

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Tax Case No. 41 Of 2016**

Commissioner, Central Excise, Customs & Service Tax Bilaspur

---- Appellant**Versus**M/s Shri Radhe Industries Ltd., Village Silpahari, Near Sirgitti Industrial Area,
Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh**---- Respondent**

For Appellant	: Shri Vinay Pandey, Advocate.
For Respondent	: Shri Bhaskar Payashi, Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Deepak Gupta, Chief Justice
Hon'ble Shri Sanjay Agrawal, J.

Judgment on Board**Per Deepak Gupta, Chief Justice****21/11/2016**

1. This appeal is directed against the order of the Customs, Excise, Service Tax Appellate Tribunal (hereinafter called as 'CESTAT') whereby the CESTAT had held that the notice issued to the assessee is beyond the period of limitation and hence has quashed the same.
2. The undisputed facts of the case is that the assessee is a manufacturer of Sponge Iron. It claimed and utilized CENVAT credit for the period July-2004 to October-2005 on MS Angle, MS Channel, MS Joint MS flat used for supporting structure of the factory in which the goods were to be manufactured. Admittedly, the notice was sent either on 6.7.2008 or 16.7.2008 i.e. after three years.
3. Section 11A(3) of the Central Excise Act, 1944 provides limitation of one year to the Central Excise Officer to issue notice to the assessee. However sub-section (4) provides that when there is fraud; collusion; any willful mis-statement; suppression of fact and contravention of any of the provisions of this Act or the

rules made thereunder with intent to evade payment of duty, the period of limitation will be five years.

4. The CESTAT held that sub-section (4) was not attracted because the items which were used on the face of it could not be used for manufacture of Sugar and Molasses and the assessee had not suppressed any facts or mis-stated any facts and therefore, limitation would be one year and not five years. This is a pure finding of fact and no question of law much less any substantial question of law arises in this appeal. The question of limitation may in certain cases be a mixed question of law and fact but it is not a substantial question of law.

5. Even otherwise, we are of the considered view that the view taken by the CESTAT is correct. The assessee has not withheld any fact; the assessee has not mis-stated any fact; the assessee has not suppressed any facts. The assessee may have been guilty of claiming wrong CENVAT credit but as pointed out by the CESTAT, there continues to be divergence of opinion with regard to the issue whether CENVAT credit can be claimed on the inputs used for setting up the factory in which goods were manufactured. Therefore, it cannot be said to be a fraudulent claim or a claim which has an aspect of dishonesty attached to it. In this view of the matter, limitation would only be one year.

6. We therefore find no merit in the appeal. The appeal is dismissed.

Sd/-
(Deepak Gupta)
CHIEF JUSTICE

Sd/-
(Sanjay Agrawal)
Judge