



सीमाशुल्क(अपील) आयुक्तकाकार्यालय,

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


DIN - 20250571MN000000A5B3

क	फ़ाइलसंख्या FILE NO.	S/49-441/CUS/AHD/23-24
ख	अपीलआदेशसंख्या ORDER-IN-APPEAL NO. (सीमाशुल्कअधिनियम, 1962 कीधारा 128ककेअंतर्गत) (UNDER SECTION 128A OF THE CUSTOMS ACT, 1962):	AHD-CUSTM-000-APP-43-2025-26
ग	पारितकर्ता PASSED BY	Shri Amit Gupta Commissioner of Customs (Appeals), Ahmedabad
घ	दिनांक DATE	23.05.2025
ङ	उद्भूतअपीलआदेशकीसं. वदिनांक ARISING OUT OF ORDER-IN-ORIGINAL NO.	OIO No. 02/ICD-Valvada/AR/ADC/SRT/23-24 dated 14.12.2023 passed by the Additional Commissioner of Customs, Surat.
च	अपीलआदेशजारीकरनेकीदिनांक ORDER-IN-APPEAL ISSUED ON:	23.05.2025
छ	अपीलकर्तकानामवपता NAME AND ADDRESS OF THE APPELLANT:	M/s Surya Exim Limited, 3040, Jash Textiles & Yarn Market, Ring Road, Surat-395002.

1.	यहप्रतिसव्यक्तिकेनिजीउपयोगकेलिएमुफ्तमेंदीजातीहैजिनकेनामयहजारीकियागयाहै. 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, नईदिल्लीकोपुनरीक्षणआवेदनप्रस्तुतकरसकतेहैं.

	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)	बैगेजकेरूपमेंआयातितकोईमाल.
(a)	any goods imported on baggage.
(ख)	भारतमेंआयातकरनेहेतुकीसीवाहनमेंलादागयालेकिनभारतमेंउनकेगन्तव्यस्थानपरउतारेनगएमालयाउसगन्तव्यस्थानपरउतारेजानेकेलिएअपेक्षितमालउतारेनजानेपरयाउसगन्तव्यस्थानपरउतारेगएमालकीमात्रामेंअपेक्षितमालसेकमीहो.
(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)	कोर्टफीक्ट, 1870 केमदसं. 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)	सम्बद्धदस्तावेजोंकेअलावासाथमूलआदेशकी 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) या रु. 1,000/- (रूपएएकहज़ारमात्र), जैसाभीमामलाहो, सेसम्बन्धितभुगतानकेप्रमाणिकचलानटी. आर. 6 कीदोप्रतियां. यदिशुल्क, मांगागयाब्याज, लगायागयादंडकीराशिऔररूपएएकलाखयाउससेकम होतोऐसेफीसकेरूपमेंरु. 200/- औरयदिएकलाखसेअधिकहोतोफीसकेरूपमेंरु. 1,000/-
(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 केअधीनसूचितमामलोंकेअलावाअन्यमामलोंकेसम्बन्धमेंयदि कोईव्यक्तिइसआदेशसेआहतमहसूसकरताहोतोवेसी माशुल्कअधिनियम 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, केन्द्रीयउत्पादशुल्कवसेवाकरअपीलियअधिकरण, पश्चिमीक्षेत्रीयपीठ	Customs, Excise & Service Tax Appellate Tribunal, West Zonal Bench

	दूसरीमंज़िल, बहुमालीभवन, निकटगिरधरनगरपुल, असारवा, अहमदाबाद-380016	2 nd Floor, Bahumali Bhavan, Nr. Girdhar Nagar Bridge, Asarwa, Ahmedabad-380 016
5.	सीमाशुल्क अधिनियम, 1962 की धारा 129 ए (6) के अधीन, सीमाशुल्क अधिनियम, 1962 की धारा 129 ए (1) के अधीन अपील के साथ निम्नलिखित शुल्क संलग्न होने चाहिए-	
	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)	अपील से सम्बन्धित मामले में जहाँ किसी सीमाशुल्क अधिकारी द्वारा मांगा गया शुल्क और व्याज तथा लगाया गया दंड की रकम पाँच लाख रूपए या उससे कम हो तो एक हजार रूपए.	
(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)	अपील से सम्बन्धित मामले में जहाँ किसी सीमाशुल्क अधिकारी द्वारा मांगा गया शुल्क और व्याज तथा लगाया गया दंड की रकम पाँच लाख रूपए से अधिक हो लेकिन रुपये पाँच लाख से अधिक न हो तो; पाँच हजार रूपए	
(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)	अपील से सम्बन्धित मामले में जहाँ किसी सीमाशुल्क अधिकारी द्वारा मांगा गया शुल्क और व्याज तथा लगाया गया दंड की रकम पाँच लाख रूपए से अधिक हो तो; दस हजार रूपए.	
(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)	<p>अपील से आदेश के विरुद्ध अधिकरण के सामने, मांगे गए शुल्क के 10% अर्पण करने पर, जहाँ शुल्क या शुल्क एवं दंड विवाद में हैं, या दंड के 10% अर्पण करने पर, जहाँ केवल दंड विवाद में हैं, अपील रखा जाएगा।</p> <p>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.</p>	
6.	उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 129 (ए) के अन्तर्गत अपील प्राधिकरण के समक्ष दायर प्रत्येक आवेदन पत्र- (क) रोक आदेश के लिए या गलतियों को सुधारने के लिए या किसी अन्य प्रयोजन के लिए किए गए अपील : - अथवा (ख) अपील या आवेदन पत्र का प्रत्यावर्तन के लिए दायर आवेदन के साथ रुपये पाँच सौ का शुल्क भी संलग्न होने चाहिए.	
	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

M/s Surya Exim Limited, 304, Jash Textiles & Yarn Market, Ring Road, Surat-395002 (hereinafter referred to as "the Appellant") have filed the present appeal in terms of Section 128 of the Customs Act, 1962 against the OIO No. 02/ICD-Valvada/AR/ADC/SRT/23-24 dated 14.12.2023 (hereinafter referred to as the "impugned order") passed by the Additional Commissioner of Customs, Surat (hereinafter referred to as the "adjudicating authority").

2. Briefly stated, facts of the case are that the Appellant had imported goods from China and filed 07 Bills of Entry, as mentioned in the impugned order, and declaring the goods as "100% Rayon Embroidery Thread 120D/2A1 Grade Bright Raw White on Hank Carton Packing" under CTH No. 54012000 for clearance under home consumption. Further, the subject goods were cleared after provisional assessment of the relevant Bills of Entry, pending test report of representative samples drawn from each of the consignment, samples for 5 Bills of entry were forwarded to Textile Committee for testing and samples of 2 Bills of entry were forwarded to CRCL for testing. Further, the test report confirmed the sample to be in the form of shining white twisted two ply yarns composing of Viscose Filament Yarn, whereas in the subject Bills of Entry, the goods were declared as 100% Rayon Embroidery Thread 120D/2A1 Grade Bright Raw White on Hank Carton Packing. Therefore, it appeared that the Appellant had mis-declared the goods to garner benefit of customs and Anti-dumping duty and thereby appeared to have rendered the goods liable for confiscation under Section 111(m) of Customs, Act, 1962.

2.1 After the completion of investigation, a Show Cause Notice F. No. VII/ICD-Valvada/B.E.8192086/12-13 dated 30.09.2013 was issued to the appellant answerable to the AC, Customs, ICD-Valvada as to why:

- I. The subject goods should not be treated as "Viscose Filament Yarn" as confirmed by the test report.
- II. The Bills of Entry stated above, should not be finalized by: -
 - Treating the subject goods as "Yarn" and consequently the value w.r.t. the contemporary import price for the subject goods;
 - Classifying the goods under CTH 5403 and duty charged accordingly;
- III. Anti-dumping duty as per Notification No. 23/2012-Cus (ADD), dated 04.05.2012 should not be charged.




2.2 Further, the said SCN was adjudicated by the Assistant Commissioner, Customs, ICD-Valvada vide OIO No. 79/14-15 dated, 31.03.2015 issued vide F. No. VIII/ICD-Valvada/B.E.8192086/12-13. The Assistant Commissioner, Customs, ICD-Valvada had ordered to

(i) classify the goods as "Viscose Filment Yarn" under CTH No. 5403 of Customs, Tariff Act, 1975,

(ii) assessed the value of imported goods at Rs.4,53,89,644.17/- . Confiscated the goods and due to non-availability of the same physically, imposed redemption fine of Rs.46,00,000/- in lieu of confiscation, recovery of Anti- dumping duty @16.90% amounting to Rs.76,70,850/-, interest at appropriate rate and also imposed a penalty of Rs.76,70,850/- on the importer under section 112 of Customs Act, 1962.

2.3 Further, aggrieved with the above said OIO No. 79/14-15 dated 31.03.2015, the appellant filed appeal before the Hon'ble Commissioner (Appeals). The said appeal was decided vide OIA No. AHD-CUSTM-000-APP-333-15-16 dated 21.01.2016 by the Hon'ble Commissioner (Appeals) observing that adjudication of confiscation and penalty exceeding Rs.5 lakhs are required to be adjudicated by the Commissioner of Customs or Additional/Joint Commissioner of Customs and accordingly the impugned OIO No. 79/14-15, dated 31.03.2015 was set aside with a direction that the entire issue should be re-adjudicated by the appropriate authority as specified under 122 of the Customs Act, 1962 after hearing the appellant. Accordingly, the SCN dated 30.09.2013, was re-adjudicated vide OIO No. 79/MKR/ADC/SRT/2016-17, dated 31.03.2017 wherein the then adjudicating authority classified the imported goods as "Viscose Filament Yarn" under Customs Tariff Heading 5403 and finalized the value at Rs.4,53,89,644.17/- based on the earlier provisional assessment. Alleging mis-declaration, the goods were held liable for confiscation under Section 111(m) of the Customs Act, but since they had already been cleared, a redemption fine of Rs.45,50,000/- was imposed under Section 125. Anti-dumping duty of Rs.76,70,850/- was demanded under Section 28(8), citing Notification No. 23/2012-Customs (ADD), along with applicable interest under Section 28AA and penalty of Rs.76,70,850/- was also imposed under Section 112(a), with an option to pay a reduced penalty of 25% if the duty, interest, and reduced penalty were paid within 30 days.

3. Further, aggrieved with the above said OIO dated 31.03.2017, the appellant again filed appeal before the Hon'ble Commissioner (Appeals) which was decided vide OIA No. AHD-CUSTM-000-APP-096-18-19 dated 21.08.2018 by the Hon'ble Commissioner (Appeals) wherein the OIO dated 31.03.2017 was



set aside and the matter was remanded for de-novo proceedings. Accordingly, the said matter was re-adjudicated vide the impugned order as follows:

1. Classified the impugned goods as "Viscose Filament Yarn" under Customs Tariff Head 5403 of Customs Tariff Act, 1975;
2. Assessed the value of impugned goods as Rs.4,53,89,644.17/- based on valuation arrived at the time of provisional assessment.
3. Confiscated the subject goods under Section 111(m) of the Customs Act, 1962. However, since the goods were not available for confiscation and already cleared on provisional assessment basis under test bonds, imposed a redemption fine of Rs.45,50,000/- under Section 125 of the Customs Act, 1962 in lieu of confiscation of the goods;
4. Confirmed the demand and ordered recovery of anti-dumping duty @ 16.90% ad valorem amounting to Rs.76,70,850/- under Section 28(8) of the Customs Act, 1962 read with Notification No. 23/2012-Customs (ADD), dated 04.05.2012;
5. Ordered to pay the interest at the appropriate rate on the confirmed amount of anti-dumping duty as mentioned at (iv) above, under Section 28AA of Customs Act, 1962.
6. Imposed penalty of Rs.76,70,850/- under Section 112(ii) of the Customs Act, 1962.

4. Being aggrieved with the impugned order, the Appellants have filed the present appeal and mainly contended the following:

- That the demand confirmed under the impugned Order is legally unsustainable, as all liabilities against appellant including claims by Government/Statutory Authorities, stood permanently extinguished upon approval of the resolution plan under the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016 by the Hon'ble NCLT, Ahmedabad vide order dated 01.07.2022
- That the appellant was taken over by Agarwal Coal Corporation Pvt. Ltd. under the NCLT-approved resolution plan. The new management was not provided with prior records or notified about pending proceedings. Hence, the current entity cannot be held liable for actions of the former management.
- That the NCLT's approval of the resolution plan clearly states that all past claims, including contingent and unconfirmed dues, stand extinguished. This includes any customs duty demands or penalties arising before the CIRP.



[Handwritten signature]

- That without prejudice to the legal bar under IBC, the appellant reserves the right to challenge the merits of classification, valuation, and anti-dumping duty imposition if the extinguishment argument is not accepted.
- They have relied upon the various case laws, few of which are as under:
 - a. M/s. Ghanashyam Mishra & Sons Pvt. Ltd. v. Edelweiss ARC (2021) 9 SCC 657
 - b. ABG Shipyard Liquidator v. CBIC – Supreme Court.
 - c. Essar Steel v. Satish Kumar Gupta
 - d. Ramsarup Industries Ltd. v. CC – Delhi HC 2023 (12) TMI 577
 - e. Arcelor Mittal Nippon Steel v. CC – CESTAT Ahmedabad 2023 (10) TMI 899.
 - f. CESTAT Ahmedabad Final Order No. 12563-12566/2023 in the appellant's own case.

PERSONAL HEARING

5. Shri Vivek Bapat along with Ms. Nitu Chaturvedi both advocates, attended personal hearing on 21.05.2025 in virtual mode on behalf of the Appellant. They reiterated the submission made in the appeal memorandum.

DISCUSSION & FINDINGS

6. I have gone through the appeal memorandum filed by the appellant, records of the case and submissions made during personal hearing. The main contention in the appeal is that the appellant underwent CIRP (Corporate Insolvency Resolution Process) under the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016 and the Resolution plan submitted by M/s Agarwal Coal Corporation Pvt. Ltd. was approved by the COC which was ultimately submitted to NCLT for approval. The NCLT vide its Order dated 01.07.2022 allowed the application and directed to the resolution of appellant and NCLT's approval of the resolution plan clearly states that all past claims, including any customs duty demands or penalties arising before the CIRP, stand extinguished. Therefore, the main issues to be decided in present appeal is whether the demand confirmed vide impugned order classifying impugned goods as "Viscose Filament Yarn" under CTH 5403, confiscating the goods under Section 111(m), imposing redemption fine under Section 125, confirming duty along with interest under Section 28 and imposing penalty under Section 112(ii) of the Customs Act, 1962 on the Appellant, in the facts and circumstances of the case, is legal and proper or otherwise.



6.1 Before going into the merits of the case, I find that as per CA-1 Form of the Appellant, the present appeal has been filed on 13.02.2024 against the impugned order dated 14.12.2023 which is not within statutory time limit of 60 days prescribed under Section 128(1) of the Customs Act, 1962

6.1.1 In this regard, it is relevant to refer the legal provisions governing filing an appeal before the Commissioner (Appeals) and his powers to condone the delay in filing appeals beyond 60 days. Extracts of relevant Section 128 of the Customs Act, 1962 are reproduced below for ease of reference:

SECTION 128. Appeals to [Commissioner (Appeals)]. — (1) Any person aggrieved by any decision or order passed under this Act by an officer of customs lower in rank than a [Principal Commissioner of Customs or Commissioner of Customs] may appeal to the [Commissioner (Appeals)] [within sixty days] from the date of the communication to him of such decision or order.

[Provided that the Commissioner (Appeals) may, if he is satisfied that the appellant was prevented by sufficient cause from presenting the appeal within the aforesaid period of sixty days, allow it to be presented within a further period of thirty days.]

Section 128 of the Customs Act, 1962 makes it clear that the appeal has to be filed within 60 days from the date of communication of order. Further, if the Commissioner (Appeals) is satisfied that the appellant was prevented by sufficient cause from presenting the appeal within the aforesaid period of 60 days, he can allow it to be presented within a further period of 30 days.

6.1.3 It is observed from the appeal memorandum that the appeal has been filed on 13.02.2024 resulting in a delay of 01 days in filing of appeal beyond the time limit of 60 days prescribed under Section 128(1) of the Customs Act, 1962. However, the appellant has requested for the condonation of delay. In light of the above provisions of law and considering the submissions of the Appellant and also considering the fact that the appeals have been filed within a further period of 30 days. I allow the condonation of delay in filing the appeal, taking a lenient view in the interest of justice in the present appeal.

6.2 It is observed that the appellant has contended that they underwent Corporate Insolvency Resolution Process (CIRP) initiated by the State Bank of India under Section 7 of the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016, and the resolution plan submitted by M/s Agarwal Coal Corporation Pvt. Ltd. was approved by the Hon'ble NCLT, Ahmedabad on 01.07.2022. As per the resolution plan and judicial precedents, including the Hon'ble Supreme Court

ruling in *Ghanashyam Mishra & Sons Pvt. Ltd.*, all past liabilities, including statutory and government dues, whether admitted or not, stand permanently extinguished. The new management, having taken over after CIRP, had no access to prior records and cannot be burdened with legacy liabilities and same is supported with multiple rulings given by Hon'ble Delhi High Court and CESTAT Ahmedabad, confirming that tax and customs dues prior to CIRP approval are no longer enforceable.

In this regard, it is observed that the resolution plan submitted by M/s Agarwal Coal Corporation Pvt. Ltd. was approved by Hon'ble NCLT vide order dated 01.07.2022. The relevant para of the same is reproduced as below:

"...

III. The Resolution Applicant claimed various reliefs and concessions in the resolution plan. However, we grant the reliefs in the following manner and to this extent;

a. After the payment of the dues to the creditors, as per the resolution plan, all the liabilities of the said stakeholders prior to CIRP against the Corporate Debtor shall stand permanently extinguished after the approval of the resolution plan. We further hold that other claims including Government/Statutory Authority, whether lodged during CIRP or not, shall also stand extinguished against the Corporate Debtor after the approval of the resolution plan. Contingent/unconfirmed extinguished;



In view of the above, it is observed that if a company has completed the Corporate Insolvency Resolution Process (CIRP) and a resolution plan is approved under Section 31 of the IBC, all past claims, including tax and customs dues, whether known, unknown, admitted, or contingent, stand extinguished unless specifically provided for in the resolution plan. Further, it is also observed that the IBC law prevails over Customs Act, 1962 as per Section 238 of IBC which is reproduced as under:

Section 238 – Provisions of this Code to override other laws

"The provisions of this Code shall have effect, notwithstanding anything inconsistent therewith contained in any other law for the time being in force or any instrument having effect by virtue of any such law."

6.3 Further, I find that the appellant has relied on the Judgment cited by Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of M/s. Ghanashyam Mishra & Sons Pvt. Ltd. v. Edelweiss ARC (2021) 9 SCC 657 and the relevant para is reproduced as under:

A.L.

"...

130. In the foregoing paragraphs, we have held, that 2019 amendment to Section 31 of I&B Code is clarificatory and declaratory in nature and therefore will have a retrospective operation. As such, when the resolution plan is approved by NCLT, the claims, which are not part of the resolution plan, shall stand extinguished and the proceedings related thereto shall stand terminated. Since the subject matter of the petition are the proceedings, which relate to the claims of the respondents prior to the approval of the plan, in the light of the view taken by us, the same cannot be continued. Equally the claims, which are not part of the resolution plan, shall stand extinguished.

..."

6.4 Further, the appellant have submitted the Judgment of Hon'ble CESTAT Ahmedabad, in their own previous matter i.e. CC Customs Ahmedabad vs Surya Exim Limited, wherein the Hon'ble CESTAT Ahmedabad vide Final Order No. 12563-12566/2023 dated 05.10.2023 has rejected the appeal and dismissed the demand. The relevant para of the same is reproduced as below:

"....

3. On careful consideration of the submission made by the learned Authorized Representative and perusal of records, we find that the present respondent company has undergone the proceedings under insolvency and bankruptcy code, whereby as per the NCLT order, the present appellant company has been taken over by some other company namely M/s Agarwal Coal Corporation Private Limited. In this regard, this Tribunal in the respondent's case in their other appeal bearing number C/10055/2013 passed a final order A/12174-12176/2022 dated 12.12.2022 whereby though the order was passed on merit but made an observation as regard the issue of IBC decided by NCLT vide its order dated 01.07.2022.

...

As per the above order of NCLT, we find that dues of government, if any, shall stand extinguished. Similar view was also expressed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court which was referred in the NCLT order in para 16. Which is reproduced below:

"16. As far as reliefs and concessions claimed by the resolution applicant, the law has been well settled by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Ghanashyam Mishra and Sons Private Limited



A-12

Vs. Edelweiss Asset Reconstruction Company Limited and Ors. reported in MANU/SC/0273/2021 in the following words: I. "The legislative intent behind this is, to freeze all the claims so that the resolution applicant starts on a clean slate and is not flung with any surprise claims. If that is permitted, the very calculations on the basis of which the resolution applicant submits its plans, would go haywire and the plan would be unworkable.


II. We have no hesitation to say, that the word "other stakeholders" would squarely cover the Central Government, any State Government or any local authorities. The legislature, noticing that on account of obvious omission, certain tax authorities were not abiding by the mandate of IB Code and continuing with the proceedings, has brought out the 2019 amendment so as to cure the said mischief..."

18. With regard to pending dues of Customs, the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the recent judgement dated 26th August 2022 of Sundaresh Bhatt, in Civil Appeal No. 7667 of 2021 held as under: -

"54. On the basis of the above discussions, following are our conclusions:

- i) Once moratorium is imposed in terms of Sections 14 or 33(5) of the IBC as the case may be, the respondent authority only has a limited jurisdiction to assess/determine the quantum of customs duty and other levies. The respondent authority does not have the power to initiate recovery of dues by means of sale/confiscation, as provided under the Customs Act.
- ii) After such assessment, the respondent authority has to submit its claims (concerning customs dues/operational debt) in terms of the procedure laid down. in strict compliance of the time periods prescribed under the IBC. before the adjudicating authority.
- iii) In any case, the IRP/RP/liquidator can immediately secure goods from the respondent authority to be dealt with appropriately, in terms of the IBC. 55. Resultantly, we allow the appeal and set aside the impugned order and judgment of the NCLAT. There shall be no orders as to costs." 19. For the reason of aforesaid NCLT order in the appellant case and the above cited Apex Court judgments, the dues of the Government, including the present dues, if any, is not prima facie recoverable. However, since we decide this appeal on its merit and fact of the case, we do not incline to give conclusive finding on the basis of NCLT order."

4. From the above observation, it can be seen that all the government dues stand extinguished as per the resolution approved by the NCLT vide order dated 01.07.2022, therefore, there is no purpose even to proceed



with the present appeals by the department. Accordingly, in our view, the Revenue's appeals became infructuous. Hence, the appeals are dismissed as infructuous."

6.5 In light of the Judgments cited above, I am of the considered view that the demand confirmed vide impugned order was not the part of the resolution plan approved by Hon'ble NCLT, therefore, the same stands extinguished and this fact has also been considered by the Hon'ble CESTAT Ahmedabad in the appellant's matter itself as discussed in *para supra*. Further, it is pertinent to mention that the Final Order No. 12563-12566/2023 dated 05.10.2023 passed by Jurisdictional Hon'ble CESTAT, Ahmedabad is binding upon the lower quasi-judicial authorities including the Commissioner (Appeals), Customs, Ahmedabad.

6.6 In view of the above, I am bound to follow the precedence laid by judgment of Hon'ble CESTAT, Ahmedabad, in light of the law laid by Hon'ble High Court of Gujarat in case of Lubi Industries LLP [2018 (337) E.L.T. 179 (Guj.)] on judicial discipline and binding nature of judgment of superior court:

"6. In our opinion, the Assistant Commissioner committed a serious error in ignoring the binding judgment of superior Court that too in case of the same assessee. The principle of precedence and judicial comity are well established in our legal system, which would bind an authority or the Court by the decisions of the Coordinate Benches or of superior Courts. Time and again, this Court has held that the departmental authorities would be bound by the judicial pronouncements of the statutory Tribunals. Even if the decision of the Tribunal in the present case was not carried further in appeal on account of low tax effect, it was not open for the adjudicating authority to ignore the ratio of such decision. It only means that the Department does not consciously agree to the view point expressed by the Tribunal and in a given case, may even carry the matter further. However, as long as a judgment of the Tribunal stands, it would bind every Bench of the Tribunal of equal strength and the departmental authorities taking up such an issue. An order that the adjudicating authority may pass is made appealable, even at the hands of the Department, if the order happens to aggrieve the Department. This is clearly provided under Section 35 read with Section 35E of the Central Excise Act. Therefore, even after the adjudicating authority passes an order in favour of the assessee on the basis of the judgment of the Tribunal, it is always open to the




12

Department to file appeal against such judgment of the adjudicating authority.”

(emphasis supplied)

7. In view of the above discussion, the impugned order is set aside and appeal of the appellant is allowed.




(AMIT GUPTA)


COMMISSIONER (APPEALS)
CUSTOMS, AHMEDABAD

F.Nos. S/49-441/CUS/AHD/23-24

Dated - 23.05.2025

By Registered Post A.D.

To,
M/s Surya Exim Limited,
3040 Jash Textiles & Yarn Market,
Ring Road, Surat-395002

સત્યાપિત/ATTESTED

અધીક્ષક/SUPERINTENDENT
સીમા શુલ્ક (અપીલ), અમદાવાદ.
CUSTOMS (APPEALS), AHMEDABAD.

Copy to:

- ✓ 1. The Chief Commissioner of Customs Gujarat, Customs House, Ahmedabad.
2. The Pr. Commissioner of Customs, Customs Ahmedabad.
3. The Additional Commissioner of Customs, ICD- Valvada, Surat.
4. Guard File.

