



## ***ALO Law Office- IDT Tax / Arbitration / Litigation***

**Date: 23.04.2025**

### **CESTAT Mumbai No provision under Customs Act, 1962 empowers officers to collect interest in the absence of duty**

The Customs, Excise and Service Tax Appellate Tribunal (CESTAT), Mumbai Bench has allowed the appeal of M/s Lotus Herbals Color Cosmetics, ordering the refund of ₹1,02,818, which was collected as interest without legal authority during EPCG import clearance.

#### **Case Overview:**

- The appellant imported a filling machine and parts under Bill of Entry No. 7362042 dated 27.03.2020 at JNPT, Nhava Sheva.
- At the time of filing, they did not possess an EPCG authorisation, which was later issued on 03.06.2020.
- Due to the COVID-19 lockdown, the EPCG licence was submitted after some delay.
- Customs officers allegedly verbally demanded payment of interest for the intervening period.
- The appellant paid ₹1,02,818 as interest vide challan dated 25.06.2020, and the goods were cleared at nil customs duty under Notification No. 16/2015-Cus.

#### **Dispute Raised:**

- Appellant contested that:
  - No customs duty was payable; hence, interest on duty was inapplicable.

- There was no written order or legal justification.
- The interest was collected under oral coercion.
- The Commissioner (Appeals) rejected the appeal stating interest was not paid under protest.

#### **CESTAT Findings:**

- No provision under Customs Act, 1962 empowers officers to collect interest in the absence of duty.
- The miscellaneous order dated 19.06.2020 cited by the department did not reference any statutory authority.
- Since the goods attracted zero duty, no delay in duty payment occurred, making the interest demand ultra vires.

#### **Final Order:**

- The Tribunal held that collection of ₹1,02,818 was without legal backing.
- Ordered the refund of the full amount within one month.
- Impugned Order-in-Appeal was set aside.

#### **Significance:**

- Reinforces that tax and interest can only be collected under express statutory authority.
- Oral or administrative instructions cannot override legal provisions.
- Establishes taxpayer right to seek refund of coercively collected amounts.

*This Article has been written by Shri Ravi Shekhar Jha, Advocate Delhi High Court based on his interpretation of the law. He can be reached at his email id [intelconsul@gmail.com](mailto:intelconsul@gmail.com) or on his Mobile +91-9999005379.*

**Source: CESTAT Mumbai**

Write to us at [office@aadrikaalaw.com](mailto:office@aadrikaalaw.com)

Tel: +91-11-4999 2707 | +91-9999005379

[www.aadrikaalaw.com](http://www.aadrikaalaw.com)

**Disclaimer:**

*1. The views expressed are of the Author based on the interpretation of the relevant information/documents, applicable law, and government policy and there is no assurance that a court or tribunal or regulatory body or other governmental authority may not interpret it differently.*

*2. We are not responsible for updating or revising this article on account of any change in law or interpretation thereof or a change in events or circumstances informed or occurring after the date of this article unless specifically requested for it.*

*3. Our advice should not be taken or used out of context or reproduced for any other purpose or transaction. Views expressed in this update are strictly personal, based on our understanding of the underlying law.*

*4. We are not responsible for any injury, loss or cost arising to any person who refers to this update and acts or refrains from any act accordingly. We would suggest that detailed legal advice must be sought before relying on this update.*

**CUSTOMS, EXCISE & SERVICE TAX APPELLATE  
TRIBUNAL, MUMBAI  
REGIONAL BENCH  
E-Hearing**

**Customs Appeal No. 85804 of 2022**

(Arising out of Order-in-Appeal No. 05 (Gr.VA)/2022(JNCH)/Appeals dated 07.01.2022 passed by the Commissioner of Customs (Appeals), Mumbai-II)

**Lotus Herbals Color Cosmetics**

80-B, EPIP, Phase-I, Jharmalri,  
Baddi, Solan (HP) – 173 205.

**Appellant**

Vs.

**Commissioner of Customs, Nhava Sheva-V**

JNPT, Custom House, Nhava Sheva, Raigad 400 707.

**Respondent**

Appearance:

Shri Sudhir Malhotra, Advocate, for the Appellant

Shri Rajiv Ranjan, Assistant Commissioner, Authorised Representative  
for the Respondent

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. ANIL G. SHAKKARWAR, MEMBER (TECHNICAL)**

Date of Hearing: 28.03.2025

Date of Decision: 21.04.2025

**FINAL ORDER No. 85730/2025**

Brief facts of the case are that the appellant imported Filling machine and parts of the same and filed Bill of Entry bearing No. 7362042 on 27.03.2020 at J.N. Custom House, Nhava Sheva for clearance of the same under EPCG scheme. Appellant did not have EPCG authorization on the date of filing of Bill of Entry. Subsequently, due to COVID pandemic, there was lockdown all over the country. EPCG authorization bearing No. 0530175974 dated 03.06.2020 was issued to the appellant. With the said authorization, appellant approached Customs authorities for clearance of the said machine. As per record, appellant was verbally directed by officers of Customs looking after assessment of goods under Group-V at J.N. Custom House, Nhava Sheva to pay interest of Rs.1,02,818/- stating that unless the said interest is paid, the goods shall not be cleared. On the basis of oral directions, appellant deposited interest of Rs.1,02,818/- vide challan HCM1258 dated 25.06.2020. Subsequently the goods were cleared on 07.07.2020 by accepting EPCG authorization at

nil rate of customs duty since the goods were exempted from payment of customs duty under Notification No.16/2015-Cus. Dated 01.04.2015 with a condition that valid EPCG authorization is available. After the goods were handed over possession after passing the out of charge order, appellant preferred appeal against the said assessment of the said Bill of Entry before learned Commissioner (Appeals) claiming that the interest was demanded from the appellant on oral directions without any authority of law. Appellant contended before learned Commissioner (Appeals) that there has not been any legal order or legal authority cited by the officers of Customs who directed the appellant to pay interest before clearance of the goods and that the goods attracted nil rate of duty and the provisions of Customs Act authorized collection of interest if there was delay in payment of customs duty. Learned Commissioner (Appeals) decided the said appeal through impugned order-in-appeal dated 07.01.2022. Learned Commissioner (Appeals) has recorded in para 7 of order-in-appeal that the appellant had deposited interest of Rs.1,02,818/- on 25.06.2020 in respect of the said Bill of Entry dated 27.03.2020 and further held that since the appellant had not paid interest under protest, the appeal was rejected. Aggrieved by the said order, appellant is before this Tribunal.

2. Heard the learned counsel for the appellant. He has submitted that on oral directions, interest was deposited before clearance of goods and that the goods were cleared at nil rate of duty. Further he has submitted that Customs law requires payment of interest if there is delay in payment of customs duty. He has submitted that in the present case since the goods were assessed at nil rate of duty, the question of requirement of payment of interest does not arise and, therefore, the amount so deposited towards interest deserves to be refunded to the appellant.

3. Heard the learned AR. Learned AR has submitted that as per the order issued by Commissioner of Customs from F.No. 26-MISC-604/2020-21 Gr.V dated 19.06.2020, if warehousing was not done, interest was required to be paid for intervening period and accordingly payment of interest for intervening period vide

challan No. HCM 1238 dated 25.06.2020 amounting to Rs.1,02,818/- was collected.

4. I have carefully gone through the record of the case and submissions made. I have noted the submissions by departmental representative that there were directions from Commissioner of Customs through a miscellaneous order passed on 19.06.2020 for collection of interest. Neither the Commissioner of Customs in the said miscellaneous order dated 19.06.2020 has indicated any authority of law vested in him by any of the provisions of Customs Act, 1962 that he can pass such an order, nor the representative of Revenue could point out any provisions of law which required the appellant to pay the said interest. On the contrary, learned counsel for the appellant has pointed out that interest is to be paid for delay in payment of customs duty. I note that in the present case nil customs duty was charged for clearance of the said goods and, therefore, I hold that that there was no authority of law for the Customs officers to direct the appellant to pay interest of the said amount. I, therefore, direct the authorities under the Department of Revenue to refund the said amount of Rs.1,02,818/- to the appellant within a period of one month from passing of this order.

5. In above terms, the appeal is allowed after setting aside the impugned order-in-appeal.

(Pronounced in the court on 21.04.2025)

**(Anil G. Shakkwar)**  
**Member (Technical)**

*tvu*