was as under:

4. Thereafter, on completion of the proceedings of the extraction of gold at the workshop the Panchas, DRI/ AIU officers and the passengers came back to the Airport in government vehicle alongwith the extracted gold bar. In presence of the Panchas the officers asked the passenger Ms. Uma Madanlal Joshi to produce the identity proof documents and accordingly the passenger produced the same as under:

i) Copy of Passport No. Y9785275 issued at Ahmedabad on 25.09.2023 valid up to 24.09.2033.

ii) Boarding pass of Spice Jet Airline Flight No. SG16 from Dubai to Ahmedabad dated 07.02.2024 having seat no.12F.

5. The DRI/ AIU Officers informed the Panchas as well as the passenger, that the Gold bar of 24Kt. with purity 999.0 weighing

891.980 grams derived from Semi Solid substance material consisting of Gold & Chemical Mix having the Market Value of Rs.57,69,327/- (Rupees Fifty Seven Lakhs Sixty Nine Thousand Three Hundred and Twenty Seven only) and Tariff Value is Rs.49,57,170/- (Rupees Forty Nine Lakhs Fifty Seven Thousand One Hundred and Seventy only) recovered from the above said passenger was attempted to be smuggled into India with an intent to evade payment of Customs duty which is a clear violation of the provisions of Customs Act, 1962. Thus, the DRI/ AIU officers informed that they have a reasonable belief that the above said Gold is being attempted to be smuggled by Ms. Uma Madanlal Joshi and is liable for confiscation as per the provisions of the Customs Act, 1962 and hence the same was placed under seizure. The officers, then, in presence of the Panchas and in the presence of the said passenger placed the said 24 kt. gold bar of 999.0 purity weighing 891.980 grams recovered from Ms. Uma Madanlal Joshi in one transparent plastic box and after placing the packing list on the same, tied it with white thread and seals it with the Customs lac seal.

5.1 The copies of travelling documents and identity proof documents mentioned above have been taken into possession for further investigation of the case and the Panchas as well as the passenger put their dated signatures on copies of all the above-mentioned travelling documents and the passenger manifest, as a token of having seen and agreed to the same.

5.2. A statement of Ms. Uma Madanlal Joshi, residing at 9/A, Khodiyar Nagar, Nr. Rambalram Nagar, Chandlodia, Ahmedabad, Pin:-382481, holding an Indian Passport Number No. Y9785275 was

recorded under Section 108 of the Customs Act, 1962 before the Superintendent (AIU), Customs, SVPI Airport, Ahmedabad on 08.02.2024, wherein she inter alia stated that she went to Dubai on 02.02.2024; that she booked the travel ticket from Ahmedabad to Dubai from her own fund but the return ticket was booked by some unknown person; that this gold is not her and not purchased by her; that an unknown person met her at City Centre Mall in Dubai and gave her this gold to hand over the same in India for which the unknown person would pay her Rs.20,000/-.

5.3. On being asked she stated that the unknown person handed over this gold & Chemical mix paste in form of capsules to her and instructed her not to eat and drink anything as this gold would be carried by way of body concealment i.e. rectum; that she did not have any mobile number or photo to whom the said capsules of gold paste were to handover in India; that she was also aware that import of gold in such ways of concealment with intent to evade the payment of Customs Duty is an offence.

5.4 On being asked she stated that she was fully aware that clearing gold illicitly without payment of Customs duty is an offence, under the provisions of the Customs Act, 1962 and Regulations; that she agreed that she had evaded Customs duty on total 891.980 grams of 24Kt, with purity 999.00 involving Market Value of Rs.57,69,327/- (Rupees Fifty Seven Lakhs Sixty Nine Thousand Three Hundred and Twenty Seven only) and Tariff Value is Rs.49,57,170/- (Rupees Forty Nine Lakhs Fifty Seven Thousand One Hundred and Seventy only) which were recovered from her rectum.

5.5 The above said gold bar with a net weight of 891.980 grams having purity of 999.0/24 Kt. involving tariff value of Rs.49,57,170/- (Rupees Forty Nine Lakhs Fifty Seven Thousand One Hundred and Seventy only) and market value of Rs.57,69,327/- (Rupees Fifty Seven Lakhs Sixty Nine Thousand Three Hundred and Twenty Seven only) recovered from the said passenger which was attempted to be smuggled into India with an intent to evade payment of Customs duty by of concealment of three gold capsules wrapped in black coloured adhesive tape containing gold in semi solid paste form in her rectum, which was in clear violation of the provisions of the Customs Act, 1962. Thus, on a reasonable belief the Gold bar totally weighing 891.980 grams, which was attempted to be smuggled by Ms. Uma Madanlal Joshi, is liable for confiscation under the provisions of Section 111 of the Customs Act, 1962, hence, the above said gold bar weighing 891.980 grams was placed under seizure under the provision of Section 110 of the Customs Act, 1962, vide Seizure Memo Order dated 08.02.2024, issued from F. No. VIII/10-294/AIU/A/2023-24, under Section 110 (1) & (3) of Customs Act, 1962.

6. In terms of Board's Circular No. 28/2015-Customs issued from F. No. 394/68/2013-Cus(AS) dtd. 23.10.2015 and 27/2015-Cus issued from 394/68/2013-Cus(AS) dtd. 23.10.2015 as revised vide circular No. 13/2022-Customs dtd. 16.08.2022, the prosecution and the decision to arrest may be considered in cases involving outright smuggling of high value goods such as precious metal, restricted items or prohibited items were the value of the goods involved is Rs.50,00,000/- (Rs. Fifty Lakhs) or more.

6.1 Since the market value of gold attempted to be smuggled and recovered from Ms. Uma Madanlal Joshi (Passport No.Y9785275) is Rs.57,69,327/- which is more than Rs.50,00,000/- hence, the Passenger Ms. Uma Madanlal Joshi was arrested on 09.02.2024 and was subsequently released on payment of bail bond amount of Rs.90,000/- vide Receipt No.38992 dated 09.02.2024 as per Bail Bond.

7. **RELEVANT LEGAL PROVISIONS:**

A. THE CUSTOMS ACT, 1962:

I) Section 2 - Definitions.—*In this Act, unless the context otherwise requires,—*

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

(3) "baggage" includes unaccompanied baggage but does not include motor vehicles;

(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;

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

II) Section11A – Definitions *-In this Chapter, unless the context otherwise requires,*

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

III) "Section 77 – Declaration by owner of baggage.— *The owner of any baggage shall, for the purpose of clearing it, make a declaration of its contents to the proper officer."*

IV) Section 79. Bona fide baggage exempted from duty. -

(1) The proper officer may, subject to any rules made under sub-section (2), pass free of duty –

(a) any article in the baggage of a passenger or a member of the crew in respect of which the said officer is satisfied that it has been in his use for such minimum period as may be specified in the rules;

(b) any article in the baggage of a passenger in respect of which the said officer is satisfied that it is for the use of the passenger or his family or is a bonafide gift or souvenir; provided that the value of each such article and the total value of all such articles does not exceed such limits as may be specified in the rules.

V) "Section 110 – Seizure of goods, documents and things. *— (1) If the proper officer has reason to believe that any goods are liable to confiscation under this Act, he may seize such goods:"*

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

(d) any goods which are imported or attempted to be imported or are 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;
(f) any dutiable or prohibited goods required to be mentioned under the regulations in an arrival manifest or import manifest or import report which are not so mentioned;
(i) any dutiable or prohibited goods found concealed in any manner in any package either before or after the unloading thereof;
(j) 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;

(l) 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;

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

VII) "Section 112 – Penalty for improper importation of goods, etc.– *Any person,-*

(a) who, in relation to any goods, does or omits to do any act which act or omission would render such goods liable to confiscation under Section 111, or abets the doing or omission of such an act, or

(b) who acquires possession of or is in any way concerned in carrying, removing, depositing, 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.

VIII) "Section 119 – Confiscation of goods used for concealing smuggled goods–*Any goods used for concealing smuggled goods shall also be liable to confiscation."*

B. <u>THE FOREIGN TRADE (DEVELOPMENT AND REGULATION) ACT, 1992;</u>

I) "Section 3(2) - *The Central Government may also, by Order published in the Official Gazette, 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."*

II) "Section 3(3) - *All 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."

III) "Section 11(1) - *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."*

C. THE CUSTOMS BAGGAGE DECLARATIONS REGULATIONS, 2013:

I) Regulation 3 (as amended) - *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 law:

8. It therefore appears that:

(a) The passenger had dealt with and actively indulged himself in the instant case of smuggling of gold into India. The passenger had improperly imported gold bar weighing 891.980 grams having purity 999.0/24 Kt. by concealing in three gold capsules wrapped in black coloured adhesive tape containing gold in semi solid paste form in his rectum, totally weighing 891.980 grams and involving tariff value of Rs.49,57,170/- (Rupees Forty Nine Lakhs Fifty Seven Thousand One Hundred and Seventy only) and market value of Rs.57,69,327/- (Rupees Fifty Seven Lakhs Sixty Nine Thousand Three Hundred and Twenty Seven only). The said gold was concealed in three capsules wrapped in black coloured adhesive tape containing gold in semi solid paste form in her rectum and not declared to the Customs. The passenger opted not to declare before Customs and denied for any declaration even though she was repeatedly suggested to declare if anything

dutiable/ prohibited/ restricted are in her possession with 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 891.980 grams of gold bar of purity 999.0/24 Kt. by the passenger by way of concealment of three capsules wrapped in black colored adhesive tape containing gold in semi solid paste form in her rectum without declaring it to the Customs on arrival in India cannot be treated as bonafide household goods or personal effects as per Section 79 of the Customs Act,1962. 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.

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

(c) The improperly imported gold by the passenger, Ms. Uma Madanlal Joshi, found concealed capsules wrapped in black coloured adhesive tape containing gold in semi solid paste form in her rectum, without declaring it to the Customs and now converted into gold bar is thus liable for confiscation under Section 111(d), 111(f), 111(i), 111(j), 111(l) and 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.

(d) Ms. Uma Madanlal Joshi, by her above-described acts of omission and commission on her part has rendered herself liable to penalty under Section 112 of the Customs Act, 1962.

(e) As per Section 123 of the Customs Act, 1962, the burden of proving that the gold bar weighing 891.980 grams having purity 999.0/24 Kt. and involving tariff value of Rs.49,57,170/- (Rupees Forty Nine Lakhs Fifty Seven Thousand One Hundred and Seventy only) and market value of Rs.57,69,327/- (Rupees Fifty Seven Lakhs Sixty Nine Thousand Three Hundred and Twenty Seven only) which was concealed in the capsules wrapped in black colored adhesive tape containing gold in semi solid paste form in her rectum by the passenger, totally weighing 891.980 grams without declaring it to the Customs, are not smuggled goods, is upon the passenger and Noticee Ms. Uma Madanlal Joshi.

9. Accordingly, a Show Cause Notice was issued to **Ms. Uma Madanlal Joshi**, residing at 9/A, Khodiyar Nagar, Nr. Rambalram Nagar, Chandlodia, Ahmedabad, Pin - 382481, holding an Indian Passport No. Y9785275, as to why:

(i) One Gold Bar weighing **891.980** grams having purity 999.0/ 24 Kt. and involving tariff value of **Rs.49,57,170/-** (Rupees Forty Nine Lakhs Fifty Seven Thousand One Hundred and Seventy only) and market value of **Rs.57,69,327/-** (Rupees Fifty Seven Lakhs

Sixty Nine Thousand Three Hundred and Twenty Seven only), derived from three capsules wrapped in black colored adhesive tape containing gold in semi solid paste form in the passenger's rectum was placed under seizure under Panchnama proceedings dated 07/08.02.2024 and Seizure Order dated 08.02.2024, should not be confiscated under the provision of Section 111(d), 111(f), 111(i), 111(j), 111(l) and 111(m) of the Customs Act, 1962;

(ii) The packing material i.e. black coloured adhesive tape, used for packing and concealment of the above-mentioned gold bar which was attempted to be smuggled into India in violation of Section 77, Section 132 and Section 135, of the Customs Act, 1962, seized under panchnama dated 07/08.02.2024 and Seizure memo order dated 08.02.2024, should not be confiscated under Section 119 of the Customs Act, 1962; and

(iii) Penalty should not be imposed upon the passenger Ms. Uma Madanlal Joshi holding Indian Passport No. Y9785275 under Section 112 of the Customs Act, 1962, for the omissions and commissions mentioned hereinabove.

Defense reply and record of personal hearing:

10. The noticee has not submitted any written submission to the Show Cause Notice issued to him.

11. The noticee was given opportunity for personal hearing on 09.12.2024, 20.12.2024 & 27.12.2024 but she failed to appear and represent her case. In the instant case, the noticee has been granted sufficient opportunity of being heard in person for three times but she failed to appear. In view of above, it is obvious that the Noticee is not bothered about the ongoing adjudication proceedings and she do not have anything to say in her defense. I am of the opinion that sufficient opportunities have been offered to the Noticee in keeping with the principle of natural justice and there is no prudence in keeping the matter in abeyance indefinitely.

11.1 Before, proceeding further, I would like to mention that Hon'ble Supreme Court, High Courts and Tribunals have held, in several judgments/decision, that ex-parte decision will not amount to violation of principles of Natural Justice.

In support of the same, I rely upon some the relevant judgments/orders which are as under-

a) The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of JETHMAL Versus UNION OF INDIA reported in 1999 (110) E.L.T. 379 (S.C.), the Hon'ble Court has observed as under;

> *"7. Our attention was also drawn to a recent decision of this Court in A.K. Kripak v. Union of India - 1969 (2) SCC 340, where some of the rules of natural justice were formulated in Paragraph 20 of the judgment. One of these is the well known principle of audi alteram partem and it was argued that an ex parte hearing without notice violated this rule. In our opinion this rule can have no application to the facts of this case where the appellant was asked not only to send a written reply but to inform the Collector whether he wished to be heard in person or through a representative. If no reply was given or no intimation was sent to the Collector that a personal hearing was*

desired, the Collector would be justified in thinking that the persons notified did not desire to appear before him when the case was to be considered and could not be blamed if he were to proceed on the material before him on the basis of the allegations in the show cause notice. Clearly he could not compel appearance before him and giving a further notice in a case like this that the matter would be dealt with on a certain day would be an ideal formality."

b). Hon'ble High Court of Kerala in the case of UNITED OIL MILLS Vs. COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS & C. EX., COCHIN reported in 2000 (124) E.L.T. 53 (Ker.), the Hon'ble Court has observed that;

Natural justice - Petitioner given full opportunity before Collector to produce all evidence on which he intends to rely but petitioner not prayed for any opportunity to adduce further evidence - Principles of natural justice not violated.

c) Hon'ble High Court of Calcutta in the case of KUMAR JAGDISH CH. SINHA Vs. COLLECTOR OF CENTRAL EXCISE, CALCUTTA reported in 2000 (124) E.L.T. 118 (Cal.) in Civil Rule No. 128 (W) of 1961, decided on 13-9-1963, the Hon'ble court has observed that;

Natural justice - Show cause notice - Hearing - Demand - Principles of natural justice not violated when, before making the levy under Rule 9 of Central Excise Rules, 1944, the Noticee was issued a show cause notice, his reply considered, and he was also given a personal hearing in support of his reply - Section 33 of Central Excises & Salt Act, 1944. - It has been established both in England and in India [vide N.P.T. Co. v. N.S.T. Co. (1957) S.C.R. 98 (106)], that there is no universal code of natural justice and that the nature of hearing required would depend, inter alia, upon the provisions of the statute and the rules made there under which govern the constitution of a particular body. It has also been established that where the relevant statute is silent,

what is required is a minimal level of hearing, namely, that the statutory authority must 'act in good faith and fairly listen to both sides' [Board of Education v. Rice, (1911) A.C. 179] and, "deal with the question referred to them without bias, and give to each of the parties the opportunity of adequately presenting the case" [Local Govt. Board v. Arlidge, (1915) A.C. 120 (132)]. [para 16]

d) Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in the case of SAKETH INDIA LIMITED Vs. UNION OF INDIA reported in 2002 (143) E.L.T. 274 (Del.). The Hon'ble Court has observed that:

Natural justice - Ex parte order by DGFT - EXIM Policy - Proper opportunity given to appellant to reply to show cause notice issued by Addl. DGFT and to make oral submissions, if any, but opportunity not availed by appellant - Principles of natural justice not violated by Additional DGFT in passing ex parte order - Para 2.8(c) of Export-Import Policy 1992-97 - Section 5 of Foreign Trade (Development and Regulation) Act, 1992.

e) The Hon'ble CESTAT, Mumbai in the case of GOPINATH CHEM TECH. LTD Vs. COMMISSIONER OF CENTRAL EXCISE, AHMEDABAD-II reported in 2004 (171) E.L.T. 412 (Tri. - Mumbai), the Hon'ble CESTAT has observed that;

Natural justice - Personal hearing fixed by lower authorities but not attended by appellant and reasons for not attending also not explained - Appellant cannot now demand another hearing - Principles of natural justice not violated. [para 5]

f). The Hon'ble High Court of Jharkhand in W.P.(T) No. 1617 of 2023 in case of Rajeev Kumar Vs. The Principal Commissioner of Central Goods and Service Tax & The Additional Commissioner of Central GST & CX, 5A Central Revenue Building, Main Road, Ranchi pronounced on 12.09.2023 wherein Hon'ble Court has held that

"Accordingly, we are of the considered opinion that no error has been committed by the adjudicating authority in passing the impugned Order-in-Original, inasmuch as, enough opportunities were provided to the petitioner by issuing SCN and also fixing date of personal hearing for four times; but the petitioner did not respond to either of them.

8. Having regard to the aforesaid discussions and admitted position with regard to non-submission of reply to the SCN, we failed to appreciate the contention of the petitioner that principle of natural justice has not been complied in the instant case. Since there is efficacious alternative remedy provided in the Act itself, we hold that the instant writ application is not maintainable.

9. As a result, the instant application stands dismissed. Pending I.A., if any, is also closed."

Discussion and Findings:

12. I have carefully gone through the facts of the case. Though sufficient opportunity for filing reply and personal hearing had been given, the Noticee has not come forward to file her reply/ submissions or to appear for the personal hearing opportunities offered to her. The adjudication proceedings cannot wait until the Noticee makes it convenient to file her submissions and appear for the personal hearing. I, therefore, take up the case for adjudication ex-parte, on the basis of evidences available on record.

13. In the instant case, I find that the main issue to be decided is whether the **891.980** grams of gold bar, derived from semi solid gold paste in form of 03 capsules containing gold and chemical mix concealed in her rectum, having **tariff value of Rs.49,57,170/-** and market value is **Rs.57,69,327/-**, seized vide Seizure Memo/ Order under Panchnama proceedings both dated

07/08.02.2024, is liable for confiscation under Section 111 of the Customs Act, 1962 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Act') or not; and whether the noticee is liable for penal action under the provisions of Section 112 of the Act.

14. I find that the panchnama dated 07/08.02.2024 clearly draws out the fact that the noticee, who arrived from Dubai in Spice Jet Airline Flight No. SG16 (Seat No:12F) was intercepted by the Air Intelligent Unit (AIU) officers, SVP International Airport, Customs, Ahmedabad on the basis of input passed on by DRI, Ahmedabad when she was trying to exit through green channel of the Arrival Hall of Terminal 2 of SVPI Airport, without making any declaration to the Customs. While the noticee passed through the Door Frame Metal Detector (DFMD) Machine no beep sound was heard which indicated there was no objectionable/dutiable substance on her body/clothes. Thereafter, the said passenger, the Panchas and the officers of AIU moved to the AIU Office located opposite Belt No.2 of the Arrival Hall, Terminal-2, SVPI Airport, Ahmedabad alongwith the baggage of the passenger. The AIU officers checked the baggage of the passenger, however nothing objectionable was found. The officers again asked the said passenger if she is having anything dutiable which is required to be declared to the Customs to which the noticee denied. After thorough interrogation by the officers, Ms. Uma Madanlal Joshi confessed that she was carrying 03 capsules containing gold paste inside her rectum. The noticee handed over the 03 capsules containing gold paste covered with black coloured adhesive tape after returned from washroom. It is on record that the noticee had admitted that she was carrying the capsules containing gold in paste form concealed in her rectum, with intent to smuggle

into India without declaring before Customs Officers. It is also on record that Government approved Valuer had tested and converted said capsules in Gold Bar with certification that the gold is of 24 kt and 999.0 purity, weighing 891.980 Grams. The Tariff Value of said Gold bar weight 891.980 grams having purity 999.0/24 Kt. derived from 944.530 grams of 03 capsules containing semi solid paste consisting of gold and chemical mix concealed in rectum, having Tariff value of Rs**. 49,57,170/-** and market Value of **Rs.57,69,327/-** which was placed under seizure under Panchnama dated 07/08.02.2024, in the presence of the noticee and independent panch witnesses.

15. I also find that the passenger/noticee 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 of her 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/noticee. In fact, in her statement dated 07/08.02.2024 , she has clearly admitted that she had travelled from Dubai to Ahmedabad by Flight No. SG16 (Seat No:12F) dated 07/08.02.2024 carrying gold paste in form of capsule concealed in her rectum; that she had intentionally not declared the substance containing foreign origin gold before the Customs authorities as she wanted to clear the same illicitly and evade payment of customs duty; that she was aware that smuggling of gold without payment of customs duty is an offence under the Customs law and thereby, violated provisions of Customs Act and the Baggage Rules, 2016.

16. I find that the noticee has clearly accepted that she had not declared the gold in paste form concealed in her rectum, to the Customs authorities. It is clear case of non-declaration with intent to smuggle the gold. Accordingly, there is sufficient evidence to conclude that the passenger had failed to declare the foreign origin gold before the Customs Authorities on her arrival at SVP International Airport, Ahmedabad. Therefore, it is a case of smuggling of gold without declaring in the aforesaid manner with intent to evade payment of Customs duty is conclusively proved. Thus, it is proved that 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.

17. From the facts discussed above, it is evident that the passenger/noticee had brought gold of 24 kt having 999.0 purity weighing 891.980 grams, retrieved from the gold paste in form of capsules concealed by the noticee in her rectum, while arriving from Dubai to Ahmedabad, with an intention to smuggle and remove the same without payment of Customs duty, thereby rendering the gold weighing 891.980 gms., seized under panchnama dated 07/08.02.2024 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 secreting the gold in form of capsules having gold and chemical mix concealed in her rectum and not declaring the same before the Customs, it is established that the passenger/noticee 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.

18. It is seen that for the purpose of customs clearance of arriving passengers, a two-channel system is adopted i.e Green Channel for passengers not having dutiable goods and Red Channel for passengers having dutiable goods and all passengers have to ensure to file correct declaration of their baggage. I find that the Noticee had not filed the baggage declaration form and had not declared the said gold which was in her possession, as envisaged under Section 77 of the Act read with the Baggage Rules and Regulation 3 of Customs Baggage Declaration Regulations, 2013 as amended and she was tried to exit through Green Channel which shows that the noticee was trying to evade the payment of eligible customs duty. I also find that the definition of "eligible passenger" is provided under Notification No. 50/2017- Customs New Delhi, the 30th June, 2017 wherein it is mentioned as - *"eligible passenger" means a passenger of Indian origin or a passenger holding a valid passport, issued under the Passports Act, 1967 (15 of 1967), who is coming to India after a period of not less than six months of stay abroad; and short visits, if any, made by the eligible passenger during the aforesaid period of six months shall be ignored if the total duration of stay on such visits does not exceed thirty days*. I find that the noticee has not declared the gold before customs authority. It is also observed that the imports were also for non-

bonafide purposes. Therefore, the said improperly imported gold weighing 891.980 grams concealed by her, without declaring to the Customs on arrival in India cannot be treated as bonafide household goods or personal effects. The noticee 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.

19. It, is therefore, proved that by the above acts of contravention, the passenger/noticee has rendered gold of 24 kt having 999.0 purity weighing 891.980 gms., retrieved from gold paste concealed in rectum in form of capsules, having total Tariff Value of Rs.49,57,170/- and market Value of Rs.57,69,327/-, seized vide Seizure Memo/Order under the Panchnama proceedings both dated 07/08.02.2024 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 concealing the gold in rectum and without declaring to the Customs on arrival in India, it is observed that the passenger/noticee was fully aware that the import of said goods is offending in nature. It is therefore very clear that she has knowingly carried the gold and failed to declare the same to the Customs on his arrival at the Airport. It is seen that she has involved herself in carrying, keeping, concealing and dealing with the impugned goods in a manner which she knew or had reasons to believe that the same were 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 Customs Act, 1962 making him liable for penalty under Section 112 of the Customs Act, 1962.

20. I find that the passenger/noticee has confessed of carrying gold of 24 kt having 999.0 purity, weighing 891.980 grams and attempted to remove the said gold by concealing the gold in her rectum and attempted to remove the said gold from the Customs 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 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.

21. It is quite clear from the above discussions that the gold was concealed and not declared to the Customs with the sole intention to evade payment of Customs duty. The records before me shows that the passenger/noticee did not choose to declare the prohibited/dutiable goods and opted for green channel customs clearance after arriving from foreign destination with the willful intention to smuggle the impugned goods. One Gold Bar weighing

891.980 grams of 24Kt./ 999.0 purity, having total Market Value of the recovered gold bar Rs.57,69,327/- and Tariff Value Rs.49,57,170/-, retrieved from the gold paste concealed in rectum, were placed under seizure vide panchnama dated 07/08.02.2024. The passenger/noticee has clearly admitted that despite having knowledge that the goods had to be declared and such import is an offence under the Act and Rules and Regulations made thereunder, she attempted to remove the gold by concealing in rectum and by deliberately not declaring the same on his arrival at airport with the willful intention to smuggle the impugned gold into India. I therefore, find that the passenger/noticee has committed an offence of the nature described in Section 112(a) of Customs Act, 1962 making her liable for penalty under provisions of Section 112 of the Customs Act, 1962.

22. I further find that 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-fulfillment 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 the same was not eligible passenger to bring or import gold into India in baggage. The gold was recovered in a manner concealed in rectum in form of capsules and 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.

23. In view of the above discussions, I hold that the gold weighing 891.980 grams of 24Kt./999.0 purity, retrieved from gold and chemical paste concealed in rectum in form of capsules and undeclared by the passenger/noticee with an intention to clear the same illicitly from Customs Airport and to evade payment of Customs duty, are liable for absolute confiscation. Further, it becomes very clear that the gold was carried to India by the noticee in concealed manner for extraneous consideration. **In the instant case, I am therefore, not inclined to use my discretion to give an option to redeem the gold on payment of redemption fine, as envisaged under Section 125 of the Act.**

24. 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 High Court of Madras has ruled that as the goods were prohibited and there was concealment, the Commissioner's order for absolute confiscation was upheld.

25. Further I find that in a case decided by the Hon'ble High Court of Madras reported at 2016-TIOL-1664-HC-MAD-CUSin 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)."

26. The Hon'ble High Court of Madras in the matter of Commissioner of Customs (AIR), Chennai-I Vs. P. Sinnasamy [2016 (344) E.L.T. 1154 (Mad.)] has 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.

27. 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 7-10-2019 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 10-5-1993 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".

28. The Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in the matter of Rameshwar Tiwari Vs. Union of India (2024) 17 Centax 261 (Del.) has held-

*"**23.** There is no merit in the contention of learned counsel for the Petitioner that he was not aware of the gold. Petitioner was carrying the packet containing gold. The gold items were concealed inside two pieces of Medicine Sachets which were kept inside a Multi coloured zipper jute bag further kept in the Black coloured zipper hand bag that was carried by the Petitioner. The manner of concealing the gold clearly establishes knowledge of the Petitioner that the goods were liable to be confiscated under section 111 of the Act. The Adjudicating Authority has rightly held that the manner of concealment revealed his knowledge about the prohibited nature of the goods and proved his guilt knowledge/mens-rea."*

*24……**.***

25……..

*"**26.** The Supreme Court of India in State of Maharashtra v. Natwarlal Damodardas Soni [1980] 4 SCC 669/1983 (13) E.L.T. 1620 (SC)/1979 taxmann.com 58 (SC) **has held that smuggling particularly of gold, into India affects the public economy and financial stability of the country**."*

29. Given the facts of the present case before me and the judgements and rulings cited above, I find that the manner of concealment, in this case clearly shows that the noticee had attempted to smuggle the seized gold to avoid detection by the Customs Authorities. Further, no evidence has been produced to prove licit import of the seized gold bars. Thus, the noticee has failed to discharge the burden placed on him in terms of Section 123. Further, from the SCN, Panchnama and Statement, I find that the manner of concealment of the gold is **ingenious** in nature, as the noticee concealed the gold in her rectum with intention to smuggle the same into India and evade payment of customs duty. Therefore, the gold weighing 891.980 grams of 24Kt./999.0 purity in form of gold bar, derived from the gold and chemical paste concealed in rectum in form of capsules is therefore, liable to be **confiscated absolutely**. I therefore hold in unequivocal terms that the gold weighing 891.980 grams of 24Kt./999.0 purity, 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 Act.

30. I further find that the passenger had involved herself in the act of smuggling of gold weighing 891.980 grams of 24Kt./999.0 purity, retrieved from gold and chemical paste concealed in rectum in form of capsules. Further, it is fact that the passenger/noticee has travelled with gold weighing 891.980 grams of 24Kt./999.0 purity, retrieved from paste concealed in her rectum, from Dubai to Ahmedabad despite her knowledge and belief that the gold carried by her is an offence under the provisions of the Customs Act, 1962 and the Regulations made thereunder. Thus, it is clear that the passenger has concerned herself with carrying, removing, keeping,

concealing and dealing with the smuggled gold which she knew or had reason to believe that the same are liable for confiscation under Section 111 of the Customs Act, 1962. Therefore, I find that the passenger/noticee is liable for penal action under Sections 112 of the Customs Act, 1962 and I hold accordingly.

31. Accordingly, I pass the following Order:

O R D E R

i.) I order absolute confiscation of the One Gold Bar weighing **891.980** grams having Market Value at **Rs.57,69,327/-** (Rupees Fifty-Seven Lakhs Sixty-Nine Thousand Three Hundred and Twenty-Seven only) and Tariff Value is **Rs.49,57,170/-** (Rupees Forty-Nine Lakhs Fifty-Seven Thousand One Hundred and Seventy only) derived from semi solid gold paste in form of 03 capsules containing gold and chemical mix concealed in rectum by the passenger/noticee Ms. Uma Madanlal Joshi and placed under seizure under Panchnama dated 07/08.02.2024 and seizure memo order dated 08.02.2024 under Section 111(d), 111(f), 111(i), 111(j), 111(l) & 111(m) of the Customs Act, 1962;

ii.) I order absolute confiscation of the packing material i.e. black coloured adhesive tape, used for packing and concealment of the above-mentioned gold bar, seized under panchnama dated 07/08.02.2024 and Seizure memo order dated 08.02.2024, under Section 119 of the Customs Act, 1962;

iii.) I impose a combined penalty of **Rs. 14,00,000/-** (Rupees Fourteen Lakh Only) on Ms. Uma Madanlal Joshi under the provisions of Section 112(a)(i) and Section 112(b)(i) of the Customs Act 1962.

32. Accordingly, the Show Cause Notice No. VIII/10-136/SVPIA-A/O&A/HQ/2024-25 dated 11.07.2024 stands disposed of.

Signed by
Shree Ram Vishnoi
Date: 17.01.2025 17:06:23

(Shree Ram Vishnoi)
Additional Commissioner
Customs, Ahmedabad

F. No. VIII/10-136/SVPIA-A/O&A/HQ/2024-25 Date:17.01.2025

DIN: 20250171MN0000888DFA

By SPEED POST A.D.

To,
Ms. Uma Madanlal Joshi,
9/A, Khodiyar Nagar,
Nr. Rambalram Nagar,
Chandlodia, Ahmedabad,
Pin:-382481

Copy to :-

1. The Principal Commissioner of Customs, Ahmedabad.(Kind Attn: RRA Section)
2. The Deputy Commissioner of Customs (AIU), SVPIA, Ahmedabad.
3. The Deputy Commissioner of Customs, SVPIA, Ahmedabad.
4. The Deputy Commissioner of Customs (Task Force), Ahmedabad.
5. The System In-Charge, Customs, HQ., Ahmedabad for uploading on the official web-site i.e. http://www.ahmedabadcustoms.gov.in.
6. Guard File.