



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

**Date: 20.08.2025**

### **CESTAT Kolkata- Quicklime Classified under CTH 25221000**

In a significant win for M/s. ITC Limited, the Customs, Excise, and Service Tax Appellate Tribunal (CESTAT), Kolkata, has ruled in favor of the appellant in Customs Appeal Nos. 75117 and 75118 of 2022. The case revolved around the classification of imported goods—Quicklime—under the Customs Tariff Act, 1985. The Tribunal's decision has reaffirmed the correct classification of Quicklime under Customs Tariff Item No. 2522 1000, bringing clarity to an issue that has been contested for years.

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

The dispute arose when ITC Limited imported consignments of Quicklime and sought to classify them under Chapter Sub-Heading 2522 1000. However, the Assessing Officer reclassified the goods under Chapter Sub-Heading 2825 9090, leading to a higher duty liability. ITC Limited paid the duty under protest and subsequently challenged the assessment before the Commissioner of Customs (Appeals), who rejected their appeals. Aggrieved by this decision, ITC Limited approached the CESTAT Kolkata.

#### **Key Arguments**

The appellant argued that the issue was no longer res integra, as the Tribunal had already ruled in their favor in a similar case (Final Order No. 76709-76712 of 2025 dated 03.07.2025). The Tribunal had previously held that Quicklime with a Calcium Oxide (CaO) purity of less than 98% is rightly classifiable under Customs Tariff Item No. 2522 1000. ITC Limited presented chemical analysis certificates showing CaO content of 96.74% and 97.57%, further supporting their claim.

On the other hand, the Revenue justified its classification under Customs Tariff Item No. 2825 9090, arguing that the goods met the criteria for classification under this heading.

## CESTAT Kolkata's Decision

After hearing both sides and reviewing the evidence, the Tribunal ruled in favor of ITC Limited. The key points of the judgment include:

1. **Chemical Composition:** The Tribunal noted that the Calcium Oxide content of the imported Quicklime was less than 98%, making it ineligible for classification under Chapter Heading 2825, which covers pure calcium oxide.
2. **Precedent:** The Tribunal relied on its earlier decision in ITC Limited's own case and other similar rulings, including *M/s. JSW Steel Ltd. v. Commissioner of Customs, Cochin*, which established that Quicklime with less than 98% purity is classifiable under Chapter Heading 2522.
3. **Specific vs. Residuary Classification:** The Tribunal emphasized that specific tariff headings, such as 2522 1000 for Quicklime, should be preferred over residuary entries like 2825 9090 unless the product meets the purity requirements.
4. **Consequential Relief:** The Tribunal allowed the appeals and granted ITC Limited consequential reliefs as per law.

## Implications of the Ruling

This decision is a landmark for importers dealing with Quicklime and similar products. It provides clarity on the classification criteria under the Customs Tariff Act, ensuring that goods are classified based on their chemical composition and specific tariff headings. The ruling also underscores the importance of relying on established precedents and chemical analysis in classification disputes.

## Conclusion

The victory for ITC Limited in this case highlights the importance of challenging incorrect assessments and standing firm on legal and factual grounds. The Tribunal's decision not only benefits ITC Limited but also sets a precedent for other importers facing similar classification disputes. As the dust settles, this ruling will undoubtedly serve as a guiding light for future cases involving the classification of Quicklime and other mineral products.

*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 Kolkata**

**[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)

**IN THE CUSTOMS, EXCISE AND SERVICE TAX APPELLATE TRIBUNAL  
EASTERN ZONAL BENCH: KOLKATA**

REGIONAL BENCH – COURT NO. 1

**Customs Appeal No. 75117 of 2022**

(Arising out of Order-in-Appeal Nos. KOL/CUS(PORT)/AKR/808-809/2021 dated 23.11.2021 passed by the Commissioner of Customs (Appeals), 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Custom House, 15/1, Strand Road, Kolkata – 700 001)

**M/s. ITC Limited**

Paperboards & Specialty Papers Division,  
106, Sardar Patel Road, Secunderabad,  
Telangana – 500 003

**: Appellant**

**VERSUS**

**Principal Commissioner of Customs (Port)**

3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Custom House, 15/1, Strand Road, Kolkata – 700 001  
[Haldia (Port) Commissionerate]

**: Respondent**

**AND**

**Customs Appeal No. 75118 of 2022**

(Arising out of Order-in-Appeal Nos. KOL/CUS(PORT)/AKR/808-809/2021 dated 23.11.2021 passed by the Commissioner of Customs (Appeals), 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Custom House, 15/1, Strand Road, Kolkata – 700 001)

**M/s. ITC Limited**

Paperboards & Specialty Papers Division,  
106, Sardar Patel Road, Secunderabad,  
Telangana – 500 003

**: Appellant**

**VERSUS**

**Principal Commissioner of Customs (Port)**

3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Custom House, 15/1, Strand Road, Kolkata – 700 001  
[Haldia (Port) Commissionerate]

**: Respondent**

**APPEARANCE:**

Shri Agnibesh Sengupta, Advocate,  
Shri Indranil Banerjee, Advocate,  
For the Appellant

Shri Tariq Sulaiman, Authorized Representative,  
For the Respondent

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE SHRI R. MURALIDHAR, MEMBER (JUDICIAL)**

**HON'BLE SHRI K. ANPAZHAKAN, MEMBER (TECHNICAL)**

**FINAL ORDER NOs. 77242-77243 / 2025**

DATE OF HEARING / DECISION: 12.08.2025

**ORDER: [PER SHRI R. MURALIDHAR]**

These appeals have been filed by M/s. ITC Limited, Paperboards & Specialty Papers Division, 106, Sardar Patel Road, Secunderabad, Telangana – 500 003 [hereinafter referred to as the “appellant”] against the Order-in-Appeal Nos. KOL/CUS(PORT)/AKR/808-809/2021 dated 23.11.2021 passed by the Commissioner of Customs (Appeals), 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Custom House, 15/1, Strand Road, Kolkata – 700 001.

1.1. A common issue being involved in both these appeals, they are taken up together for disposal.

2. The brief facts of the case are that the appellant filed two Bills of Entry bearing Nos. 9353323 dated 28.10.2020 and 9691601 dated 24.11.2020 for clearance of import consignments declared as “PCC Lime 0/20MM (Quicklime)”. For the goods imported vide aforesaid Bills of Entry, the appellant had sought to classify the same under Chapter Sub-Heading 2522 1000. However, the Assessing Officer assessed the aforesaid goods by varying the classification to Chapter Sub-Heading 2825 9090. The appellant paid the duty under protest.

2.1. The appellant challenged the assessment of the aforementioned Bills of Entry as done by the lower authority before the Ld. Commissioner (Appeals), who vide the impugned order has rejected their appeals.

3. Being aggrieved, the appellant is before the Tribunal.

4. The Ld. Counsel appearing on behalf of the appellant submit at the outset that the issue involved in these appeals is no longer res integra as an identical issue has already been examined and dealt with by this Tribunal in the appellant's own case in *Final Order No. 76709-76712 of 2025 dated 03.07.2025 in Customs Appeal No. 75369 of 2021 & ors. [CESTAT, Kolkata] (cit. 2025 (7) TMI 648 – CESTAT, Kolkata)* wherein the impugned goods have been held to be rightly classifiable under Customs Tariff Item No. 2522 1000. It is thus their prayer that the impugned order be set aside.

5. On the other hand, the Ld Authorized Representative of the Revenue justified the assessment of the Bills of Entry by classifying the goods in question under Customs 2825 9090, as done by the authorities below. Accordingly, he prayed that the impugned order be upheld by rejecting of the appeals filed by the assessee.

6. Heard both sides, perused the appeal papers and have gone through the records placed before us.

7. Admittedly, the appellant engages in the process of manufacture of paper, for which it is inter alia using Precipitated Calcium Carbonate (PCC) in slurry form. The appellant imports Quicklime in lump form (described by the appellant as 'PCC lime' – lime for processing into PCC) and processes the same in its PCC plant to obtain PCC in slurry form, for use in the above manufacturing process as a filler. It is the case of the Revenue that the goods imported by the appellant merit classification under Customs Tariff Item No. 2825 9090, which assessee seeks to classify the same under Customs Tariff Item No. 2522 1000.

7.1. In this regard, the appellant has furnished Chemical Analysis Certificates of the goods under import in this case, which indicate the Calcium Oxide (CaO) content as '96.74%' and '97.57%'. For ease of reference, the said Analysis Certificates are reproduced below: -



309

ITC Ltd  
**ANALYSIS CERTIFICATE - CDP 246/20**  
 VESSEL « CMA CGM TITAN »  
 FROM FOS-SUR-MER ON 24/10/20  
 222,120 MT PCC LIME 0/20 mm

| AVERAGE CHEMICAL ANALYSIS                       |           |                                      |        |
|---|-----------|--------------------------------------|--------|
| CALCIUM OXIDE<br>(Available CaO)                | 96,74 %   | CARBON DIOXIDE<br>(CO <sub>2</sub> ) | 0,53 % |
| IRON OXIDE<br>(Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> ) | 0,055 %   | MAGNESIUM OXIDE<br>(MgO)             | 0,52 % |
| MANGANESE OXIDE<br>(MnO)                        | < 0,005 % |                                      |        |

| PHYSICAL PROPERTIES       |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| GRANULOMETRY              | 0 - 20 mm                                     |
| REACTIVITY ASTM (100/400) | 25° < Δ T°C 30 sec < 45°<br>Δ T°C total > 40° |

Lhoist Southern Europe  
 Export Department  
 1, Chemin des Chaux de la Tour  
 13820 Ensûs-La-Redonne - FRANCE  
 Tél. : +33(0)4 42 10 91 16

Lhoist Southern Europe  
 Provence-Sacem - Export Department  
 de courrier : 1 Chemin des Chaux de la Tour - 13820 Ensûs-La-Redonne - France  
 (0)442 109 116  
 lhoist.com

149



30-09

**ITC Ltd**  
**ANALYSIS CERTIFICATE - CDP 132/20**  
**VESSEL « COSCO SHIPPING ALPS »**  
**FROM FOS-SUR-MER ON 11/09/20**  
**218,760 MT PCC LIME 0/20 mm**

| AVERAGE CHEMICAL ANALYSIS                       |           |                                      |        |
|---|-----------|--------------------------------------|--------|
| CALCIUM OXIDE<br>(Available CaO)                | 97,57 %   | CARBON DIOXIDE<br>(CO <sub>2</sub> ) | 0,45 % |
| IRON OXIDE<br>(Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> ) | 0,060 %   | MAGNESIUM OXIDE<br>(MgO)             | 0,55 % |
| MANGANESE OXIDE<br>(MnO)                        | < 0,005 % |                                      |        |

| PHYSICAL PROPERTIES       |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| GRANULOMETRY              | 0 - 20 mm                                     |
| REACTIVITY ASTM (100/400) | 25° < Δ T°C 30 sec < 45°<br>Δ T°C total > 40° |

**Lhoist Southern Europe**  
 Export Department  
 1, Chemin des Chaux de la Tour  
 13820 Ensues-la-Redonne - FRANCE  
 Tél. : +33(0)4 42 10 91 16

Lhoist Southern Europe  
 1, Chemin des Chaux de la Tour - Export Department  
 13820 Ensues-la-Redonne - France  
 Tél. : +33 (0)442 109 116  
 www.lhoist.com

7.2. From the above, it transpires that the Calcium Oxide (CaO) content of the goods in question is less than 98%.

8. We find that an identical issue has already been examined by this Tribunal in the appellant's own case in *Final Order No. 76709-76712 of 2025 dated 03.07.2025 in Customs Appeal No. 75369 of 2021 & ors. [CESTAT, Kolkata] (cit. 2025 (7) TMI 648 – CESTAT, Kolkata)*, wherein by relying on the decision of the Tribunal at Bangalore in the case of *M/s. JWS Steel Ltd. v. Commissioner of Customs, Cochin [2025 (5) TMI 455 – CESTAT, Bangalore]*, this Tribunal has rejected the Revenue's classification of the goods in question i.e., 'Quicklime', under Customs Tariff Item No. 2825 9090 and held the same to be rightly classifiable under Customs Tariff Item No. 2522 1000, as adopted by the assessee. The relevant observations of this Tribunal in the aforesaid decision read thus: -

*"5. We find that a similar issue has been examined by this Tribunal in the case of M/s. JSW Steel Ltd. v. Commissioner of Customs, Cochin [2025 (5) TMI 455 CESTAT, Bangalore] (Final Order No. 20529 of 2025 dated 28.04.2025 in Customs Appeal No. 21776 of 2016) wherein the Tribunal observed as under: -*

*"5. Heard both sides. The only issue to be decided is whether the product "Quick Lime" imported by the appellant falls under CTH 2522.10 or 2825.9090 of the Customs Tariff 1985. The classification by the Revenue is based on the Lab Test Results report which says that the sample is in the form of white lumps and powder, composed of mainly Calcium Oxide (Quick Lime) along with small amounts of compounds of Iron, Magnesium, Manganese, etc.; available CaO 92.2% and based on the fact that the Chapter 25 includes mineral products in the crude state or washed, crushed, ground, powdered, or concentrated by floatation, magnetic separation or other mechanical or physical process and heat treatments like roasting, fusion or calcination are not allowed.*

6. Let's examine the relevant Chapter Headings and the reasoning given by the Commissioner (Appeals) in the impugned order. The period of dispute is from September 2015 to November 2015. During this period the relevant tariff headings were as follows:

*SECTION V-MINERAL PRODUCTS*

*Chapter 25: Salt; sulphur; earths and stone, plastering materials, lime and cement*

*Notes:*

*1. Except where their context or Note 4 to this Chapter otherwise requires, the headings of this Chapter cover only products which are in the crude state or which have been washed (even with chemical substances eliminating the impurities without changing the structure of the product), crushed, ground, powdered, levigated, sifted, screened, concentrated by flotation, magnetic separation or other mechanical or physical processes (except crystallization), but not products that have been roasted, calcined, obtained by mixing or subjected to processing beyond that mentioned in each heading.*

*2522 Quicklime, Slaked Lime and Hydraulic Lime, other than Calcium Oxide and Hydroxide of Heading 2825*

*2522 10 00 - Quicklime*

*2522 20 00-Slaked lime*

*2522 30 00-Hydraulic lime*

*The Commissioner (Appeals) rejected the classification of the product under CTH 2522 on the ground that it is calcined product which is excluded as per Note 1 reproduced above and classified the same under CTH 2825 as separately defined compound.*

7. Now, let's see Chapter Heading 28, which is reproduced below:

*Chapter 28: Inorganic chemicals, organic or inorganic compounds of precious metals, of*

*rare-earth metals, of radioactive elements or of isotopes.*

*Notes:*

*1. Except where the context otherwise requires, the headings of this Chapter apply only to:*

*a) separate chemical elements and separate chemically defined compounds, whether of not containing impurities:*

*2825 90-Other.*

*2825 90 10-- Tin oxide*

*2825 90 20 Cadmium oxide*

*2825 90 40 Calcium hydroxide*

*2825 90 50-Ammonium hydroxide*

*2825 90 90- Other*

*8. As per the HSN Notes, Chapter 2522 which includes "Quick Lime" is explained as.*

*Quicklime (an impure calcium oxide) is obtained by calcining limestone containing very little or no clay. It combines very rapidly with water, giving off considerable heat and producing slaked lime (calcium hydroxide) is usually employed for soil improvement or in the sugar industry.*

*Hydraulic lime is obtained by low temperature calcinations of limestone containing sufficient clay (although usually less than 20%) to ensure that the product sets under water. Hydraulic lime differs from natural cement in that it still contains appreciable amounts of uncombined quicklime, which may be slaked with water."*

*This heading excludes purified calcium oxide and calcium hydroxide heading 2825.*

*Similarly, the HSN notes at Chapter heading 2825 explains as follows:*

*(11) Calcium oxide, hydroxide and peroxide. This heading covers only the Oxide (CaO) and the hydroxide (Ca (OH)<sub>2</sub>), in the pure state (i.e., containing practically no clay, iron oxide, manganese oxide, etc.), such as the product obtained by calcining precipitated calcium carbonate.*

*The heading also covers fused lime obtained by fusing ordinary quicklime in an electric furnace. This product has a high degree of purity (approximately 98% calcium oxide); it is crystalline and generally colourless. It is used, in particular, for refractory linings for furnaces, in the manufacture of crucibles and for addition to concrete, in small pieces, to increase its resistance to wear. Calcium peroxide (CaO<sub>2</sub>) is a white or yellowish powder, hydrated (usually with 8 H<sub>2</sub>O), sparingly soluble in water. Used as a bactericide and as a detergent, in medicine and in the preparation of cosmetics.*

*Quicklime (calcium oxide) and slaked lime (calcium hydroxide) are excluded (heading 2522)*

*9. Based on the above Tariff Headings and the Explanation given in the HSN Notes, it is very clear that "Quick Lime" is classifiable under CTH 2522 unless the chemical analysis proves that it has purity of 98% calcium oxide. Admittedly, in the present case, the purity is only 92%. Moreover, there is a specific classification of the product "Quick Lime" under CTH 2522 1000 while the classification prompted by Revenue is 2825 9090 is only a 'Residuary Entry', and taking into consideration the Interpretative Rules of Classification, specific heading is to be preferred to the residuary entry unless it is established that the product is pure calcium oxide. The decision in the case of CCE, Hyderabad-III vs. Bhadradi Minerals Pvt Limited (supra) relied upon by the appellant has been brushed aside only on the ground that the product there was 80%, on the same analogy that the calcium oxide with purity less than 98% does not merit classification under CTH 2825.*

10. This Tribunal in the case of *M/s. Viraj Profiles Limited vs. Commissioner of Customs (Preventive), Mumbai: 2023 (10) TMI 1260 CESTAT Mumbai dated 20.10.2023* in an identical set of facts observed as:

14.2 From the test reports of samples of imported goods, which are relied upon documents in the adjudication proceedings, we find that the chemical test conducted by the Central Revenue Control Laboratory (CRCL), Jawaharlal Nehru Custom House, on the samples of imported goods and its report dated 18.04.2018 indicate that the description of the goods as 'white lumps of irregular shapes & sizes along with waste powder. It is mainly composed of calcium oxide (quick lime) along with traces of Iron & Silicious matter'. On the percentage of chemical composition, the report stated that available lime 93.8%. Further, one another such chemical testing of imported goods by CRCL in report dated 16.05.2018, indicate that the imported goods contain '92.27% of calcium oxide and 0.96% of magnesium oxide'. Further, the HSN explanatory notes in the second para of B(11) also specify that calcium oxide of high degree of purity i.e., app. 98% or more would alone gets covered under the scope of sub-heading 2825. As seen from the test reports, the content of calcium oxide or lime is much less than the requisite 98%. Thus, we are of the considered view that in terms of the HSN explanatory notes, both on account of presence of specified material making it not in pure state and the composition of calcium oxide not upto the requisite 98% making it not a product of high degree, would not enable the imported goods to be classified under sub-heading 2825.

18. We also find that on similar issue of classification of quick lime the Co-ordinate Bench of the Tribunal in the case *Jindal Stainless (Hisar) Ltd. (supra)* had decided the appropriate classification of quick lime under chapter 25. The relevant paragraphs in the said order is extracted below:

"4. We have gone through rival submissions. It is seen that the goods imported by the

*appellant have purity in the range 95-97% as stated in the SCN. Certificated produced by the appellant shows the range to be slightly below that.*

*4.1 The heading 2522 reads as following:*

*"25.22- Quicklime, slaked lime and hydraulic lime, other than calcium oxide and hydroxide of heading 28.25."*

*2522.10-Quicklime"*

*It is seen that it specifically covers Quicklime under sub heading 25 22.10. Chapter note 1 of chapter 25 prescribes as follows:*

*"Quicklime (an impure calcium oxide) is obtained by calcining limestone containing very little or no clay. It combines very rapidly with water, giving off considerable heat and producing slaked lime (Calcium hydroxide) The heading excludes purified calcium oxide and calcium hydroxide (heading 28.25)."*

*The HSN also prescribes as follows:*

*"1. Except where their context..... otherwise requires..... but not products that have been roasted, calcined, obtained by mixing or subjected to processing beyond that mentioned in each heading."*

*4.2 It is seen that Revenue has relied on the decision of the Tribunal in the case of Nuchem Industries Pvt. Ltd. (supra) which was upheld by Hon'ble Apex Court. It is seen that the said decision has been given in the context of Central Excise duties At the material time. Central Excise Tariff was not aligned to HSN. Learned Counsel for the appellant pointed out that the Central excise Tariff was align with HSN only with effect from 20.03.1990. He pointed out that this distinction has been specifically examined by Tribunal in the case of Bhadradi Minerals Pvt. Ltd. (supra) in para 5.1 and 5.2. In view of above, it is apparent that the said decision would render in different circumstances and, therefore, cannot be relied as binding precedent.*

4.3 It is seen that the decision of Tribunal in the case of Bhadradari Minerals Pvt. Ltd. (supra) has been rendered in practically identical circumstances. The said decision relies on the HSN explanatory notes 11 under chapter heading 2825. The said chapter note provides as follows:

"5.3 HSN Explanatory Note under Tariff Heading 28.25 also excludes Calcium Oxide which has a purity less than 98% from Chapter 28 in view of the fact that what is covered under 28.25 is Calcium Oxide of purity 98%. The relevant Chapter Note is reproduced below:

"(11) Calcium Oxide, Hydroxide and Peroxide: This Heading covers only the oxide (CaO) and the hydroxide (CaOH), in the pure state (ie, containing practically no clay, iron oxide, manganese oxide, etc.) such as the product obtained by calcining precipitated calcium carbonate:

The Heading also covers fused lime obtained by fusing ordinary quicklime in an electric furnace. This product has a high degree of purity (approximately) 98% calcium oxide: it is crystalline and generally colourless. It is used, in particular, for refractory linings for furnaces, in the manufacture of crucibles and for addition to concrete, in small pieces, to increase in resistance to water.

Calcium peroxide (CaO) is a white or yellowish powder, hydrated (usually with 8 H<sub>2</sub>O) sparingly soluble in water. Used as a bactericide and as a detergent, in medicine and in the preparation of cosmetics.

Quicklime (calcium oxide) and slaked lime (calcium Hydroxide) are excluded (heading 25.22)"

In the instant case, it is not in dispute that what is imported has purity less than 98%. Therefore, the decision squarely applies to the facts of the case.

*4.4 Revenue has relied on the Advance Ruling Authority given in the case of M/s Lhoist India Pvt. Ltd. (supra) wherein burnt lime having 94-96% CaO was held to be classifiable under chapter heading 2825. The facts in the said case were significantly different. The said decision has been passed without taking note of chapter note 11 to chapter 28. Moreover, in the said decision, Hon'ble Justice PV Reddy chairman of the authority has observed as follows:*

*"22. This is perhaps a rare case in which the applicant has come forward to pay duty for its product under Tariff Item 2825 90 90 instead of claiming duty relief available for quick lime. Apparently, the applicant being convinced of the correct classification, would like to avert the risk of availing the benefit the strength of decisions rendered in a different context and then facing a backlash at a later stage."*

*From the above it is apparent that the facts and circumstances were significantly different.*

*5. As a result of above observations, we find that the ratio of decisions of Tribunal in the case of M/s Bhadradi Minerals Pvt. Ltd. is applicable to the facts of the instant case. Therefore, the product is rightly classified under chapter 25. The appeal is consequently allowed."*

*19. In view of the foregoing detailed discussions, analysis and findings recorded in the above paragraphs, we conclude that the imported goods 'quicklime' would be appropriately classifiable under Customs Tariff Item 2522 10 00 and not as 'other' under the Customs Tariff Item 2825 90 90, as claimed by Revenue".*

*11. In the present case as discussed above, the chemical analysis clearly states that the purity is only 92% and accordingly, the product "Quick Lime" is rightly classifiable under CTH 2522 1000. Accordingly, the impugned order is set aside and appeal is allowed with consequential relief, if any, as per law.*

*6. Admittedly, in the Bills of Entry filed, the purity of Calcium Oxide is less than 98% and therefore, the product in question i.e., Quicklime, is rightly classifiable under Customs Tariff Item No.25221000, following the decision in the case of M/s. JSW Steel Ltd. (supra). 7. In view of this, we do not find any merit in the impugned orders and accordingly, the same are set aside. 8. In the result, the appeals are allowed, with consequential relief, if any."*

8.1. The facts of the above case being identical to those in the case on hand and the Revenue having failed to bring any evidence to the contrary on record, we do not see any reason to deviate from the above view already expressed by the Tribunal in the decision cited supra. Accordingly, by following the aforesaid decision, we hold that the goods in question are rightly classifiable under Customs Tariff Item No. 2522 1000, as claimed by the appellant-assessee.

9. In view of the above, we do not find any merit in the impugned order and consequently, the same is set aside.

10. In the result, the appeals are allowed. The appellant shall be entitled to consequential reliefs, if any, as per law.

(Dictated and pronounced in the open court)

Sd/-

**(R. MURALIDHAR)**  
MEMBER (JUDICIAL)

Sd/-

**(K. ANPAZHAKAN)**  
MEMBER (TECHNICAL)