

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CUSAP No.6 of 2018 (O&M)
Date of Decision.28.08.2018

M/s P.R. Products

...Appellant

Vs

Commissioner of Customs

...Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BINDAL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL**

Present: Mr. Jagmohan Bansal, Advocate
for the appellant.

Mr. Anshuman Chopra, Advocate
for the respondent.

-. -

RAJESH BINDAL J.

This order will dispose of two appeals bearing Nos.6 of 2018 and 58 of 2018. Both the assessee as well the revenue have filed appeals against the order dated 19.07.2017 passed by the Customs, Excise and Service Tax Appellate Tribunal (for short “CESTAT”) in appeal No.C/50/2012, vide which, the order passed by the Commissioner has been set aside and the matter has been remitted back to the Adjudicating Authority for fresh decision.

Both the parties are agreed that the order of remand passed by the Tribunal was not required, as the issue involved is pending consideration before Hon'ble the Supreme Court against the views expressed by the Delhi High Court in “Mangali Impex Limited Vs. Union of India 2016 (335) ELT 605 (Del.)”.

The submission is that once the legal issues involved in the appeal are to be decided keeping in view the decision of Hon'ble

the Supreme Court in Mangali Impex Limited's case (supra), there was no need to remand the case back to the Adjudicating Authority, as in that process, the litigation will start from Adjudicating Authority afresh, whereas it can be decided by the Tribunal after the judgment of Hon'ble the Supreme Court Mangali Impex Limited's case (supra). Operation of the judgment of Delhi High Court in Mangali Impex Limited's case (supra) has also been stayed by Hon'ble the Supreme Court. Reference has also been made to order passed by Delhi High Court in CUSAA No.57 of 2017 titled as "Vipul Overseas Pvt. Ltd. Vs. Commissioner of Customs and others" decided on 20.11.2017 where identical orders passed by the Tribunal remanding cases back to the Adjudicating Authority were set aside and the matters were directed to be decided on merits by the Tribunal.

After hearing learned counsel for the parties, we find merit in the submissions made by them. Once the legal issue, which is subject matter of appeal before the Tribunal, is pending consideration before Hon'ble the Supreme Court, the Tribunal itself should have decided the cases on merits after the decision of Hon'ble the Supreme Court instead of remanding those cases back to the Adjudicating Authority.

The process adopted by the Tribunal apparently is to dispose of the cases pending before it without application of mind. That approach should have been avoided. Even the order passed by the Tribunal only states that the Adjudicating Authority shall decide the matters afresh after decision of Hon'ble the Supreme Court in Mangali Impex Limited's case. In fact, vide similar orders, the

Tribunal had disposed of more than 50 cases.

For the reasons mentioned above, both the appeals are allowed. The impugned order passed by the Tribunal is set aside. The matter is remitted back to the Tribunal to be decided on merits after decision of Hon'ble the Supreme Court in Mangali Impex Limited's case.

(RAJESH BINDAL)
JUDGE

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

August 28, 2018
Pankaj*

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No