



Jose

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY AT GOA**

**WRIT PETITION NO.1428 OF 2021 (F)**

PARMINDER SINGH CHADHA

... Petitioner.

*Versus*

ADDITIONAL DIRECTOR,  
DIRECTORATE OF REVENUE  
INTELLIGENCE, MUMBAI  
ZONAL UNIT AND ANR.

... Respondents.

Mr Omkar Bhave, Advocate for the Petitioner. (through V.C.)  
Mr Raviraj Chodankar, Deputy Solicitor General of India for  
Respondent No.1.

Ms Asha Desai, Senior Standing Counsel for Respondent  
No.2.

**WITH  
MISC. CIVIL APPLICATION NO.147 OF 2024  
IN  
WRIT PETITION NO.1428 OF 2021 (F)**

ADDITIONAL DIRECTOR,  
DIRECTORATE OF REVENUE  
INTELLIGENCE

... Applicant.

*Versus*

PARMINDER SINGH CHADHA

... Respondent.

**CORAM: VALMIKI MENEZES, J.**

**DATED: 7<sup>th</sup> March, 2025**

**ORAL ORDER:**

1. This petition impugns a show cause notice dated 03.10.2019 issued by the Additional Director, Directorate of Revenue Intelligence (DRI) under Section 28 of the Customs Act. The main ground raised in the petition is that the DRI is not the Proper Authority to issue the show cause notice under Section 28 of the Customs Act. This ground was agitated on the basis of the law as then expounded by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Judgment and Order dated 09.03.2021 in **Civil Appeal No. 1827 of 2018** titled *M/s Canon India Pvt. Ltd. vs. Commissioner of Customs*. This view has now been reconsidered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of *Commissioner of Customs vs. M/s Canon India Pvt. Ltd.* (Review Petition No. 400/2021 in Civil Appeal No. 1827 of 2018).

2. After the Review Judgment was passed by the Supreme Court, this Court, in a Judgment dated 26.11.2024 passed in **Writ Petition No.6548/2021** (*Kaka Carpets and Anr. vs. Union of India and Anr.*), has considered the application of the Review Judgment of the Supreme Court in *M/s Canon India* (supra) and has passed the following directions:

***“F. CONCLUSION***

*168. In view of the aforesaid discussion, we conclude that:*

*(i) DRI officers came to be appointed as the officers of customs vide Notification No. 19/90-Cus (N.T.) dated 26.04.1990 issued by the Department of Revenue, Ministry of Finance, Government of India.*

*This notification later came to be superseded by Notification No. 17/2002 dated 07.03.2002 issued by the Department of Revenue, Ministry of Finance, Government of India, to account for administrative changes.*

*(ii) The petition seeking review of the decision in Canon India (supra) is allowed for the following reasons:*

*a. Circular No. 4/99-Cus dated 15.02.1999 issued by the Central Board of Excise & Customs, New Delhi which empowered the officers of DRI to issue show cause notices under Section 28 of the Act, 1962 as well as Notification No. 44/2011 dated 06.07.2011 which assigned the functions of the proper officer for the purposes of Sections 17 and 28 of the Act, 1962 respectively to the officers of DRI were not brought to the notice of this Court during the proceedings in Canon India (supra). In other words, the judgment in Canon India (supra) was rendered without looking into the circular and the notification referred to above thereby seriously affecting the correctness of the same.*

*b. The decision in Canon India (supra) failed to consider the statutory scheme of Sections 2(34) and 5 of the Act, 1962 respectively. As a result, the decision erroneously recorded the finding that since DRI officers were not entrusted with the functions of a proper officer for the purposes of Section 28 in accordance with Section 6, they did not possess the jurisdiction to issue show cause notices for the recovery of duty under Section 28 of the Act, 1962.*

*c. The reliance placed in Canon India (supra) on the decision in Sayed Ali (supra) is misplaced for two reasons – first, Sayed Ali (supra) dealt with the case of officers of customs (Preventive), who, on the date of the decision in Sayed Ali (supra) were not empowered to issue show cause notices under Section 28 of the Act, 1962 unlike the officers of DRI; and secondly, the decision in Sayed Ali (supra) took into consideration Section 17 of the Act, 1962 as it stood prior to its amendment by the Finance Act, 2011. However, the assessment orders, in respect of which the show cause notices under*

*challenge in Canon India (supra) were issued, were passed under Section 17 of the Act, 1962 as amended by the Finance Act, 2011.*

*(iii) This Court in Canon India (supra) based its judgment on two grounds:*

*(1) the show cause notices issued by the DRI officers were invalid for want of jurisdiction; and (2) the show cause notices were issued after the expiry of the prescribed limitation period. In the present judgment, we have only considered and reviewed the decision in Canon India (supra) to the extent that it pertains to the first ground, that is, the jurisdiction of the DRI officers to issue show cause notices under Section 28. We clarify that the observations made by this Court in Canon India (supra) on the aspect of limitation have neither been considered nor reviewed by way of this decision. Thus, this decision will not disturb the findings of this Court in Canon India (supra) insofar as the issue of limitation is concerned.*

*(iv) The Delhi High Court in Mangali Impex (supra) observed that Section 28(11) could not be said to have cured the defect pointed out in Sayed Ali (supra) as the possibility of chaos and confusion would continue to subsist despite the introduction of the said section with retrospective effect. In view of this, the High Court declined to give retrospective operation to Section 28(11) for the period prior to 08.04.2011 by harmoniously construing it with Explanation 2 to Section 28 of the Act, 1962. We are of the considered view that the decision in Mangali Impex (supra) failed to take into account the policy being followed by the Customs department since 1999 which provides for the exclusion of jurisdiction of all other proper officers once a show cause notice by a particular proper officer is issued. It could be said that this policy provides a sufficient safeguard against the apprehension of the issuance of multiple show cause notices to the same assessee under Section 28 of the Act, 1962. Further, the High Court could not have applied the doctrine of harmonious construction to harmonise Section 28(11) with Explanation 2 because Section 28(11) and Explanation 2 operate in two distinct fields and no inherent contradiction can be said to exist between the two. Therefore, we set*

*aside the decision in Mangali Impex (supra) and approve the view taken by the High Court of Bombay in the case of Sunil Gupta (supra).*

*(v) Section 97 of the Finance Act, 2022 which, inter-alia, retrospectively validated all show cause notices issued under Section 28 of the Act, 1962 cannot be said to be unconstitutional. It cannot be said that Section 97 fails to cure the defect pointed out in Canon India (supra) nor is it manifestly arbitrary, disproportionate and overbroad, for the reasons recorded in the foregoing parts of this judgment. We clarify that the findings in respect of the vires of the Finance Act, 2022 is confined only to the questions raised in the petition seeking review of the judgment in Canon India (supra). The challenge to the Finance Act, 2022 on grounds other than those dealt with herein, if any, are kept open.*

*(vi) Subject to the observations made in this judgment, the officers of Directorate of Revenue Intelligence, Commissionerates of Customs (Preventive), Directorate General of Central Excise Intelligence and Commissionerates of Central Excise and other similarly situated officers are proper officers for the purposes of Section 28 and are competent to issue show cause notice thereunder. Therefore, any challenge made to the maintainability of such show cause notices issued by this particular class of officers, on the ground of want of jurisdiction for not being the proper officer, which remain pending before various forums, shall now be dealt with in the following manner:*

*a. Where the show cause notices issued under Section 28 of the Act, 1962 have been challenged before the High Courts directly by way of a writ petition, the respective High Court shall dispose of such writ petitions in accordance with the observations made in this judgment and restore such notices for adjudication by the proper officer under Section 28.*

*b. Where the writ petitions have been disposed of by the respective High Court and appeals have been preferred against such orders which are pending before this Court, they shall be disposed of in*

*accordance with this decision and the show cause notices impugned therein shall be restored for adjudication by the proper officer under Section 28.*

*c. Where the orders-in-original passed by the adjudicating authority under Section 28 have been challenged before the High Courts on the ground of maintainability due to lack of jurisdiction of the proper officer to issue show cause notices, the respective High Court shall grant eight weeks' time to the respective assessee to prefer appropriate appeal before the Customs Excise and Service Tax Appellate Tribunal (CESTAT).*

*d. Where the writ petitions have been disposed of by the High Court and appeals have been preferred against them which are pending before this Court, they shall be disposed of in accordance with this decision and this Court shall grant eight weeks' time to the respective assessee to prefer appropriate appeals before the CESTAT.*

*e. Where the orders of CESTAT have been challenged before this Court or the respective High Court on the ground of maintainability due to lack of jurisdiction of the proper officer to issue show cause notices, this Court or the respective High Court shall dispose of such appeals or writ petitions in accordance with the ruling in this judgment and restore such notices to the CESTAT for hearing the matter on merits.*

*f. Where appeals against the orders-in-original involving issues pertaining to the jurisdiction of the proper officer to issue show cause notices under Section 28 are pending before the CESTAT, they shall now be decided in accordance with the observations made in this decision."*

3. Considering the view taken in *Kaka Carpets* (supra), the challenge in this petition must necessarily fail, since the impugned show cause notice has been issued by the Officer of the DRI, who is,

according to the said Judgment, the Proper Officer under Section 28 of the Customs Act.

4. In that view of the matter, this petition stands rejected. Needless to state, the Proper Officer under Section 28 of the Customs Act shall proceed to adjudicate the show cause notice dated 03.10.2019 in accordance with law and preferably within six months from the date of this order.

5. Petition stands disposed of in the above terms.

6. MCAs, if any, stand disposed of in view of the disposal of this petition.

**VALMIKI MENEZES, J.**