सत्यमेव जयते

सीमा शुल्क(अपील) आयुक्त का कार्यालय, अहमदाबाद

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

चौथी मंज़िल **4th Floor,** हडको भवन **HUDCO Bhawan,** ईश्वर भुवन रोड़ **Ishwar Bhuvan Road**
नवरंगपुरा **Navrangpura,** अहमदाबाद **Ahmedabad – 380 009**
दूरभाष क्रमांक **Tel. No. 079-26589281**

DIN -20260371MN000000E9A7

क	फ़ाइल संख्या FILE NO.	S/49-349/CUS/MUN/2024-25
ख	अपील आदेश संख्या ORDER-IN-APPEAL NO. (सीमा शुल्क अधिनियम, 1962 की धारा 128क के अंतर्गत)(UNDER SECTION 128A OF THE CUSTOMS ACT, 1962)	MUN-CUSTM-000-APP-975-25-26
ग	पारितकर्ता PASSED BY	Shri Amit Gupta Commissioner of Customs (Appeals), Ahmedabad
घ	दिनांक DATE	31.03.2026
ङ	उदभूत अपील आदेश की सं. व दिनांक ARISING OUT OF ORDER-IN-ORIGINAL NO.	Order-in-Original no. MCH/ADC/AKM/205/2024-25 dated 27.11.2024
च	अपील आदेश जारी करने की दिनांक ORDER- IN-APPEAL ISSUED ON:	31.03.2026
छ	अपीलकर्ता का नाम व पता NAME AND ADDRESS OF THE APPELLANT:	Shri Gaurav Sahay, B-15,U S Villa Swaminarayan Nagar, Mundra, Kutch, Gujarat-370421

आयुक्त (अपील), सीमा शुल्क, अहमदाबाद

1	यह प्रति उस व्यक्ति के निजी उपयोग के लिए मुफ्त में दी जाती है जिनके नाम यह जारी किया गया है.
	This copy is granted free of cost for the private use of the person to whom it is issued.
2.	सीमाशुल्क अधिनियम **1962** की धारा **129** डी डी **(1)** (यथा संशोधित) के अधीन निम्नलिखित श्रेणियों के मामलों के सम्बन्ध में कोई व्यक्ति इस आदेश से अपने को आहत महसूस करता हो तो इस आदेश की प्राप्ति की तारीख से **3** महीने के अंदर अपर सचिव-/संयुक्त सचिव (आवेदन संशोधन), वित्त मंत्रालय, (राजस्व विभाग) संसद मार्ग, नई दिल्ली को पुनरीक्षण आवेदन प्रस्तुत कर सकते है.
	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.
	निम्नलिखित सम्बन्धित आदेश/Order relating to :
(क)	बैगेज़ के रूप में आयातित कोई माल.
(a)	any goods exported
(ख)	भारत में आयात करने हेतु किसी वाहन में लादा गया लेकिन भारत में उनके गन्तव्य स्थान पर उतारे न गए माल या उस गन्तव्य स्थान पर उतारे जाने के लिए अपेक्षित माल उतारे न जाने पर या उस गन्तव्य स्थान पर उतारे गए माल की मात्रा में अपेक्षित माल से कमी हो.
(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)	सीमाशुल्क अधिनियम, 1962 के अध्याय X तथा उसके अधीन बनाए गए नियमों के तहत शुल्क वापसी की अदायगी.
(c)	Payment of drawback as provided in Chapter X of Customs Act, 1962 and the rules made thereunder.
3.	पुनरीक्षण आवेदन पत्र संगत नियमावली में विनिर्दिष्ट प्रारूप में प्रस्तुत करना होगा जिसके अन्तर्गत उसकी जांच की जाएगी और उस के साथ निम्नलिखित कागजात संलग्न होने चाहिए :
	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)	कोर्ट फी एक्ट,1870 के मद सं.**6** अनुसूची **1** के अधीन निर्धारित किए गए अनुसार इस आदेश की **4** प्रतियां, जिसकी एक प्रति में पचास पैसे की न्यायालय शुल्क टिकट लगा होना चाहिए.
(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)	सम्बद्ध दस्तावेज़ों के अलावा साथ मूल आदेश की **4** प्रतियां, यदि हो
(b)	4 copies of the Order-in-Original, in addition to relevant documents, if any
(ग)	पुनरीक्षण के लिए आवेदन की **4** प्रतियां
(c)	4 copies of the Application for Revision.
(घ)	पुनरीक्षण आवेदन दायर करने के लिए सीमाशुल्क अधिनियम, **1962** (यथा संशोधित) में निर्धारित फीस जो अन्य रसीद, फीस,दण्ड,जब्ती और विविध मदों के शीर्ष के अधीन आता है में रु. **200/-**(रूपए दो सौ मात्र)या रु.**1000/-**(रूपए एक हज़ार मात्र), जैसा भी मामला हो, से सम्ब न्धित भुगतान के प्रमाणिक चलान टी.आर.**6** की दो प्रतियां. यदि शुल्क, मांगा गया ब्याज, लगाया गया दंड की राशि और रूपए एक लाख या उससे कम हो तो ऐसे फीस के रूप में रु.**200/-** और यदि एक लाख से अधिक हो तो फीस के रूप में रु.**1000/-**
(d)	The duplicate copy of the T.R.6 challan evidencing payment of Rs.200/- (Rupees two Hundred only) or Rs.1,000/- (Rupees one thousand only) as the case may be, under the Head of other receipts, fees, fines, forfeitures and Miscellaneous Items being the fee prescribed in the Customs Act, 1962 (as amended) for filing a Revision Application. If the

	amount of duty and interest demanded, fine or penalty levied is one lakh rupees or less, fees as Rs.200/- and if it is more than one lakh rupees, the fee is Rs.1000/-.
4.	मद सं. **2** के अधीन सूचित मामलों के अलावा अन्य मामलों के सम्बंन्ध में यदि कोई व्यक्ति इस आदेश से आहत महसूस करता हो तो वे सीमाशुल्क अधिनियम **1962** की धारा **129** ए **(1)** के अधीन फॉर्म सी.ए.**-3** में सीमाशुल्क, केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क और सेवा कर अपील अधिकरण के समक्ष निम्नलिखित पते पर अपील कर सकते हैं
	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, केंद्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क व सेवा कर अपीलिय अधिकरण, पश्चिमी क्षेत्रीय पीठ / **Customs, Excise & Service Tax Appellate Tribunal, West Zonal Bench**
	दूसरी मंज़िल, बहुमाली भवन, निकट गिरधरनगर पुल, असारवा, अहमदाबाद-380016 / 2nd 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 जहां किसी सीमाशुल्क अधिकारी द्वारा मांगा गया शुल्क और व्याज तथा लगाया गया दंड की रकम पाँच लाख रूपए या उससे कम हो तो एक हज़ार रुपए.
(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 जहां किसी सीमाशुल्क अधिकारी द्वारा मांगा गया शुल्क और व्याज तथा लगाया गया दंड की रकम पाँच लाख रूपए से अधिक हो लेकिन रुपये पचास लाख से अधिक न हो तो; पांच हज़ार रुपए
(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 जहां किसी सीमाशुल्क अधिकारी द्वारा मांगा गया शुल्क और व्याज तथा लगाया गया दंड की रकम पचास लाख रूपए से अधिक हो तो; दस हज़ार रुपए.
(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)	इस आदेश के विरुद्ध अधिकरण के सामने, मांगे गए शुल्क के 10% अदा करने पर, जहां शुल्क या शुल्क एवं दंड विवाद में हैं, या दंड के 10% अदा करने पर, जहां केवल दंड विवाद में है, अपील रखा जाएगा।
(d)	An appeal against this order shall lie before the Tribunal on payment of 10% of the duty demanded where duty or duty and penalty are in dispute, or penalty, where penalty alone is in dispute.
6.	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

Appeal has been filed by Shri Gaurav Sahay, B-15,U S Villa Swaminarayan Nagar, Mundra, Kutch, Gujarat-370421, (hereinafter referred to as the 'Appellant') in terms of Section 128 of the Customs Act, 1962, challenging the Order-in-Original nos. MCH/ADC/AKM/205/2024-25 dated 27.11.2024 (hereinafter referred to as 'the impugned order') issued by the Additional Commissioner, Customs, Mundra (hereinafter referred to as 'the adjudicating authority').

2. Facts of the case, in brief, are that the present matter originated from specific, actionable intelligence gathered by the Directorate of Revenue Intelligence (DRI), Gandhidham Regional Unit. The intelligence indicated the operation of a high-level, organized smuggling cartel involving a common set of individuals who utilized multiple dummy entities and front firms to facilitate the illegal importation of restricted and prohibited goods. Initial enforcement actions were triggered on September 1, 2022, by the interception of vehicle No. GJ12BV0610 near Palsana Chokdi, Surat. This vehicle was found to be carrying a consignment of 823 cartons cleared from Mundra Port (Container No. TLLU4615592). Upon detailed inspection at ICD Sachin, officers discovered a massive concealment of foreign-brand E-cigarettes of the "Yuotto" brand, totaling 85,600 pieces in various flavors such as Strawberry Watermelon and Blueberry Ice. These items were hidden behind a "cover" of declared household goods to deceive visual inspections.

2.1 Subsequent analysis of the Customs system data, combined with extensive field investigations and the recovery of incriminating digital records, revealed that this interception was merely the tip of a much larger operation. Investigations revealed that this was part of a larger operation involving 18 containers imported under the names of eight different dummy entities, including M/s. Nikhat Enterprises.

2.2 The specific focus of the impugned OIO involves the activities surrounding a consignment imported by M/s. Nikhat Enterprises (IEC: ANDPB0477C) via Container No. NYKU0844232. In a calculated and professional attempt to bypass automated risk management systems (RMS) and standard regulatory scrutiny, the goods were initially declared in the Import General Manifest (IGM) as "Floor Clean Mop (Misc Item Non-popular Brand)" under HS Code 96039000. This specific HS code was selected by the syndicate for its low duty profile and the physical volume of the product, which provided ample "void space" for the concealment of high-value contraband.

2.3 When filing the Warehouse Bill of Entry (No. 1011448 dated August 25, 2022), the syndicate slightly adjusted the declaration to include "Back Cover, Exercise Book, and Tempered Glass," creating a "mixed-merchandise" profile. This profile was designed to deter customs officers from conducting a full de-stuffing, as mixed consignments are often perceived as standard low-risk consumer imports. The container was processed through the Mundra SEZ warehouse unit M/s. Empezar Logistics Pvt. Ltd., which, rather than serving its intended statutory purpose for value-addition, manufacturing, or legitimate storage, acted as a high-speed transit point or "revolving door." This facility was utilized to rapidly facilitate the diversion of goods into the Domestic Tariff Area (DTA) under DTA Bill of Entry No. 2012900 dated August 26, 2022, after which the cargo was immediately dispatched to a decentralized distribution hub in Bhiwandi, Maharashtra.

2.4 The investigative trail, supported by GPS tracking and statement analysis, led DRI officers to the Madhvi Compound godowns in Village Rahanal, Bhiwandi. This location was strategically chosen by the cartel for its proximity to major transportation routes serving the Mumbai Metropolitan Region, allowing for rapid "last-mile" distribution to retailers. During the course of investigation, the driver of the transport vehicle (Registration No. GJ-12 BT-4667), Shri Poona, provided a comprehensive voluntary statement under Section 108 of the Customs Act, 1962. His testimony provided an insider's view of the operation, detailing how he received real-time location coordinates and voice instructions via WhatsApp, directing him to offload the cargo from Container No. NYKU0844232 at these specific premises under the cover of night on August 31, 2022.

2.5 During search conducted on September 2, 2022, at Gala Nos. 5, 6, and 7—warehouses managed by the associate Shri Parwej Alam—officers recovered 12 leftover cartons containing 9,600 pieces of "Yuoto" brand e-cigarettes (specifically the XXL 2500 Puffs Disposable Vape model). These items were found hidden behind voluminous stacks of "cover goods," including mops, exercise books, and plastic chocolate moulds. The recovery of these goods highlighted a severe and intentional breach of the Prohibition of Electronic Cigarettes Act, 2019. Consequently, the recovered 9,600 pieces were placed under absolute seizure as prohibited contraband.

2.6 The investigation unearthed a structured syndicate masterminded by Shri Asif Sathi, a Mumbai-based operative who exercised absolute control over the network's financial, logistical, and communicative architecture. Shri Sathi's modus operandi relied on the systematic exploitation of economically vulnerable individuals to serve as "dummy" proprietors for front entities. Mrs. Nikhat Baig, the declared proprietor of M/s. Nikhat Enterprises, admitted in her statement that she was merely an "on-paper" owner with no knowledge of the firm's actual imports, suppliers, or bank accounts. She had been induced by an intermediary named Shri Kishore to provide her KYC documents, PAN, and Aadhaar, and to sign multiple blank forms in exchange for a nominal fee, which was presented to her as a facilitation fee for a bank loan. This tactic created a legal shielding Shri Sathi from direct culpability and allowing the cartel to burn through IECs once they were compromised. The mastermind coordinated these imports with key associates, including Shri Sarfaraz Kamani and Shri Mohammed Tahir Menn. Together, they managed an "end-to-end" chain that originated with suppliers in China—often managed through shadow entities like M/s. AH International Trading Co. Limited and M/s. HK Longcheng Trade Co. Limited—and concluded with a network of domestic buyers such as Sohail Bhai and Raju Bhai, who specialized in the distribution of contraband into the grey market.

2.7 A critical component of this scheme was the role played by Shri Baldevsinh Vala of M/s. Kalpana Exim, who functioned as the syndicate's primary forwarder, logistics manager, and "fixer" at Mundra Port. Forensic analysis of messages of WhatsApp group "Mm" revealed that Shri Vala was instrumental in the fabrication and manipulation of shipping documents. He would routinely receive original invoices from Chinese suppliers and then alter them to ensure they matched the false, low-value declarations intended for the Bills of Entry. Furthermore, the syndicate employed a tactical "crossing" of containers—a sophisticated counter-surveillance maneuver where goods were de-stuffed and re-loaded into different domestic vehicles immediately after customs clearance but before leaving the port vicinity. This was designed to generate fresh e-way bills with new vehicle numbers, effectively "cleaning" the cargo of its import history. By doing so, the syndicate effectively broke the digital audit trail, making it nearly impossible for enforcement agencies to link the original import container at Mundra to the final delivery point in Bhiwandi.

2.8 Shri Samir Sharma, a G-Card holder of M/s. Al Cargo Services, filed the false Bills of Entry. He conspicuously and willfully neglected the mandatory due diligence on IEC holders required under the Customs Broker Licensing Regulations (CBLR). Rather than acting as a gatekeeper of the law, he served as a professional enabler, receiving payments ranging from ₹2.5 lakh to ₹3 lakh per consignment for his cooperation.

2.9 Finally, the DRI noted a failure in the regulatory oversight provided by the Customs Preventive Officer, Shri Vipin Sharma. Despite receiving explicit, system-generated examination orders to "examine as per SEZ norms and check description and packages with respect to invoice and packing list," the officer submitted a cursory and misleading report claiming the cargo matched the declarations. This "casual approach" was not merely a procedural lapse; it was the final, critical gap in the safety net that allowed prohibited contraband to flow into the domestic market. The implications of such failures are profound, as they compromise the integrity of the entire SEZ framework, which relies heavily on the trust and diligence of its officers to prevent the leak of goods into the DTA.

2.10 Regarding the valuation of the seized goods, the total absence of a legal market meant that traditional valuation methods were inapplicable. Consequently, the DRI utilized internet-based pricing from the official "Yuoto" brand website (www.yuoto.in), which listed the product at a retail price of ₹2,499 per unit. This valuation brought the total market value of the seized 9,600 pieces to a staggering ₹2,39,90,400. The department has alleged that these goods are liable for absolute confiscation under multiple sub-sections of Section 111 of the Customs Act, 1962, including 111(d) for the violation of absolute prohibitions, 111(f) for non-mention in manifest, and 111(m) for the deliberate and mala-fide mis-declaration of quantity, value, and description.

2.11 By knowingly concerning themselves with the removal, concealment, and dealing of prohibited and mis-declared goods, the noticees violated multiple sections of the Customs Act, including:

- Section 111(d), (f), and (m): For importing goods contrary to prohibitions and for filing entries that did not correspond to the actual value or description of the goods.

- Section 112(a) and (b): For acts of omission and commission—including the failure to examine goods and the facilitation of fraudulent clearances—that rendered the goods liable for confiscation.
- Section 114AA: For the deliberate use of false and fraudulent documents, including forged invoices and manipulated packing lists, in the transaction of business with Customs.

2.12 The investigation concluded that the entire operation was a deliberate attempt to defraud the government exchequer of legitimate revenue and bypass essential quality standards intended for consumer safety. The cumulative evidence, including WhatsApp chats, voluntary statements under Section 108, and the physical recovery of contraband, established a "preponderance of probability" that the syndicate operated with full knowledge of the illegal nature of their trade.

2.13 On the basis of the investigation, Show Cause Notice was issued to M/s. Nikhat Enterprise and other persons involved. Consequently, the Adjudicating Authority confirmed the liability of the goods for confiscation and the imposition of significant personal penalties on M/s. Nikhat Enterprise and other accomplices under Sections 112 and 114 of the Customs Act, 1962, for their roles in a "well-hatched conspiracy" to defraud the national exchequer. The Adjudicating Authority passed the following order in respect of the appellant.

(I) He imposed penalty of Rs. 10,00,000/- upon the appellant under Section 112(a)(i) of the Customs Act, 1962.

(II) He imposed penalty of Rs. 3,00,000/- upon the appellant under Section 114AA of the Customs Act, 1962.

SUBMISSIONS OF THE APPELLANT:

3. Being aggrieved with the impugned order, the Appellant has filed the present appeal against the order passed by the Additional Commissioner, Customs, Mundra. The Grounds of Appeal are not reproduced in detail for sake of brevity, as the copy of the same is available with the Appellant as well Respondent. However, the same have been examined and the brief is as under:

3.1 The appellant contends that the impugned order is "non-speaking" and was passed in violation of the principles of natural justice. It is argued that the Additional Commissioner relied solely on departmental investigations without conducting an independent inquiry or considering the actual statements made by the appellants.

3.2 The appeal asserts that the Show Cause Notice (SCN) is based on assumptions rather than concrete evidence. The department's case relies primarily on WhatsApp chat data from a seized mobile phone and confessional statements that the appellant claims were recorded under pressure, threat, and coercion.

3.3 The appellant argues that confessional statements and digital data cannot be the sole basis for a conviction or penalty. Citing various judicial precedents, the appeal maintains that the department must provide corroborative evidence—such as proof of unaccounted raw materials, excess production, or receipt of cash—to sustain charges of clandestine activities or improper importation.

3.4 The appeal highlights a significant procedural flaw regarding the use of statements. Under Section 138B of the Customs Act, statements are only relevant if the person who made them is examined as a witness before the adjudicating authority. The appellant specifically requests the cross-examination of several individuals and the "Panchas" (witnesses to the search) to ensure a fair proceeding.

3.5 The appellant contests the penalties proposed under Sections 112 and 114AA of the Customs Act. It is argued that the appellant acted in good faith (bona fide), without any "contumacious or dishonest conduct". Since the revenue failed to prove intentional use of false documents or knowledge of abetment, the appeal claims these penalties are legally unsustainable.

PERSONAL HEARING:

4. Personal hearing was granted to the Appellant on 18.12.2025 following the principles of natural justice wherein Ms Madhu Jain, Advocate, appeared for the hearing and re-iterated the submissions made at the time of filing the appeal.

DISCUSSION AND FINDINGS:

5. I have carefully gone through the case records, impugned order passed by the Additional Commissioner, Customs, Mundra and the defense put forth by the Appellant in their appeal.

5.1 The Appellant has vehemently contested the reliance placed by the Adjudicating Authority on the statements recorded under Section 108 of the Customs Act, 1962, and the digital evidence extracted from WhatsApp. The Appellant's primary contention is that the statements were "coerced" and subsequently retracted, and that the digital evidence lacks the requisite certification under Section 138C.

5.2 Under the Customs Act, Section 108 empowers a Gazetted Officer of Customs to summon any person to give evidence or produce a document. These proceedings are deemed to be "judicial proceedings" within the meaning of Section 193 and Section 228 of the Indian Penal Code. Unlike statements made to police officers, which are restricted by Section 25 of the Evidence Act, statements made to Customs Officers are admissible as substantive evidence. The Hon'ble Supreme Court, in the landmark case of Ramesh Chandra Mehta vs. State of West Bengal [1970 (2) SCC 166], clarified that a Customs Officer is not a "police officer" and therefore, a confession made before him is not hit by the exclusionary rule. In the present case, the Appellant's statement was recorded in a structured manner, and more importantly, it was corroborated by the statements of co-accused:

- Shri Tahir Menn: Who explicitly stated that he paid ₹1,00,000/- to the Appellant for "documentary coordination."
- Shri Asif Sathi: Who identified the Appellant as the person responsible for arranging "dummy IECs" like Global Impex.

5.3 The Appellant's claim of "coercion" is a standard defense often used to circumvent the implications of a voluntary disclosure. However, as held in K.I. Pavunny vs. Assistant Collector of Central Excise [1997 (3) SCC 721], even a retracted confession can form the basis of a decision if it is corroborated by other independent evidence. In this instance, the "other evidence" is the physical seizure of 9,600 E-cigarettes and the digital footprints left by the Appellant in the smuggling syndicate's communication channels.

5.4 The Appellant argues that the WhatsApp chats from the "Mm" group are inadmissible due to the lack of certification under Section 138C of the Customs Act (which mirrors Section 65B of the Evidence Act). However, it is pertinent to note the evolution of law regarding digital evidence. In the present case, the mobile phones belonging to the co-accused were seized under a valid Panchnama. The Appellant's mobile number was verified as being part of the "Mm" group. The content of the messages—specifically the Appellant asking for "BL copies" and "consignee names"—directly matches the timeline of the imports of M/s Nikhat Enterprises.

5.5 The "Doctrine of Contemporaneous Records" applies here. The WhatsApp messages are digital records created in the normal course of the illegal transaction. When these messages are read in conjunction with the Section 108 statements, they form a "composite whole" of evidence that establishes the Appellant's mens rea and active participation. The Appellant's specific role in suggesting the use of "Exemplar Trading" and managing the "Notify Party" to shield the beneficial owners is clearly visible in the chat logs. This is not a case of "assumptions and presumptions" but a case of "demonstrated involvement."

5.6 The Adjudicating Authority has correctly applied the "Preponderance of Probability" standard applicable in quasi-judicial proceedings. Unlike criminal trials requiring "proof beyond reasonable doubt," Customs adjudication requires a clear nexus between the person and the illegal act. The synchronization between the physical seizure, the confessional statements of the cartel members, and the digital logs provides an airtight case against the Appellant.

5.7 The Appellant heavily relies on Basudev Garg vs. Commissioner (2013 (294) ELT 353 (Del.)) to argue that cross-examination is mandatory. While I acknowledge the importance of cross-examination, it is not an absolute right in quasi-judicial proceedings if the evidence is otherwise corroborated by documentary and digital facts. In this instance, the Appellant's involvement is proved by his own presence in the WhatsApp group where he was actively asking for "BL details" and "Notify Party" names. Cross-examination of co-accused who have already confessed their roles in a synchronized manner would serve no purpose other than delaying the proceedings.

5.8 The investigation revealed that Shri Gaurav Sahay was not a mere bystander. He forwarded the IEC of "Global Impex" and suggested the use of "Exemplar Trading." He managed the Bills of Lading (BL) and instructed on what "Notify Party" should be mentioned to avoid detection. He received substantial payments (₹1,00,000/-) for his "coordination" work. Such acts clearly constitute abetment of smuggling. Section 112(a) of the Customs Act penalizes any person who "abets the doing or omission of any act" that renders goods liable to confiscation. Furthermore, Section 114AA is triggered when a person knowingly uses "false or incorrect" documents. Since the Appellant managed BLs that omitted the mention of E-cigarettes (prohibited items), his liability under Section 114AA is fully established.

5.9 The Adjudicating Authority correctly relied on Naresh J. Sukhawani vs. Union of India (1996 (83) ELT 258 (SC)) wherein it was established that the statement of a co-accused can be used as substantive evidence against others in a smuggling case. The Appellant's argument that he was just an "employee" or "associate" without knowledge is debunked by the WhatsApp chats. A person coordinating the "Notify Party" for a shipment of "Floor Mops" does not normally receive ₹1 Lakh as a "fee" unless he is aware of the high-value contraband (Vapes) concealed therein.

5.10 The Appellant cited Manidipa Debroy Chowdhury vs. Commissioner. However, that case dealt with a "sole statement" without corroboration. Here, we have:

- Multiple Section 108 statements (Asif, Tahir, Baldevsinh).
- WhatsApp Chat logs ("Mm" Group).
- Physical Seizure of 9,600 E-cigarettes.
- Documentary proof of dummy IECs.

Therefore, the cited cases are not applicable as the evidentiary weight in the current case is far superior.

5.11 The smuggling of E-cigarettes is a serious violation of the Prohibition of Electronic Cigarettes Act, 2019 and DGFT Notification No. 20/2015-2020. The Appellant was an integral part of the logistics and documentation arm of the smuggling cartel. His actions were deliberate, aimed at evading prohibitions and defrauding the exchequer. The findings of the Adjudicating Authority regarding the Appellant's role are well-supported by the evidence on record. The penalties imposed are proportionate to the gravity of the offence and the market value of the prohibited goods (₹2,39,90,400/-).

6. In view of the detailed discussion and findings recorded above, I find no merit in the appeal filed by Shri Gaurav Sahay. The Adjudicating Authority has correctly established the nexus, the knowledge, and the active participation of the Appellant in the smuggling syndicate. The findings in Order-in-Original No. MCH/ADC/AKM/205/2024-25 dated 27.11.2024 are upheld in their entirety.

7. The Appeal filed by Shri Gaurav Sahay is rejected.

(AMIT GUPTA)
Commissioner (Appeals),
Customs, Ahmedabad

F. No. S/49-349/CUS/MUN/2024-25 282 to 283 Date:31.03.2026

By Speed post A.D/E-Mail

To,
Shri Gaurav Sahay,
B-15,U S Villa Swaminarayan Nagar,
Mundra, Kutch,
Gujarat-370421

Copy to:
1. The Chief Commissioner of Customs, Gujarat, Custom House, Ahmedabad.
2. The Principal Commissioner of Customs, Custom House Mundra.
3. The Additional Commissioner of Customs, Custom House, Mundra.
4. Guard File.