



**प्रधान आयुक्त का कार्यालय, सीमा शुल्क, अहमदाबाद**  
**“सीमा शुल्क भवन,” पहली मंजिल, पुराने हाई कोर्ट के सामने, नवरंगपुरा,**  
**अहमदाबाद – 380 009.**

दूरभाष : (079) 2754 4630

E-mail: [cus-ahmd-adj@gov.in](mailto:cus-ahmd-adj@gov.in)

फैक्स : (079) 2754 2343

**DIN: 20250371MN000000123E****PREAMBLE**

A	फाइल संख्या / File No.	:	VIII/10-162/ICD-Khod/O&A/HQ/2024-25
B	कारण बताओ नोटिस संख्या – तारीख / Show Cause Notice No. and Date	:	VIII/22-12/ICD/Audit/2015 dated 01.07.2024
C	मूल आदेश संख्या / Order-In-Original No.	:	<b>276/ADC/SRV/O&amp;A/2024-25</b>
D	आदेश तिथि / Date of Order-In-Original	:	<b>17.03.2025</b>
E	जारी करने की तारीख / Date of Issue	:	<b>17.03.2025</b>
F	द्वारा पारित / Passed By	:	<b>SHREE RAM VISHNOI,</b> ADDITIONAL COMMISSIONER, CUSTOMS, AHMEDABAD.
G	आयातक का नाम और पता / Name and Address of Importer / Noticee	:	<b>M/S. SHERMAN INC.,</b> 606, LOHA BHAVAN, NEAR OLD HIGH COURT, ASHRAM ROAD, AHMEDABAD - 380009.
(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 मंजिल, 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 इयूटी 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:**

**M/S. SHERMAN INC.**, 606, Loha Bhavan, Near Old High Court, Ashram Road, Ahmedabad - 380009 (herein after referred to as 'M/s. Sherman' or 'the importer' or 'the noticee', for the sake of brevity) [Import Export Code **0806005611**], filed Bills of Entry No. 4549423 dated 05.09.2011, 4551001 dated 05.09.2011 and 6633674 dated 24.04.2012 for import of "Empty Flexi Tank Containers" falling under Customs Tariff Item 39233090 of the First Schedule to the Customs Tariff Act, 1975, by availing benefit of Notification No. 104/1994-Cus. dated 16.03.1994, as amended.

**2.** Notification No. 104/1994-Cus. dated 16.03.1994 provides exemption to containers which are of durable nature. The said Notification reads as follows:-

*"In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 25 of the Customs Act, 1962 (52 of 1962), the Central Government being satisfied that it is necessary in the public interest so to do, hereby exempts containers which are of durable nature, falling within the First Schedule to the Customs Tariff Act, 1975 (51 of 1975), when imported into India, from-*

*(a) the whole of the duty of customs leviable thereon under the said First Schedule; and*

*(b) the whole of the additional duty leviable thereon under section 3 of the said Customs Tariff Act:*

*Provided that the importer, by execution of a bond in such form and for such sum as may be specified by the Assistant Commissioner of Customs or Deputy Commissioner of Customs binds himself to re-export the said containers within six months from the date of their importation and to furnish documentary evidence thereof to the satisfaction of the said Assistant Commissioner and to pay the duty leviable thereon in the event of the importer's failure to do so:*

*Provided further that in any particular case, the aforesaid period of six months may, on sufficient cause being shown, be extended by the said Assistant Commissioner for such further period, as he may deem fit."*

**2.1** Notification No. 104/1994-Cus. dated 16.03.1994 exempts containers which are of durable nature, from the whole of the duty of Customs leviable thereon under the First Schedule to the Customs Tariff Act, 1975 (51 of 1975) and the whole of the additional duty leviable under section 3 of the said Customs Tariff Act, subject to the condition that the said containers are re-exported within six months from the date of their importation or such extended period not exceeding a further period of six months as the Assistant Commissioner of Customs may allow. In terms of the conditions of Notification No. 104/1994-Cus., the importer is also required to execute a bond, binding himself (a) to export the said containers within the stipulated period and to furnish

VIII/10-162/ICD-Khod/O&A/HQ/2024-25  
OIO No. 276/ADC/SRV/O&A/2024-25

documentary evidence thereof to the satisfaction of the Assistant Commissioner; and (b) to pay the duty leivable thereon in the event of the importer's failure to do so.

**3.** M/s. Sherman Inc. submitted following Re-export Bonds in respect of the Bills of Entry. Further, the aforesaid Bills of Entry have been provisionally assessed, in respect of which the said importer submitted following Provisional Duty Bonds.

<b>Bill of Entry No. / Date</b>	<b>Re-Export Bond No./ Date</b>	<b>Re-Export Bond Amount (Rs.)</b>	<b>Provisional Duty Bond No. / Date</b>	<b>Provisional Duty Bond Amount (Rs.)</b>
4549423/ 05.09.2011	2000276708/ 01.05.2012	4,49,034/-	2000276709/ 01.05.2012	5,30,000/-
4551001/ 05.09.2011	2000276707/ 01.05.2012	4,49,034/-	2000276706/ 01.05.2012	5,30,000/-
6633674/ 24.04.2012	2000278524/ 05.05.2012	6,41,561/-	2000278523/ 05.05.2012	5,31,361/-

**3.1** It appeared during the course of audit from the EDI Systems and available records that the said importer had neither applied for extension of the period for re-export, nor such extension of period for re-export, had been allowed to them. However, even after expiry of one year from the import of the said goods, the said importer had not submitted proof of re-exportation of the said goods to the satisfaction of the Deputy / Assistant Commissioner of Customs, as required under the conditions of Notification No. 104/1994-Cus.

**4.** Therefore, it appeared that the benefit of Notification No. 104/1994-Cus. was not admissible to the said importer, and Consultative clarification letters F. No. VIII/22-12/ICD/Audit/2015 dated 28.07.2020, 21.12.2022 and 05.12.2023 had been issued to the importer informing that the re-export bonds were still pending for closure, requesting to submit all the documents pertaining to re-export of the goods within prescribed time limit, failing which action under the provisions of the Customs Act, 1962 would be initiated.

**4.1** However, as per the available records, the said importer had not submitted the required documents and therefore the aforesaid Bonds have not been closed.

**5.** As per the provisions of Section 143 of the Customs Act, 1962, the said imported goods were allowed clearance by proper officer on execution of bond by the importer wherein the importer bounded themselves to discharge liability in certain manner, which they have failed to do so inasmuch as the said importer has not submitted documentary evidence pertaining to re-export of the subject goods within prescribed time limit. Thus, the said importer appeared to have not complied with the conditions of the said Notification, and undertaking given in the Re-export Bond.

#### **LEGAL PROVISIONS:**

**6.** The relevant provisions of the Customs Act, 1962 and the rules made there under are as follows:-

**(A) “Section 143. Power to allow import or export on execution of bonds in certain cases. -**

(1) *Where this Act or any other law requires anything to be done before a person can import or export any goods or clear any goods from the control of officers of customs and the 1 [Assistant Commissioner of Customs or Deputy Commissioner of Customs] is satisfied that having regard to the circumstances of the case, such thing cannot be done before such import, export or clearance without detriment to that person, the 1 [Assistant Commissioner of Customs or Deputy Commissioner of Customs] may, notwithstanding anything contained in this Act or such other law, grant leave for such import, export or clearance on the person executing a bond in such amount, with such surety or security and subject to such conditions as the Assistant Commissioner of Customs or Deputy Commissioner of Customs approves, for the doing of that thing within such time after the import, export or clearance as may be specified in the bond.*

(2) *If the thing is done within the time specified in the bond, the Assistant Commissioner of Customs or Deputy Commissioner of Customs shall cancel the bond as discharged in full and shall, on demand, deliver it, so cancelled, to the person who has executed or who is entitled to receive it; and in such a case that person shall not be liable to any penalty provided in this Act or, as the case may be, in such other law for the contravention of the provisions thereof relating to the doing of that thing.*

(3) ***If the thing is not done within the time specified in the bond, the Assistant Commissioner of Customs or Deputy Commissioner of Customs] shall, without prejudice to any other action that may be taken under this Act or any other law for the time being in force, be entitled to proceed upon the bond in accordance with law.”***

**(B) SECTION 17. Assessment of duty. —**

(1) *An importer entering any imported goods under section 46, or an exporter entering any export goods under section 50, shall, save as otherwise provided in section 85, self-assess the duty if any, leviable on such goods.*

**(C) Section 46(4)**

*“The importer while presenting a bill of entry shall make and subscribe to a declaration as to the truth of the contents of such bill of entry and shall, in support of such declaration, produce to the proper officer the invoice, if any, [and such other documents relating to the imported goods as may be prescribed].”*

**Section 46(4A)**

*"The importer who presents a bill of entry shall ensure the following, namely*

- (a) the accuracy and completeness of the information given therein;*
- (b) the authenticity and validity of any document supporting it; and*
- (c) compliance with the restriction or prohibition, if any, relating to the goods under this Act or under any other law for the time being in force.]"*

**(D) 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, harbouring, keeping, concealing, selling or purchasing, or in any other manner dealing with any goods which he knows or has reason to believe are liable to confiscation under section 111, shall be liable,-*
- (i) in the case of goods in respect of which any prohibition is in force under this Act or any other law for the time being in force, to a penalty [not exceeding the value of the goods or five thousand rupees], whichever is the greater;*
- (ii) [in the case of dutiable goods, other than prohibited goods, subject to the provisions of section 114A, to a penalty not exceeding ten per cent of the duty sought to be evaded or five thousand rupees whichever is higher; Provided that where such duty as determined under sub-section (8) of section 28 and the interest payable thereon under 28AA is paid within thirty days from the date of communication of the order of the proper officer determining such duty, the amount of the penalty liable to be paid by such person under this section shall be twenty-five percent of the penalty so determined]*
- (iii) [in the case of goods in respect of which the value stated in the entry made under this Act or in the case of baggage, in the declaration made under section 77 (in either case hereinafter in this section referred to as the declared value) is higher than the value thereof, to a penalty [not exceeding the difference between the declared value and the value thereof or five thousand rupees] whichever is the greater;*
- (iv) in the case of goods falling both under clauses (i) and (iii), to a penalty [not exceeding the difference between the declared value and the value thereof or five thousand rupees], whichever is the highest;*
- (v) in the case of goods falling both under clauses (ii) and (iii), to a penalty [not exceeding the duty sought to be evaded on such goods or the difference between the declared value and the value thereof or five thousand rupees], whichever is the highest.]"*

**(D) Section 114A. Penalty for short-levy or non-levy of duty in certain cases.**

*- Where the duty has not been levied or has been short-levied or the interest has not been charged or paid or has been part paid or the duty or interest has been erroneously refunded by reason of collusion or any wilful mis-statement or suppression of facts, the person who is liable to pay the duty or interest, as the case may be, as determined under sub-section (8) of section 28 shall also be liable to pay a penalty equal to the duty or interest so determined:]*

*[Provided that where such duty or interest, as the case may be, as determined under sub-section (8) of section 28, and the interest payable thereon under section 28-AA, is paid within thirty days from the date of the communication of the order of the proper officer determining such duty, the amount of penalty liable to be paid by such person under this section shall be twenty-five per cent. of the duty or interest, as the case may be, so determined:*

*Provided further that the benefit of reduced penalty under the first proviso shall be available subject to the condition that the amount of penalty so determined has also been paid within the period of thirty days referred to in that proviso:*

*Provided also that where the duty or interest determined to be payable is reduced or increased by the Commissioner (Appeals), the Appellate Tribunal or, as the case may be, the Court, then, for the purposes of this section, the duty or interest as reduced or increased, as the case may be, shall be taken into account:*

*Provided also that in a case where the duty or interest determined to be payable is increased by the Commissioner (Appeals), the Appellate Tribunal or, as the case may be, the Court, then, the benefit of reduced penalty under the first proviso shall be available if the amount of the duty or the interest so increased, alongwith the interest payable thereon under section 28-AA, and twenty-five per cent of the consequential increase in penalty have also been paid within thirty days of the communication of the order by which such increase in the duty or interest takes effect:*

*Provided also that where any penalty has been levied under this section, no penalty shall be levied under section 112 or section 114.*

*Explanation.-For the removal of doubts, it is hereby declared that-*

- (i) the provisions of this section shall also apply to cases in which the order determining the duty or interest under [sub-section (8) of section 28 relates to notices issued prior to the date on which the Finance Act, 2000 receives the assent of the President;*
- (ii) any amount paid to the credit of the Central Government prior to the date of communication of the order referred to in the first proviso or the fourth proviso shall be adjusted against the total amount due from such person.]*

VIII/10-162/ICD-Khod/O&A/HQ/2024-25  
OIO No. 276/ADC/SRV/O&A/2024-25

**7.** In the present case, it appeared that the said importer has failed to discharge the conditions laid down under Notification No. 104/1994-Cus. Dated 16.03.1994 inasmuch as they have not submitted documentary evidence pertaining to re-export of the said containers within prescribed time limit. Thus, the said importer appeared to have not complied with the conditions of the said Notification, and undertaking given in the Re-export Bond. Therefore, the said importer appeared to have wrongly claimed and availed the benefit of the above-mentioned notification and therefore contravened the above said provisions with an intent to evade payment of Customs Duty leviable and payable on the import of subject goods. It appeared that the said importer had contravened the provisions of sub-section (4) and (4A) of Section 46 of the Customs Act, 1962 inasmuch as while filing Bill of Entry, they had to ensure the accuracy and completeness of the information given therein for assessment of Customs duty. Therefore, the said importer appeared liable to pay duty amounting to **Rs. 16,96,850/- (Rupees Sixteen Lakh Ninety Six Thousand Eight Hundred Fifty Only)**, as mentioned in **Annexure-A** to the show cause notice, in respect of the said imported goods along with interest at the applicable rate, in terms of the condition of Re-export Bond executed by the importer and Section 143 of the Customs Act, 1962 and also the Re-export Bonds and Provisional Duty Bonds furnished by the importer are required to be enforced/appropriated for such recovery.

**8.** As per clause (o) of Section 111 of the Customs Act, 1962, any goods exempted, subject to any condition, from duty or any prohibition in respect of the import thereof under the Customs Act, 1962 or any other law for the time being in force, in respect of which the condition is not observed, shall be liable to confiscation. As the exemption under Notification No. 104/1994-Cus. was granted to the said containers of durable nature, subject to the condition of their re-exportation within prescribed time limit, whereas the said condition has not been observed, therefore, the aforesaid goods appeared liable for confiscation under Section 111(o) of the Customs Act, 1962. Therefore, the said goods (containers of durable nature) totally valued at **Rs. 61,54,137/- (Rupees Sixty One Lakh Fifty Four Thousand One Hundred Thirty Seven Only)**, as mentioned in **Annexure-A** to the show cause notice, appeared liable for confiscation under Section 111(o) of the Customs Act, 1962.

**9.** The aforesaid acts of omission and commission on the part of the said importer appeared to have rendered them liable to penalty as provided under Section 112(a) / 114A of the Customs Act, 1962.

**10.** Thereafter, a Show Cause Notice was issued to M/s. Sherman Inc. from F. No. F. No. VIII/22-12/ICD /Audit/2015 dated 01.07.2024, to show cause to the Additional Commissioner of Customs, as to why:-

- (i) The exemption under Notification No. 104/1994-Cus dated 16.03.1994, claimed and availed in respect of Bills of Entry No. 4549423 dated 05.09.2011, 4551001 dated 05.09.2011 and 6633674 dated 24.04.2012 should not be denied and said Bills of Entry be re-assessed / finalized accordingly;

VIII/10-162/ICD-Khod/O&A/HQ/2024-25  
OIO No. 276/ADC/SRV/O&A/2024-25

(ii) The imported goods of declared Assessable value of Rs. 61,54,137/- (Rupees Sixty One Lakh Fifty Four Thousand One Hundred Thirty Seven Only), should not be held liable for confiscation under Section 111(o) of the Customs Act, 1962 read with conditions of Bond executed in terms of Section 143 of the Customs Act, 1962 read with Notification No. 104/1994-Cus dated 16.03.1994 as amended / applicable and why redemption fine should not be imposed in lieu of confiscation under Section 125 of the Customs Act, 1962;

(iii) Duty Forgone amount of Rs. 16,96,850/- (Rupees Sixteen Lakh Ninety Six Thousand Eight Hundred Fifty Only) along with applicable interest (from the date of clearance of goods to the date of payment of duty) should not be demanded and recovered from them in terms of conditions of Bond executed under section 143 of the Customs Act, 1962 read Notification No. 104/1994-Cus. dated 16.03.1994, as amended.

(iv) Penalty should not be imposed on the importer under Section 112(a) / 114A of the Customs Act, 1962 for the acts of omission and commission.

(v) Re-export Bonds and Provisional Duty Bonds furnished by the importer should not be enforced for recovery of duty, interest, penalty and Redemption Fine, if any.

#### **WRITTEN SUBMISSION AND PERSONAL HEARING:-**

**11.** In response to the show cause notice, M/s. Sherman Inc. have not submitted any written submission till date.

**12.** Accordingly, opportunities to be heard in person were given to M/s Sherman Inc. on 05.12.2024, 24.12.2024, 09.01.2025, and 11.02.2025 in compliance with Principle of Natural Justice. Third letter of Personal Hearing was pasted on the Notice Board of the Office of Principal Commissioner of Customs, Ahmedabad-380009 as per the provisions of Section 153(1)(e) of the Customs Act, 1962. Further on request of the noticee, two more opportunities were given on 20.02.2025 and 03.03.2025. The letters were to the address available with the office by post and email of the authorized signatory, however, noticee did not attend any of the Personal Hearing.

**13.** From the aforesaid facts, it is observed that sufficient opportunity has been granted to the noticee, but they chose not to join the personal hearing.

#### **DISCUSSIONS AND FINDINGS:**

**14.** I have carefully gone through the show cause notice, records and facts in the present case. I find that the noticee have failed to appear for Personal Hearing as well as submit any written submission, inspite of being given opportunity to appear in person several times as detailed in forgoing para for defending their case. Under such circumstance, there is no option left for me but to proceed with the adjudication proceedings ex-parte in terms of merit of the case.

**14.1** With regard to proceeding to decide the case ex-parte, support is drawn from the following case laws:

**14.1.1** Hon'ble High Court of Kerala in the case of **UNITED OIL MILLS VS. COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS & C.EX. COCHIN REPORTED IN 2000 (124) ELT 53 (KER.)** has held that:

*"19. No doubt hearing includes written submissions and personal hearing as well but the principle of Audi Alteram Partem does not make it imperative for the authorities to compel physical presence of the party concerned for hearing and go on adjourning the proceeding so long the party concerned does not appear before them. What is imperative for the authorities is to afford the opportunity. It is for the party concerned to avail the opportunity or not. If the opportunity afforded is not availed of by the party concerned, there is no violation of the principles of natural justice. The fundamental principles of natural justice and fair play are safeguards for the flow of justice and not the instruments for delaying the proceedings and thereby obstructing the flow of justice. In the instant case as stated in detail in preceding paragraphs, repeated adjournments were granted to the petitioners, dates after dates were fixed for personal hearing, petitioners filed written submissions, the administrative officer of the factory appeared for personal hearing and filed written submissions, therefore, in the opinion of this Court there is sufficient compliance of the principles of natural justice as adequate opportunity of hearing was afforded to the petitioners.*

*21. It may be recalled here that the requirement of natural justice varies from cases to cases and situations to situations. Courts cannot insist that under all circumstances personal hearing has to be afforded. Quasi-judicial authorities are expected to apply their judicial mind over the grievances made by the persons concerned but it cannot be held that before dismissing such applications in all events the quasi-judicial authorities must hear the applicants personally. When principles of natural justice require an opportunity before an adverse order is passed, it does not in all circumstances mean a personal hearing. The requirement is complied with if the person concerned is afforded an opportunity to present his case before the authority. Any order passed after taking into consideration the points raised in such applications shall not be held to be invalid merely on the ground that no personal hearing had been afforded. This is all the more important in the context of taxation and revenue matters. See Union of India and Another v. M/s. Jesus Sales Corporation [1996 (83) E.L.T. 486 (S.C.) = J.T. 1996 (3) SC 597]."*

**14.1.2** Hon'ble Tribunal of Mumbai in the case of **SUMIT WOOL PROCESSORS V. CC, NHAVA SHEVA REPORTED IN 2014 (312) E.L.T. 401 (TRI. - MUMBAI)** has observed as under:

*"8.3 We do not accept the plea of Mr. Sanjay Kumar Agarwal and Mr. Parmanand Joshi that they were not heard before passing of the impugned orders and principles of natural justice has been violated. The records show that notices were sent to the addresses given and sufficient opportunities were given. If they failed in not availing of the opportunity, the mistake lies on them. When all others who were party to the notices were heard, there is no reason why these two appellants would not have been heard by the adjudicating authority. Thus the argument taken is only an alibi to escape the consequences of law. Accordingly, we reject the plea made by them in this regard."*

**14.2** Now I proceed to adjudicate the subject show cause notice dated 01.07.2024. I find that the show cause notice was issued to M/s. Sherman Inc. due to observations of the audit of the EDI Systems and available records that the noticee failed to re-export the said goods in time frame imported under Bills of Entry No. 4549423 dated 05.09.2011, 4551001 dated 05.09.2011 and 6633674 dated 24.04.2012. I also find that as per records no such extension of period for re-export has been allowed to them. Therefore, the Customs duty Forgone amount of **Rs. 16,96,850/- (Rupees Sixteen Lakh Ninety Six Thousand Eight Hundred Fifty Only)**, appeared to be recoverable along with applicable interest in terms of conditions of Bond executed under section 143 of the Customs Act, 1962 read with Notification No. 104/1994-Cus dated 16.03.1994 as amended. Also, penalty appeared imposable on the importer under Section 112(a)/114A of the Customs Act, 1962 for the acts of omission and commission. Now therefore, the issues before me are to decide:-

- a. Whether the exemption under Notification No. 104/1994-Cus dated 16.03.1994, in respect of above said Bills of Entry No. 4549423 dated 05.09.2011, 4551001 dated 05.09.2011 and 6633674 dated 24.04.2012 is available to the noticee.
- b. Whether the imported goods of declared Assessable value of Rs. 61,54,137/- (Rupees Sixty One Lakh Fifty Four Thousand One Hundred Thirty Seven Only), are liable for confiscation under Section 111(o) of the Customs Act, 1962 read with conditions of Bond executed in terms of Section 143 of the Customs Act, 1962 read with Notification No. 104/1994-Cus dated 16.03.1994, as amended.
- c. Whether Duty Forgone amount of Rs. 16,96,850/- (Rupees Sixteen Lakh Ninety Six Thousand Eight Hundred Fifty Only) is recoverable along with applicable interest in terms of conditions of Bond executed under section 143 of the Customs Act, 1962 read with Notification No. 104/1994-Cus dated 16.03.1994, as amended / applicable.

VIII/10-162/ICD-Khod/O&A/HQ/2024-25  
OIO No. 276/ADC/SRV/O&A/2024-25

d. Whether penalty is imposable on the importer under Section 112(a)/114A of the Customs Act, 1962.

**14.3 Now, I proceed to decide whether the exemption under Notification No. 104/1994-Cus dated 16.03.1994, in respect of above said Bills of Entry No. 4549423 dated 05.09.2011, 4551001 dated 05.09.2011 and 6633674 dated 24.04.2012 is available to the noticee.**

**14.3.1** I find that the M/s. Sherman Inc. failed to submit the proof of re-export of subject goods as per conditions of Notification No. 104/1994-Cus dated 16.03.1994. exempts containers which are of durable nature, from the whole of the duty of Customs leviable thereon under the First Schedule to the Customs Tariff Act, 1975 (51 of 1975) and the whole of the additional duty leviable under section 3 of the said Customs Tariff Act, subject to the condition that the said containers are re-exported within six months from the date of their importation or such extended period not exceeding a further period of six months as the Assistant Commissioner of Customs may allow.

**14.3.2** I further find In terms of the conditions of Notification No. 104/1994-Cus., the importer is also required to execute a bond, binding himself (a) to export the said containers within the stipulated period and to furnish documentary evidence thereof to the satisfaction of the Assistant Commissioner; and (b) to pay the duty leviable thereon in the event of the importer's failure to do so.

**14.3.3** I find that M/s. Sherman Inc. submitted following Re-export Bonds in respect of the Bills of Entry. Further, the aforesaid Bills of Entry have been provisionally assessed, in respect of which the said importer submitted following Provisional Duty Bonds.

<b>Bill of Entry No. / Date</b>	<b>Re-Export Bond No./ Date</b>	<b>Re-Export Bond Amount (Rs.)</b>	<b>Provisional Duty Bond No. / Date</b>	<b>Provisional Duty Bond Amount (Rs.)</b>
4549423/ 05.09.2011	2000276708/ 01.05.2012	4,49,034/-	2000276709/ 01.05.2012	5,30,000/-
4551001/ 05.09.2011	2000276707/ 01.05.2012	4,49,034/-	2000276706/ 01.05.2012	5,30,000/-
6633674/ 24.04.2012	2000278524/ 05.05.2012	6,41,561/-	2000278523/ 05.05.2012	5,31,361/-

I find from the available records, that the importer had neither applied for extension of the period for re-export, nor such extension of period for re-export, had been allowed to them. However, even after expiry of one year from the import of the said goods, the said importer had not submitted proof of re-exportation of the said goods to the satisfaction of the Deputy / Assistant Commissioner of Customs, as required under the conditions of Notification No. 104/1994-Cus. As the said importer had not submitted the required documents and therefore the aforesaid Bonds have not been closed.

**14.3.4** Further, I find that the Consultative clarification letters F. No. VIII/22-12/ICD/Audit/2015 dated 28.07.2020, 21.12.2022 and 05.12.2023 had been issued to

the importer informing that the re-export bonds were still pending for closure, requesting to submit all the documents pertaining to re-export of the goods within prescribed time limit. Even after issuance of the said Show Cause notice, the noticee have not submitted any proof of re-export or any fact to this office. Therefore, I hold that the said goods have not been re-exported within time limits as per the notification No. 104/1994-Cus dated 16.03.1994.

**14.3.5** I would like to rely on the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of **M/s. Novopan India Ltd. reported at 1994 (73) ELT 769 (SC)**, wherein the Hon'ble SC held that:

*"18. We are, however, of the opinion that, on principle, the decision of this Court in Mangalore Chemicals - and in Union of India v. Wood Papers referred to therein - represents the correct view of law. The principle that in case of ambiguity, a taxing statute should be construed in favour of the assessee - assuming that the said principle is good and sound - does not apply to the construction of an exception or an exempting provision; they have to be construed strictly. A person invoking an exception or an exemption provision to relieve him of the tax liability must establish clearly that he is covered by the said provision. In case of doubt or ambiguity, benefit of it must go to the State. This is for the reason explained in Mangalore Chemicals and other decisions, viz., each such exception/exemption increases the tax burden on other members of the community correspondingly. Once, of course, the provision is found applicable to him, full effect must be given to it. As observed by a Constitution Bench of this Court in Hansraj Gordhandas v. H.H. Dave [1978 (2) E.L.T. (J 350) (SC) = 1969 (2) S.C.R. 253] that such a Notification has to be interpreted in the light of the words employed by it and not on any other basis. This was so held in the context of the principle that in a taxing statute, there is no room for any intendment, that regard must be had to the clear meaning of the words and that the matter should be governed wholly by the language of the notification, i.e., by the plain terms of the exemption."*

**14.3.6** Further, I would like to rely on the judgment of the Constitutional Bench in Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of **M/s. Dilip Kumar & Company. reported at 2018 (361) ELT 577 (SC)**, wherein the Hon'ble SC held that:

*"48. The next authority, which needs to be referred is the case in Mangalore Chemicals (supra). As we have already made reference to the same earlier, repetition of the same is not necessary. From the above decisions, the following position of law would, therefore, clear. Exemptions from taxation have tendency to increase the burden on the other unexempted class of taxpayers. A person claiming exemption, therefore, has to establish that his case squarely falls within the exemption notification, and while doing so, a notification should be construed against the subject in case of ambiguity.*

49. The ratio in *Mangalore Chemicals* case (*supra*) was approved by a three-Judge Bench in *Novopan India Ltd. v. Collector of Central Excise and Customs*, 1994 Supp (3) SCC 606 = 1994 (73) E.L.T. 769 (S.C.). In this case, probably for the first time, the question was posed as to whether the benefit of an exemption notification should go to the subject/assessee when there is ambiguity. The three-Judge Bench, in the background of English and Indian cases, in para 16, unanimously held as follows :

*"We are, however, of the opinion that, on principle, the decision of this Court in *Mangalore Chemicals* - and in *Union of India v. Wood Papers*, referred to therein - represents the correct view of law. The principle that in case of ambiguity, a taxing statute should be construed in favour of the assessee - assuming that the said principle is good and sound - does not apply to the construction of an exception or an exempting provision, they have to be construed strictly. A person invoking an exception or an exemption provision to relieve him of the tax liability must establish clearly that he is covered by the said provision. In case of doubt or ambiguity, benefit of it must go to the State...."*

50. In *Tata Iron & Steel Co. Ltd. v. State of Jharkhand*, (2005) 4 SCC 272, which is another two-Judge Bench decision, this Court laid down that eligibility clause in relation to exemption notification must be given strict meaning and in para 44, it was further held -

*"The principle that in the event a provision of fiscal statute is obscure such construction which favours the assessee may be adopted, would have no application to construction of an exemption notification, as in such a case it is for the assessee to show that he comes within the purview of exemption (See *Novopan India Ltd. v. CCE and Customs*)."*

...

52. To sum up, we answer the reference holding as under -

- (1) Exemption notification should be interpreted strictly; the burden of proving applicability would be on the assessee to show that his case comes within the parameters of the exemption clause or exemption notification.
- (2) When there is ambiguity in exemption notification which is subject to strict interpretation, the benefit of such ambiguity cannot be claimed by the subject/assessee and it must be interpreted in favour of the revenue.
- (3) The ratio in *Sun Export* case (*supra*) is not correct and all the decisions which took similar view as in *Sun Export* case (*supra*) stands overruled."

**14.3.7** Further, I would like to quote the lines from the case of **Collector of Customs, Bangalore & Anr. Vs. M/s. Maestro Motors Ltd. & Anr. 2004 (10) SCALE 253**, wherein the Court held:

"It is settled law that to avail the benefit of a notification a party must comply with all the conditions of the Notification. Further, a Notification has to be interpreted in terms of its language."

In view of above case laws, I find that the burden of proving the claim of exemption notification is squarely on the noticee, which he failed to due to non-observance of conditions of the said notification 104/94 -Customs. I find that the said importer had neither applied for extension of the period for re-export before expiry of the said time limit, nor such extension of period for re-export has been allowed to them. I also find that, even after expiry of one year from the import of the said goods, the said importer had not submitted proof of re-exportation of the said goods to the satisfaction of the Deputy / Assistant Commissioner of Customs, as required under the conditions of Notification No. 104/94-Cus. Therefore, I hold that the exemption under Notification No. 104/94-Cus dated 16.03.1994, in respect of Bills of Entry No. 4549423 dated 05.09.2011, 4551001 dated 05.09.2011 and 6633674 dated 24.04.2012 is **NOT** available to the noticee i.e. M/s. Sherman Inc.

**14.4 Now I decide whether the imported goods of declared Assessable value of Rs. 61,54,137/- (Rupees Sixty One Lakh Fifty Four Thousand One Hundred Thirty Seven Only), are liable for confiscation under Section 111(o) of the Customs Act, 1962 read with conditions of Bond executed in terms of Section 143 of the Customs Act,1962 read with Notification No. 104/1994-Cus dated 16.03.1994, as amended.**

**14.4.1** I find from the foregoing Paras that M/s. Sherman Inc. have not fulfilled their conditions of the notification No. 104/1994-Cus dated 16.03.1994 by not re-exporting the said goods within Six months or the stipulated time period, therefore, as per Section 143 (3) –

"(3) If the thing is not done within the time specified in the bond, the [Assistant Commissioner of Customs or Deputy Commissioner of Customs] shall, without prejudice to any other action that may be taken under this Act or any other law for the time being in force, be entitled to proceed upon the bond in accordance with law."

**14.4.2** I further find that as per clause (o) of Section 111 of the Customs Act, 1962, any goods exempted, subject to any condition, from duty or any prohibition in respect of the import thereof under the Customs Act, 1962 or any other law for the time being in force, in respect of which the condition is not observed, shall be liable to confiscation. As the exemption under Notification No. 104/1994-Cus. was granted to the said re-imported goods subject to the condition of their re-exportation within prescribed time limit, whereas the said condition has not been observed, therefore, the aforesaid goods appear liable for confiscation under Section 111(o) of the Customs Act, 1962.

**14.4.3** I find that in terms of Section 17 of the Customs Act, "self-assessment" has been provided for the duty on import and export goods by the importer or exporter

VIII/10-162/ICD-Khod/O&A/HQ/2024-25  
OIO No. 276/ADC/SRV/O&A/2024-25

himself by filing a bill of entry or shipping bill as the case may be, in the electronic form, as per Section 46 or 50 respectively. Thus, under self-assessment, it is the importer or exporter who will ensure that he declares the correct classification, applicable rate of duty, value, benefit, or exemption notification claimed, if any in respect of the imported/exported goods while presenting Bill of Entry or Shipping Bill. In the present case, it is evident that the actual facts were only known to the noticee and aforesaid fact came to light only subsequent to the in-depth investigation. Further I find that the noticee was not able to justify the delay in the re-export. I find that the said importer has failed to discharge the conditions laid down under Notification No. 104/1994-Cus. dated 16.03.1994 inasmuch as they have not submitted documentary evidence pertaining to re-export of the said re-imported goods within prescribed time limit. Thus, I find that M/s. Sherman Inc. have violated the provisions of Section 46 (4) of the Customs Act, 1962 and these acts on part of M/s. Sherman Inc. I hold the imported goods valued at **Rs. 61,54,137/- (Rupees Sixty One Lakh Fifty Four Thousand One Hundred Thirty Seven Only)**, liable to confiscation under Section 111 (o) of the Customs Act, 1962.

**14.4.4** As the impugned goods are found liable to confiscation under Section 111 (o) of the Customs Act, 1962, I find it necessary to consider as to whether redemption fine under Section 125(1) of Customs Act, 1962 is liable to be imposed in lieu of confiscation in respect of the imported goods, which are not physically available for confiscation. The Section 125 (1) of the Customs Act, 1962 reads as under:-

**“125 Option to pay fine in lieu of confiscation –**

*(1) Whenever confiscation of any goods is authorised by this Act, the officer adjudging it may, in the case of any goods, the importation or exportation whereof is prohibited under this Act or under any other law for the time being in force, and shall, in the case of any other goods, give to the owner of the goods [or, where such owner is not known, the person from whose possession or custody such goods have been seized,] an option to pay in lieu of confiscation such fine as the said officer thinks fit...”*

**14.4.5** I find that though, the goods are not physically available for confiscation and in such cases redemption fine is imposable in light of the judgment in the case of **M/s. Visteon Automotive Systems India Ltd. reported at 2018 (009) GSTL 0142 (Mad)** wherein the Hon'ble High Court of Madras has observed as under:

“....

....

....

23. *The penalty directed against the importer under Section 112 and the fine payable under Section 125 operates in two different fields. The fine under Section 125 is in lieu of confiscation of the goods. The payment of fine followed up by payment of duty and other charges leviable, as per sub-section (2) of Section 125, fetches relief for the goods*

from getting confiscated. By subjecting the goods to payment of duty and other charges, the improper and irregular importation is sought to be regularised, whereas, by subjecting the goods to payment of fine under sub-section (1) of Section 125, the goods are saved from getting confiscated. Hence, the availability of the goods is not necessary for imposing the redemption fine. The opening words of Section 125, "Whenever confiscation of any goods is authorised by this Act ....", brings out the point clearly. The power to impose redemption fine springs from the authorisation of confiscation of goods provided for under Section 111 of the Act. When once power of authorisation for confiscation of goods gets traced to the said Section 111 of the Act, we are of the opinion that the physical availability of goods is not so much relevant. The redemption fine is in fact to avoid such consequences flowing from Section 111 only. Hence, the payment of redemption fine saves the goods from getting confiscated. Hence, their physical availability does not have any significance for imposition of redemption fine under Section 125 of the Act. We accordingly answer question No. (iii).

....

...."

**14.4.6** I also find that Hon'ble High Court of Gujarat by relying on this judgment, in the case of ***Synergy Fertichem Ltd. Vs. Union of India, reported in 2020 (33) G.S.T.L. 513 (Guj.)***, has followed the dictum as laid down by the Madras High Court. In view of the above, I find that subject goods can be allowed to be redeemed on payment of redemption fine under Section 125 of the Customs Act, 1962, hence redemption fine in lieu of confiscation is imposable on the said imported goods.

**14.5 Now, I decide Whether Duty Forgone amount of Rs. 16,96,850/- (Rupees Sixteen Lakh Ninety Six Thousand Eight Hundred Fifty Only) is recoverable along with applicable interest in terms of conditions of Bond executed under section 143 of the Customs Act, 1962 read with Sr. No. 1 of Notification No. 104/1994-Cus dated 16.03.1994, as amended / applicable.**

**14.5.1** I find from the foregoing Paras that M/s. Sherman Inc. have not fulfilled their conditions of the notification No. 104/1994-Cus dated 16.03.1994 by not re-exporting the said goods within Six months or the stipulated time period.

**14.5.2** I find that the importer had executed RE-Bond, binding himself to re-export the said goods within six months from the date of their importation and to furnish documentary evidence thereof to the satisfaction of the said the Deputy/Assistant Commissioner and to pay the duty leviable thereon in the event of the importer's failure to do so. However, as discussed in foregoing paras, the importer have neither re-exported the same within time nor paid the Customs duty leviable thereon in terms of the Bonds executed by them. At this juncture, it is to mention that the term "Bond" is

not defined under the Customs Act, 1962. However, the same has been defined under Sub-section (5) of Section 2 of the Indian Stamp Act, 1899 as under:

(5) "Bond" – "Bond" includes—

- (a) any instrument whereby a person obliges himself to pay money to another, on condition that the obligation shall be void if a specified act is performed, or is not performed, as the case may be;
- (b) any instrument attested by a witness and not payable to order or bearer, whereby a person obliges himself to pay money to another; and
- (c) any instrument so attested, whereby a person obliges himself to deliver grain or other agricultural produce to another;

Likewise, Section 2(d) of The Limitation Act, 1963 defines the term 'Bond' as under:

(d) "bond" includes any instrument whereby a person obliges himself to pay money to another, on condition that the obligation shall be void if a specified act is performed, or is not performed, as the case may be;

**14.5.3** In light of the definition of the term 'Bond' it is expressly clear that the importer has undertaken the obligation to pay Customs Duty alongwith Interest in the event of non-fulfillment of export obligation. Such act of the importer to the effect of not paying Customs Duty alongwith Interest tantamount to dishonoring the Bond executed by them. Therefore, I hold that M/s. Sherman Inc. are liable to pay the Customs duty to the tune of **Rs. 16,96,850/- (Rupees Sixteen Lakh Ninety Six Thousand Eight Hundred Fifty Only)** along with applicable interest (from the date of clearance of goods to the date of payment of duty) in terms of conditions of Bond executed under section 143 of the Customs Act, 1962 read Notification No. 104/1994-Cus. dated 16.03.1994, as amended.

#### **14.6 Whether penalty is imposable on the importer under Section 112(a)/114A of the Customs Act, 1962.**

**14.6.1** Section 112 reads as follows:

**"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*

*...*

*shall be liable, -*

*...*

<sup>2</sup> *[(ii) in the case of dutiable goods, other than prohibited goods, subject to the provisions of section 114A, to a penalty not exceeding ten per cent. of the duty sought to be evaded or five thousand rupees, whichever is higher ...”*

**14.6.2** I find from the foregoing Paras that M/s. Sherman Inc. have not fulfilled their conditions of the notification No. 104/1994-Cus dated 16.03.1994 by not re-exporting the said goods within Six months or the stipulated time period, therefore, the goods were liable to confiscation under Section 111(o) and the importer is liable for penalty under Section 12(a)(ii) of the Customs Act, 1962.

**14.6.3 Penalty under Section 114A of the Customs Act, 1962:** I find that the demand of duty of **Rs. 16,96,850/- (Rupees Sixteen Lakh Ninety Six Thousand Eight Hundred Fifty Only)** has been made under provisions of the Customs Act, 1962 from M/s. Sherman Inc. In the present case, it is evident that the actual facts were only known to the noticee and aforesaid fact came to light only subsequent to the in-depth investigation. Further I find that the noticee was not able to justify the delay in the re-export. I find that the said importer has failed to discharge the conditions laid down under Notification No. 104/1994-Cus dated 16.03.1994 inasmuch as they have not submitted documentary evidence pertaining to re-export of the said re-imported goods within prescribed time limit. Thus, I find that M/s. Sherman Inc. have violated the provisions of Section 46 (4) of the Customs Act, 1962. In the instant case, the ingredient of suppression of facts by the importer has been clearly established as discussed in foregoing paras and hence, I find that this is a fit case for imposition of quantum of penalty equal to the amount of Duty plus interest in terms of Section 114A ibid as proposed in the Show Cause Notice.

**14.6.4** I find that fifth proviso to Section 114A stipulates that “*where any penalty has been levied under this section, no penalty shall be levied under Section 112 or Section 114*”. Hence, I refrain from imposing penalty on M/s. Sherman Inc. under Section 112 of the Customs Act, 1962 as penalty has been imposed on them under Section 114A of the Customs Act, 1962.

**15.** Therefore, I pass the following order -

**ORDER**

- a) I deny the benefit of exemption Notification No. 104/1994-Cus dated 16.03.1994, to M/s. Sherman Inc., claimed and availed in respect of Bills of Entry No. 4549423 dated 05.09.2011, 4551001 dated 05.09.2011 and 6633674 dated 24.04.2012;
- b) I hold the imported goods of declared Assessable value of **Rs. 61,54,137/- (Rupees Sixty One Lakh Fifty Four Thousand One Hundred Thirty Seven Only)**, liable for confiscation under Section 111(o) of the Customs Act, 1962 read with conditions of

VIII/10-162/ICD-Khod/O&A/HQ/2024-25  
OIO No. 276/ADC/SRV/O&A/2024-25

Bond executed in terms of Section 143 of the Customs Act, 1962 read with Notification No. 104/1994-Cus dated 16.03.1994 as amended / applicable. However I given M/s. Sherman Inc. an option to redeem the said imported goods on payment of fine of **Rs. 6,00,000/- (Rupees Six Lakhs Only)** under Section 125 of the Customs Act, 1962;

- c) I order to demand Duty of an amount of **Rs. 16,96,850/- (Rupees Sixteen Lakh Ninety Six Thousand Eight Hundred Fifty Only)** along with applicable interest (from the date of clearance of goods to the date of payment of duty) and recover from M/s. Sherman Inc. in terms of conditions of Bond executed under section 143 of the Customs Act, 1962 read Notification No. 104/1994-Cus. dated 16.03.1994, as amended;
- d) I impose a Penalty of **Rs. 16,96,850/- (Rupees Sixteen Lakh Ninety Six Thousand Eight Hundred Fifty Only) plus interest as determined in para (c) above** on the importer under Section 114A of the Customs Act, 1962 for the acts of omission and commission. I refrain from imposing penalty on them under Section 112 for the reasons discussed in foregoing Paras;
- e) I order to enforce the Re-export Bonds furnished by the importer for recovery of duty, interest, penalty and Redemption Fine.

**16.** The Show Cause Notice No. VIII/22-12/ICD /Audit/2015 dated 01.07.2024 is disposed of in terms of the para above.

**(SHREE RAM VISHNOI)**  
Additional Commissioner

DIN: 20250371MN000000123E

F. No. VIII/10-162/ICD-Khod/O&A/HQ/2024-25

Date: **17.03.2025**

By Speed post/RPAD

To,

**M/S. SHERMAN INC.,**  
606, LOHA BHAVAN,  
NEAR OLD HIGH COURT,  
ASHRAM ROAD,  
AHMEDABAD - 380009.

VIII/10-162/ICD-Khod/O&A/HQ/2024-25  
OIO No. 276/ADC/SRV/O&A/2024-25

Copy to:-

- (i) The Principal Commissioner, Customs Ahmedabad (Kind Attention: RRA Section).
- (ii) The Assistant Commissioner of Customs, ICD – Khodiyar, Ahmedabad
- (iii) The Superintendent, Customs, H.Q. (Systems), Ahmedabad, in PDF format for uploading on website of Customs Commissionerate, Ahmedabad
- (iv) The Superintendent (Task Force), Customs-Ahmedabad
- (v) Guard File