



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

**Date: 14.06.2025**

### **CESTAT Mumbai Quashes ₹2.78 Cr Customs Duty Demand on Road Machinery Import**

The Customs, Excise and Service Tax Appellate Tribunal (CESTAT), Mumbai Bench has quashed the duty demand of ₹2.78 Crores, penalties, and confiscation order against M/s Villayati Ram Mittal and its Director. The Tribunal held that the company had not violated the conditions of Serial No. 230 of Notification No. 21/2002-Cus dated 01.03.2002, which allowed exemption from customs duty on road construction equipment.

#### **Background of the Case**

M/s Villayati Ram Mittal had imported two piling rigs under Bill of Entry dated 10.07.2003, claiming nil customs duty under Sl. No. 230 of the said notification. The exemption was subject to conditions listed in Condition No. 40, which required:

- The importer to be a contractor for road construction awarded by NHAI or PWD;
- The imported goods to be used exclusively for road construction;
- No sale or disposal of the goods for five years from importation.

The rigs were later found in possession of third parties (M/s QUIPPPO and M/s Bhumi Developers), leading to a show cause notice dated 13.05.2008 alleging violation of exemption conditions.

#### **Department's Allegations**

The Revenue alleged:

- The rigs were not used at any NHAI site;

- They were used for DMRC projects and thus not exclusively for road construction;
- The rigs were transferred for consideration, amounting to disposal;
- Statements of Shri Rohit Mittal confirmed these violations.

On these grounds, the Department demanded:

- ₹2.78 crore as customs duty;
- Penalty and interest on the importer;
- ₹5 lakh penalty on Shri Rohit Mittal;
- Confiscation of rigs with an option for redemption fine of ₹1 crore.

### **CESTAT's Observations & Final Findings**

The Tribunal meticulously analyzed the factual matrix and held:

#### **1. Use for Road Construction Proven:**

- Certificate submitted proved the rigs were used from March to October 2004 for foundation piling for ROBs (clearly part of road infrastructure).

#### **2. No Evidence of Use by DMRC:**

- No documentary proof or official statement from DMRC was provided by the Department.
- Sole reliance on Appellant's statement was held insufficient, especially since no cross-examination was allowed.

#### **3. Possession ≠ Disposal:**

- While the rigs were found with third parties, the company retained ownership.
- Possession was handed over for financial reasons, not sale or alienation of ownership.
- No transfer of title or bill of sale was on record.

#### **4. No Violation of Notification Conditions:**

- The intent and letter of Condition No. 40 were not violated.
- The Tribunal acknowledged CBEC's later clarification under Notification No. 21/2010-Cus that relocation of machinery for road projects is permissible.

### **Final Order (Dated 31.03.2023)**

The CESTAT set aside the:

- Entire duty demand;
- Penalties on both appellants;
- Confiscation and redemption fine;

Both appeals were allowed in full, reinforcing the principle of liberal interpretation of exemption conditions in alignment with CBEC's policy clarifications.

### **Legal Significance**

This ruling reinforces that:

- Liberal and purposive interpretation must be applied to customs notifications;
- Actual use and ownership retention are critical to determining violations;
- Reliance solely on uncorroborated statements without cross-examination violates principles of natural justice.

**Exporters and importers using conditional exemptions are advised to maintain:**

- Usage logs, deployment certificates;
- Loan/lease documentation distinguishing ownership and possession;
- Evidence of non-sale during restricted periods.

*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**

**Disclaimer**

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)

**CUSTOMS, EXCISE & SERVICE TAX APPELLATE  
TRIBUNAL, MUMBAI**

REGIONAL BENCH - COURT NO. I

**Customs Appeal No. 34 of 2009**

(Arising out of Order-in-Original No. 150/2008/CAC/CC(I)SR/Gr. VA dated 04.11.2008 passed by Commissioner of Customs (Import), Mumbai)

**M/s Villayati Ram Mittal** .... **Appellant**  
B-33, Defence Colony, New Delhi-110024.  
Versus

**Commissioner of Customs Import-Mumbai** .... **Respondent**  
New Customs House, Ballard Estate, Mumbai-400001.

**WITH**

**Customs Appeal No. 35 of 2009**

(Arising out of Order-in-Original No. 150/2008/CAC/CC(I)SR/Gr. VA dated 04.11.2008 passed by Commissioner of Customs (Import), Mumbai)

**Shri Rohit Mittal** .... **Appellant**  
B-33, Defence Colony, New Delhi-110024.  
Versus

**Commissioner of Customs Import-Mumbai** .... **Respondent**  
New Customs House, Ballard Estate, Mumbai-400001.

Appearance:

Shri V. M. Doiphode, Advocate for the Appellant

Shri Ashwin Kumar, Authorized Representative for the Respondent

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE DR. SUVENDU KUMAR PATI, MEMBER (JUDICIAL)**  
**HON'BLE MR. ANIL G. SHAKKARWAR, MEMBER (TECHNICAL)**

**FINAL ORDER NO. A/85486-85487/2023**

Date of Hearing: 31. 01.2023

Date of Decision: 31.03.2023

**Per: Anil G. Shakkarwar**

Above stated two appeals are taken together for disposal since they are arising out of common impugned Order-in-Original.

2. Brief facts of the case are that M/s Villayati Ram Mittal (hereinafter referred to as appellant company) imported two piling rigs and got them cleared through Bill of Entry No. 371784 dated 10.07.2003 by claiming exemption at Serial No. 230 of Notification No. 21/2002-CUS dated 01.03.2002 wherein the effective rate of duty was NIL and the availment of notification benefit was with condition specified at Serial No. 40 at the end of the said notification. The condition at Serial No. 40 can be summarized that the imported goods should be imported by a person who has been awarded the contracts for construction of roads in India either by Ministry of Surface Transport or by National Highway Authority of India or by Public Works Department of State Government. As per the condition of the said notification the importer was required to use the imported goods exclusively for the construction of roads and was prohibited from sale or otherwise disposal of the imported goods within a period of five years from the date of importation. The appellant company had imported two piling rigs as stated above, and above stated conditions were applicable for the imported goods. Both the appellants were issued with the show cause notice dated 13.05.2008 wherein it was stated that the appellant company had violated the said conditions of the said notification and that the rigs were not even sent to NHAI site after importation and at the time of importation the appellant company had claimed that the appellant company was awarded with a road construction contract by NHAI and that the rigs were not found in the possession of the appellant company inasmuch as one rig was in the possession of M/s QUIPPO and was lying in the yard of M/s QUIPPO at Taloja, Navi Mumbai, when it was seized on 15.11.2007 and the other rig was in the possession of M/s Bhumi Developers

and was lying in the yard at Goodwill Dharmkata, Mundka, New Delhi, at the time of its seizure on 16.11.2007 and that the said rigs were disposed of by the appellant company. It was further alleged in the show cause notice that the appellant company had violated the condition of notification and therefore, customs duty of Rs. 2.78 crores was demanded from the appellant company and the other appellant was propose to be imposed with penalties. Both the appellants contested with the show cause notice. They stated before the original authority that except the statement of Shri Mittal there is no evidence brought on record to prove that the rigs in question were used for DMRC Project and also stated that they were awarded contracts for construction of roads by the NHAI and they have used the rigs in question for the construction of roads and that they have not sold or otherwise dispose the said rigs. They further stated that taking loans against rigs for payment of installments to M/s Citicorp Finance Limited does not amount to sale or disposal of rigs and therefore, the demand is not sustainable. The show cause notice was adjudicated through impugned Order-in-Original wherein the learned original authority has held that through the statement the noticee has already admitted that the conditions of the notification has been violated by them. He further held in his Order-in-Original that the possession of the imported rigs was not with the importer and the goods in question were given for use to other persons for some consideration and the said act was treated as disposal in some manner and therefore, condition of notification was violated. The original authority further observed "spirit of the said condition is that the goods should be used by the importer himself for specific purpose as mentioned therein". He has confirmed the duty demanded. He ordered the appellant company to pay duty and

interest and he has imposed penalty on the appellant company. Further he has confiscated both the rigs and gave option to pay redemption fine of Rs. 1 Crore to redeem the confiscated goods. The original authority imposed a personal penalty of Rs. 5 lakhs on the other appellant. Aggrieved by the said order, both the appellants are before this Tribunal.

3. Heard the learned Counsel for the appellants. The learned Counsel for the appellants has submitted that at the time of clearance of the goods, the customs authorities have verified that the importer is having contract for construction of highway by National Highway Authority of India and therefore, the goods were cleared under Serial No. 230 of the said notification and therefore, that question does not arise as to whether the appellants were awarded with the contract for construction of roads or not. He has further submitted that the conditions of the notification are that the goods should be used for the purpose of construction of roads. In respect of that he has submitted that a certificate is available at page no. 53 of the appeal paper book certifying that the subject goods were used for piling for foundation of the R.O.B. from March 2004 to October 2004. In respect of other condition that the goods should not be sold within a period of five years, he has stated that the Revenue has not brought forward any document establishing that the goods had changed the title from the importer to any other person. He has submitted that due to the financial constraints, the possession of goods were given to some other person for availing the finance and the said action does not amount to disposal in any manner, since the ownership of the said goods at the time of seizure was with the appellant. In so far as the condition that it should not be used for any other purpose in view

of the use of words "exclusively used for", he has said that the contention of Revenue is that the goods were used by DMRC. He has submitted that said contention is based on the basis of statement of Shri Mittal, however, the Revenue has not recorded any statement from any officials of DMRC to establish that the goods in question were used for any other purpose by DMRC and therefore, there is no evidence with Revenue to establish that the subject goods were used for any other purpose. He has submitted that Revenue had relied only on the statement of Shri Mittal, however, the original authority has neither examined Shri Mittal in chief nor cross examination of Shri Mittal was allowed and therefore, statement of Shri Mittal recorded either on 13.11.2007 or on 14.11.2007 cannot be considered as evidence under the Evidence Act. There is no other basis relied on by the original authority for arriving at the conclusion in the impugned order. Therefore, he has requested to set aside the impugned order. He has further stated that at the time of issue of Notification No. 21/2010-Cus dated 27.02.2010, CBEC had observed that the goods should be exclusively used for the construction of roads was being interpreted to mean that the imported machinery may be used only for the project for which it was initially imported and such interpretation was resulting in idling of machinery. Therefore, the CBEC had clarified that it is permissible to relocate or redeploy the machinery imported under the exemption to another road construction project and further stated that liberal interpretation of condition of notification was expected by CBEC.

4. Learned AR has submitted that the appellant company had violated the condition of the notification inasmuch as that Shri Rohit Mittal in his statement dated 14.11.2007 had stated that he

had to deploy the piling rigs to the DMRC site at Pusa Road, New Delhi, and Commissioned the same there and that it became very difficult to Shri Mittal to pay the installment company in time and he approached another finance company with whom he deposited the piling rigs and in the said manner disposed of the goods. He summed up that the appellant company has used goods for other purpose at DMRC and also disposed of the goods as stated by Shri Mittal in his statement and therefore, the finding of the original authority is reasonable.

5. This Bench has carefully gone through the records of the case and submissions made. The issue is to be decided as to whether the imported goods were used for construction of roads, whether they were used for any other purpose than construction of roads, whether the imported goods were sold within a period of five years from the date of importation and whether the imported goods were otherwise disposed of.

6. It is clear from the record and submissions of learned Counsel for the appellants that there is no dispute that the imported goods were used for construction of roads from March 2004 to October 2004. Though the goods were shifted to DMRC site there is no statement on record from any official of DMRC that the goods were utilize for any other purpose than construction of roads. Had the goods been used for any other purpose than construction of roads then it was possible for Revenue to lay their hands on such evidence. From the case records, such evidence is not forth coming. Therefore, it is not proved that the goods were used for any other purpose than construction of roads. Revenue has not established that the goods were sold by the appellants.

The only issue remaining is whether the goods were otherwise disposed of by the appellants. From the case records, it appears that though at the time of seizure the goods were in custody of other person than the importer, however Revenue has not established that the goods were disposed off to other person forever and importer did not have any control over the goods. Further, the control was with the appellant that is why the installments were being paid for the finance raised by the appellant. Above discussion establishes that the importer company has not violated the specified conditions of exemption notification and therefore, the impugned order is not sustainable.

7. In view of the foregoing, this Bench sets aside the impugned orders and allows both the appeals.

(Order pronounced in court on 31.03.2023)

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

**(Dr. Suvendu Kumar Pati)**  
**Member (Judicial)**

Sinha