D/721

OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER OF CENTRAL EXCISE (APPEALS), 7th FLOOR,L.B.STADIUM,BASHEERBAGH, HYDERABAD

Paper not moving

Sub: Appeal against the O-I-O No. 44/2010 (Service Tax) (O. R. No. 82/2010-Adjn.ST Dated 15.10.2010 passed by the Additional Commissioner of Customs, Central Excise and Service Tax, Hyderabad – II Commissionerate., pertaining to Alpine Estates, Hyderabad.

O/o dept

Between:
Alpine Estates,
5-4-187/3 & 4,
III Floor,
MG Road,
Secunderabad – 500 003 ..... **Appellant**

VS.

Additional Commissioner of
Customs, Central Excise and Service Tax.,
Hyderabad II Commissionerate,
L.B.Stadium, Basheerbagh,
Hyderabad – 500 004. ..... **Respondent**

Index

Hiregange & Associates Chartered Accountants Hyderabad

FORM ST-4

Form of Appeal to the Commissioner of Central Excise (Appeals)

[Under Section 85 of the Finance Act, 1994 (32 of 1994)]

BEFORE THE COMMISSIONER (APPEALS),
7th Floor, L.B. Stadium Road, Basheerbagh,
Hyderabad – 500 004

(1) No. ..... of 2010	
(2) Name and address of the Appellant	M/s. Alpine Estates 5-4-187/3 & 4, III Floor, MG Road, Secunderabad – 500 003.
(3) Designation and address of the officer Passing the decision or order appealed against and the date of the decision or order	Additional Commissioner of Customs, Central Excise and Service Tax, Hyderabad-II Commissionerate, L.B. Stadium Road, Basheerbagh, Hyderabad – 500 004. Order in Original No. 44/2010 (Service Tax) (O. R. No. 82/2010-Adjn. ST) passed on 15.10.2010
(4) Date of Communication to the Appellant of the decision or order appealed against	21.10.2010
(5) Address to which notices may be sent to the Appellant	M/s Hiregange & Associates, "Basheer Villa", House No: 8-2 268/1/16/B, 2nd Floor, Sriniketan Colony, Road No. 3 Banjara Hills, Hyderabad – 500 034., **(Also copy to the Appellant at the above mentioned address.)**
(5A)(i) Period of dispute	Jan '09 to Dec '09
(ii) Amount of service tax, if any demanded for the period mentioned in the Col. (i)	Rs.31,10,377/- including Cess
(iii) Amount of refund if any claimed for the period mentioned in Col. (i)	Nil
(iv) Amount of Interest	Interest u/s 75 of the Finance Act 1994

ALPINE ESTATES SEC'BAD

Hiregange & Associates Chartered Accountants Hyderabad

(v) Amount of penalty	Rs. 31,10,377/- under section 78 Rs. 5,000/- u/s 77 of the Finance Act, 1994.
(vi) Value of Taxable Service for the period mentioned in Col. (i)	Rs. 7,54,94,586/-
(6) Whether Service Tax or penalty or interest or all the three have been deposited.	No, An Application for dispensing with the pre-deposit and stay the recovery thereof is separately filed along with this appeal.
(6A) Whether the appellant wishes to be heard in person?	Yes, through its authorized representative
(7) Reliefs claimed in appeal	To set aside the impugned order and grant the relief claimed.

For Hiregange & Associates
Chartered Accountants

Sudhir V S
Partner.

Hiregange & Associates * Chartered Accountants * Hyderabad

For ALPINE ESTATES

Partner

Signature of the Appellant

Signature of the authorized representatives, if any

STATEMENT OF FACTS

1. Appellant is a registered partnership firm engaged in the business of construction of residential units. Appellant had undertaken a venture by name May Flower Heights wherein 102 apartments were constructed and sold. Appellant had obtained service tax registration and made payments of service tax for the receipts pertaining to the period May 2007 to December 2008.
2. In respect of the 102 residential units constructed and sold two agreements were entered into by the appellant, one for sale of the undivided portion of land and the other is the construction agreement.
3. Initially, upto December 2008, when amounts were received by the appellant and eventhough there was a doubt and lot of confusion on the applicability of service tax the appellant paid service tax in respect of the receipts of construction agreement. Later, on the issue of the clarification vide the circular No. 108/02/2009 dated 29.01.2009 by the department, the customers of the appellant, stopped paying the service tax and accordingly appellant was forced to stop collecting and discharging service tax liability on the amounts collected in respect of the construction agreement as they were of the bonafide belief that they were excluded vide the personal use clause in the definition of residential complex.

ALPINE ESTATES SEC'BAD

Hiregange & Associates Chartered Accountants Hyderabad

4. A letter dated_____ was written to the Assistant/Additional Commissioner of Service Tax indicating the stand taken by the Noticee and also intimating the non-payment of Service Tax.

5. Investigation was taken up by the department and summons dated 13.01.2010 were done for the submission of relevant records/documents/information for which the appellant had extended full cooperation.

6. Subsequently, the Additional Commissioner has issued a show cause notice dated 16.06.2010 to the appellant to show cause as to why:

    a. An amount of Rs.31,10,377/- payable towards Service Tax, Education Cess and Secondary and Higher education cess should not be demanded under section73(1) of the Finance Act,1994 (hereinafter referred to as the Act) for the period January 2009 to December 2009;

    b. Interest on the above should not be demanded under section 75 of the Act;

    c. Penalty under sections 76 of the Act should not be demanded from them.

    d. Penalty under sections 77 of the Act should not be demanded from them.

    e. Penalty under sections 78 of the Act should not be demanded from them.

ALPINE ESTATES SEC'BAD

Hiregange & Associates Chartered Accountants Hyderabad

7. Appellants made a detailed reply dated _____ countering and answering all the points raised by the respondent in the show cause notice mentioned above. (copy of the reply is enclosed along with this appeal).

8. The issues for determination in the present case are:-

    a. Whether the units in the residential complex that are sold to the customers would be excluded by the personal use clause?

    b. Whether the circular 108/02/2009 dated 29.01.2009 clarifies about the entire complex to be put to use for personal purpose or would suffice if one unit in the complex is put to personal use?

    c. Whether extended period of limitation can be invoked?

9. The respondent passed the impugned order on the following grounds:

    a. The circular 108/02/2009 dated 29.01.2009 clarifies about the entire complex being put to personal use by single person and that a single residential unit put to personal use will not be eligible to be excluded for the purposes of service tax.

    b. The judgment M/s Classic Promoters and Developers, M/s Classic Properties v/s CCE Mangalore 2009-TIOL-1106-CESTAT-Bang not applicable to the appellants as the

ALPINE ESTATES SECBAD

Hiregange & Associates Chartered Accountants Hyderabad

construction does not include construction of commercial complex.

c. Appellant not eligible for the benefit of CENVAT credit

d. Appellant not eligible for cum tax benefit even though the service tax was not collected from the customers.

e. There was no doubt and confusion at all regarding the levy of service tax on the construction of complex service.

10. The impugned order was passed which has aggrieved the Appellant, in which it was held to the following effect:

a. Demand of Service Tax amount of Rs. 31,10,377/- is hereby confirmed on under Sec 73 (1) of the Finance Act, 1994 (hereinafter referred to as the Act) for the period from Jan 09 to Dec 09.

b. Demand of interest under section 75 of the Act confirmed.

c. Imposition of penalty of Rs. 5,000 and Rs. 31,10,377/- under section 77 and 78 of the Act respectively.

Aggrieved by the impugned order, which is contrary to facts, law and evidence, apart from being contrary to a catena of judicial decisions and beset with grave and incurable legal infirmities, the appellant prefers this appeal on the

ALPINE ESTATES * SEC'BAD *

Hiregange & Associates * Hyderabad * Chartered Accountants

following grounds (which are alternate pleas and without prejudice to one another) amongst those to be urged at the time of hearing of the appeal.

ALPINE ESTATES * SEC'BAD *

Hiregange & Associates * Hyderabad * Chartered Accountants

GROUNDS OF APPEAL

1. The Appellant submits that the impugned order is *ex-facie* illegal and untenable in law since the same is contrary to facts and judicial decisions.

2. The Appellant submits that the adjudication proceeding was rendered a solemn farce and idle formality, and the attitude of the respondent shows that a made-up mind was his approach for confirming the demand and the order was a merely a formality to complete the process with wholly irrelevant findings, and the order is therefore untenable.

3. The Appellant submits that the impugned order was passed totally ignoring the factual position and also some of the submission made and judicial decisions relied but was based on mere assumption, unwarranted inferences and presumptions. Supreme Court in case *Oudh Sugar Mills Limited v. UOI,* 1978 (2) ELT 172 (SC) has held that such impugned order are not sustainable under the law. On this count alone the entire proceedings under impugned order requires to be set-aside.

ALPINE ESTATES SEC'BAD

Hiregange & Associates Chartered Accountants Hyderabad

4. The impugned order has not considered the various submissions made in the appeal and has passed the order based on certain assumptions without proper reasoning as if there was a made up mind and for this reason itself the impugned order shall be set aside.

5. The impugned order has been passed without considering the following submission made and hence the principle on Natural Justice has been violated and hence the order is void and requires to be set aside.

   a. The various circulars that have clarified that construction of complex for personal use is not liable to service tax.

   b. The interpretation that the personal use exclusion is available only where the entire complex is put for personal use is not correct in law.

   c. Penalty has been imposed even after stating the bonafide belief of the appellant based on which payment of service tax for the period Jan '09 to Dec '09 was not made.

6. Appellant submits that it was held in the case of Cosmo Films Ltd. *v.*Commissioner of Central Excise & Custom & Service Tax, Aurangabad [2009] 21 STT 217 (MUM. - CESTAT) that the impugned order having

ALPINE ESTATES * SEC'BAD *

Hiregange & Associates * Chartered Accountants * Hyderabad

been passed without considering/dealing with all submissions of assessee including evidence produced regarding insurance service, was bad in law and void. Hence the impugned order shall be set aside.

7. Without prejudice to the foregoing appellant submits that they had given detailed reasoning and list of the various circulars that were issued by the department to clear doubts regarding the applicability of service tax on construction of residential complex. But the impugned order has stated that by the issue of the circular B1/6/2005-TRU, dated 27-7-2005 itself, the applicability of service tax on construction of residential complex was made clear and that the contention of the appellant that there was lot of confusion is not tenable.

8. Appellant submits that if by issue of the above circular all doubts were cleared then why were the subsequent circulars F. No. 332/35/2006-TRU, dated 1-8-2006 and 108/02/2009 –ST dated 29.02.2009 were issued on the same issue. This indicates that the impugned order has not considered all the submissions made by the appellant and have without any proper reasoning rejected their submissions. For this reason as well the impugned order shall be set aside.

ALPINE ESTATES * SEC'BAD *

Hiregange & Associates * Chartered Accountants * Hyderabad *

9. Without prejudice to the foregoing appellant had submitted in their reply the basis on which it is evident that the circular 108/02/2009-ST dated 29.01.2009 states that where a **residential unit** is put to personal use, and not necessarily the entire complex, it would be excluded under the taxable service 'Construction of Complex'. Though the impugned order, without giving any proper justification and by just reproducing a part of the above circular, concluded that the exclusion from taxable service would be available only when the entire complex is put to personal use. The impugned order has not considered any of the points stated by them in their reply regarding the fact that the above circular explains that personal use of a single residential unit itself would exclude it from service tax. For this reason as well the impugned order shall be set aside.

10. The impugned order has not considered the case law cited in respect of M/s Classic Promoters and Developers, M/s Classic Properties v/s CCE Mangalore 2009-TIOL–1106-CESTAT–Bang on the ground that in the present case there is no construction of commercial complex. It would be important to note that in the cited case there was both construction of residential complex and commercial complex and only part amount was pre deposited. Based on the circular 108/02/2009-ST this part amount deposited was considered sufficient and it was considered to cover the part of demand in respect of the construction of commercial complex.

ALPINE ESTATES SEC'BAD

Hiregange & Associates Chartered Accountants Hyderabad

11. Appellant submits that it is very rare that 2 cases would be exactly the same. But in such cases also the relevant inferences should be considered for passing orders. Such differences in the facts of the cases should not form a hindrance for passing orders. If such practice is followed then every case has to be fought from the scratch and the earlier decisions and orders would be of no use at all. For this reason as well the impugned order shall be set aside.

12. Appellant further submits that in the following 2 cases as well the impugned order was set aside and matter was remanded for passing fresh decision based on the circular 108/02/2009. Hence the appellant is also entitled for such benefit.

a. M/s Virgo Properties Pvt Limited Vs CST, Chennai (Dated: May 3 2010) 2010-TIOL-1142-CESTAT-MAD

b. Ardra Associates Vs. CCE, Calicut - [2009] 22 STT 450 (BANG. - CESTAT)

13. Without prejudice to the foregoing appellant submits that the impugned order has stated that if the interpretation as stated by the appellant is adopted then the entire provisions relating to service tax on residential complexes would be redundant. Appellant submits that this

ALPINE ESTATES SEC'BAD

Hiregange & Associates Chartered Accountants Hyderabad

will not happen due to the reason that the sub contractors and contractors who provide service to the builders/developers would still be liable to service tax as such complexes would not be for personal use of the builders/developers. Further the interpretation of law has to be done word by word and there shall be no addition or omission of words to interpret the law for one's convenience as the impugned order has done. For this reason as well the impugned order shall be set aside.

14. Without prejudice to the foregoing, assuming but not admitting that service tax liability exists, the appellant had submitted that they would be eligible for CENVAT credit in respect of the input services and the capital goods. But the impugned order has held that no such credit would be available as per the Works Contract (Composition scheme for the payment of service tax) Rules, 2007. Appellant submits that Rule 3(2) of such rules states that the assessee would not be eligible for CENVAT credit on inputs. There is no mention about credit in relation to input services and capital goods.

"(2) The provider of taxable service shall not take CENVAT credit of duties or cess paid on ***any inputs****, used in or in relation to the said works contract, under the provisions of CENVAT Credit Rules, 2004."*

ALPINE ESTATES SEC'BAD

Hiregange & Associates Chartered Accountants Hyderabad

15. Without prejudice to the foregoing, appellant submits that the impugned order has not given the benefit of payment of service tax on the cum tax basis for the reason that the appellant has opted for the composition scheme. Appellant submits that as per section 67 of the Finance Act (reproduced below) the appellant would be entitled for the benefit of payment of service tax on cum tax basis where the same is not collected from the customers. Such benefit would be available for all services as there is no exception/exclusion given for works contract service.

(1) Subject to the provisions of this Chapter, where service tax is chargeable on any taxable service with reference to its value, then such value shall,—

(i) in a case where the provision of service is for a consideration in money, be the gross amount charged by the service provider for such service provided or to be provided by him;

(ii) in a case where the provision of service is for a consideration not wholly or partly consisting of money, be such amount in money as, with the addition of service tax charged, is equivalent to the consideration;

(iii) in a case where the provision of service is for a consideration which is not ascertainable, be the amount as may be determined in the prescribed manner.

ALPINE ESTATES SEC'BAD

Hiregange & Associates Chartered Accountants Hyderabad

(2) Where the gross amount charged by a service provider, for the service provided or to be provided is inclusive of service tax payable, the value of such taxable service shall be such amount as, with the addition of tax payable, is equal to the gross amount charged.

16. Appellant further submits that it was also held in the following cases that where no service tax is collected from the customers the assessee shall be given the benefit of paying service tax on cum-tax basis.

a. VGB Tyre Retreading Works *v.* Commissioner of Central Excise, Salem [2010] 26 STT 210 (CHENNAI - CESTAT)

b. Billu Tech Video Communication *v.* Commissioner of Central Excise, Jaipur[2010] 28 STT 325 (NEW DELHI - CESTAT)

c. M/s Vidyut Consultants Vs CCE, Indore (Dated: June 17, 2010) 2010-TIOL-1196-CESTAT-DEL

Eventhough the above cases do not pertain to the works contract service, appellant submits that there is no where in the statute stated that the works contract category would be given a different treatment in case the same is not collected from the customer. Hence the benefit (cum tax)

ALPINE ESTATES SEC'BAD

Hiregange & Associates Chartered Accountants Hyderabad

given to the other services should also be available to the works contract service.

The impugned order has drawn conclusions without giving proper legal backup. For this reason as well the impugned order shall be set aside.

INTEREST

17. Without prejudice to the foregoing noticee submits that when service tax itself is not payable, the question of interest and penalty does not arise.

18. Noticee further submits that it is a natural corollary that when the principal is not payable there can be no question of paying any interest as held by the Supreme Court in Prathiba Processors Vs. UOI, 1996 (88) ELT 12 (SC).

PENALTY

19. The impugned order has stated that there is no confusion in the applicability of service tax in the present case and that this cannot be a reasonable cause for not having paid the service tax. Appellant states that the issue of so many circulars on the same subject at different points of time itself makes it evident that there was confusion. The

ALPINE ESTATES SEC'BAD

Hiregange & Associates Chartered Accountants Hyderabad

impugned order has not considered this submission of the appellant and has passed the impugned order. The same shall be set aside.

20. Without prejudice to the foregoing, Appellant submits that service tax liability on the builders till date has not been settled and there is full of confusion as the correct position till date. With this background it is a settled proposition of law that when the assessee acts with a bonafide belief especially when there is doubt as to statute also the law being new and not yet understood by the common public, there cannot be intention of evasion and penalty cannot be levied. In this regard we wish to rely upon the following decisions of Supreme Court.

(i) Hindustan Steel Ltd. V. State of Orissa – 1978 (2) ELT (J159) (SC)

(ii) Akbar Badruddin Jaiwani V. Collector – 1990 (47) ELT 161(SC)

(iii) Tamil Nadu Housing Board V Collector – 1990 (74) ELT 9 (SC)

Therefore on this ground it is requested to drop the penalty proceedings under the provisions of Section 76.

21. Without prejudice to the foregoing, Appellant submits that there is no allegation as to any intention to evade the payment of service tax setting out any positive act of the Appellant. Therefore any action proposed in the SCN that is invokable for the reason of fraud, wilful mis-

ALPINE ESTATES SEC'BAD

Hiregange & Associates Chartered Accountants Hyderabad

statement, collusion or suppression of facts, or contravention of any of the provisions of the Excise Act or the rules made thereunder with intention to evade payment of duty, is not sustainable and penalty under section 78 is not sustainable. In this regard reliance is placed on the following decisions:

a. Cosmic Dye Chemical v. CCE, 1995 (75) ELT 721 (SC) wherein at para-6 of the decision it was held that – "Now so far as fraud and collusion are concerned, it is evident that the requisite intent, i.e., intent to evade duty is built into these very words. So far as mis-statement or suppression of facts are concerned, they are clearly qualified by the word "wilful" preceding the words "mis-statement or suppression of facts" which means with intent to evade duty. The next set of words "contravention of any of the provisions of this Act or Rules" are again qualified by the immediately following words "with intent to evade payment of duty". It is, therefore, not correct to say that there can be a suppression or mis-statement of fact, which is not wilful and yet constitutes a permissible ground for the purpose of the proviso to Section 11A. Mis-statement or suppression of fact must be wilful".

b. T.N. Dadha Pharmaceuticals v. CCE, 2003 (152) ELT 251 (SC) wherein it was held that - To invoke the proviso three

requirements have to be satisfied, namely, (1) that any duty of excise has not been levied or paid or has been short-levied or short-paid or erroneously refunded; (2) that such a short-levy or short-payment or erroneous refund is by reason of fraud, collusion or wilful mis-statement or suppression of facts or contravention of any provisions of the Central Excise Act or the rules made thereunder; and (3) that the same has been done with intent to evade payment of duty by such person or agent. These requirements are cumulative and not alternative. To make out a case under the proviso, all the three essentials must exist. Further it was held that burden is on the Department to prove presence of all three cumulative criterions and the Revenue must have perused the matter diligently. It is submitted none of the ingredients enumerated in proviso to section 11A(1) of the Act is established to present in our clients case.

c. Tamil Nadu Housing Board v. CCE, 1994 (74) ELT 9 (SC) wherein it was held that proviso to section 11A(1) is in the nature of an exception to the principal clause. Therefore, its exercise is hedged on one hand with existence of such situations as have been visualized by the proviso by using such strong expression as fraud, collusion etc. and on the

ALPINE ESTATES * SEC'BAD *

Hiregange & Associates * Chartered Accountants * Hyderabad *

other hand it should have been with intention to evade payment of duty. Both must concur to enable the Excise Officer to proceed under this proviso and invoke the exceptional power. Since the proviso extends the period of limitation from six months to five years it has to be construed strictly. Further, when the law requires an intention to evade payment of duty then it is not mere failure to pay duty. It must be something more. That is, the assessee must be aware that the duty was leviable and it must deliberately avoid paying it. The word `evade' in the context means defeating the provision of law of paying duty. It is made more stringent by use of the word `intent'. In other words, the assessee must deliberately avoid payment of duty which is payable in accordance with law.

d. Padmini Products v. CCE, 1989 (43) ELT 195 (SC) wherein it was held that mere failure or negligence on the part of the manufacturer either not to take out a licence or not to pay duty in case where there was scope for doubt, does not attract the extended limitation. Unless there is evidence that the manufacturer knew that goods were liable to duty or he was required to take out a licence. For invoking extended period of five years limitation duty should not had been paid,

ALPINE ESTATES SEC'BAD

Hiregange & Associates Chartered Accountants Hyderabad

short-levied or short paid or erroneously refunded because of either any fraud, collusion or wilful mis-statement or suppression of facts or contravention of any provision of the Act or Rules made thereunder. These ingredients postulate a positive act, therefore, failure to pay duty or take out a licence is not necessary due to fraud or collusion or wilful mis-statement or suppression of facts or contravention of any provisions of the Act. Likewise suppression of facts is not failure to disclose the legal consequences of a certain provision.

e. Pahwa Chemicals Pvt. Ltd. v. CCE, 2005 (189) ELT 257 (SC) wherein it was held that mere failure to declare does not amount to mis-declaration or wilful suppression. There must be some positive act on the part of party to establish that either wilful mis-declaration or wilful suppression and it is a must. When the party had acted in bonafide and there was no positive act, invocation of extended period is not justified.

f. Gopal Zarda Udyog v. CCE, 2005 (188) ELT 251 (SC) where there is a scope for believing that the goods were not excisable and consequently no license was required to be taken, then the extended period is not applicable. Further,

ALPINE ESTATES SEC'BAD

Hiregange & Associates Chartered Accountants Hyderabad

mere failure or negligence on the part of the manufacturer either not to take out the licence or not to pay duty in cases where there is a scope for doubt, does not attract the extended period of limitation. Unless there is evidence that the manufacturer knew that the goods were liable to duty or he was required to take out a licence, there is no scope to invoke the proviso to Section 11A(1).

g. Kolety Gum Industries v. CCE, 2005 (183) ELT 440 (T) wherein it was held that when the assessee was under bonafide belief that the goods in question was not dutiable, there was no suppression of fact.

22. Further the appellant submits that until there was no clarity on the applicability of service tax the amounts were collected and paid properly by the appellant. It was only on issue of a clarification by the department vide the circular 108/02/2009 ibid that the appellant stopped making service tax payments as it was of the bonafide belief that there was no service tax liability. There was never an intention to evade payment of service tax by the Appellant. Hence the penalty under section 78 is not leviable in the instant case. On the other hand it was not practicable for collection of service tax from the customer as the same was denied by the customer.

ALPINE ESTATES SEC'BAD

Hiregange & Associates Chartered Accountants Hyderabad

23. Appellant further submits that they have not intentionally mis-interpreted the circular to evade tax payment as is mentioned in the impugned order. Hence the extended period of limitation shall not be applicable to them.

24. Further section 80 of Finance Act provides no penalty shall be levied under section 76. 77 or 78 if the assessee proves that there is a reasonable cause for the failure. The appellant in the instant case was under confusion as to the service tax liability on their transaction, therefore there was reasonable case for the failure to pay service tax, hence the benefit under section 80 has to be given to them.

25. Appellant crave leave to alter, add to and/or amend the aforesaid grounds.

26. Appellant wish to be heard in person before passing any order in this regard.

ALPINE ESTATES SEC'BAD

Hiregange & Associates Chartered Accountants Hyderabad

PRAYER

WHEREFORE, the Appellants pray that pending the hearing and final disposal of this appeal, an order be granted in their favour staying the order of the Respondent and granting waiver of pre-deposit of the entire duty amount.

Appellant

VERIFICATION

We, M/s. Alpine Estates, Secunderabad, the Appellants herein do declare that what is stated above is true to the best of our information and belief.

Verified today the ..... day of November 2010.

Place: Hyderabad

For ALPINE ESTATES

Partner

Signature of the appellant.

Hiregange & Associates
Chartered Accountants
Hyderabad

STAY APPLICATION UNDER SECTION 35F OF THE CENTRAL EXCISE AND SALT ACT, 1944.

BEFORE THE COMMISSIONER (APPEALS), Hqrs., Offic, 7th Floor, L.B. Stadium Road, Basheerbagh, Hyderabad – 500 004.

Between:

M/s. Alpine Estates.,

5-4-187/3 & 4, III Floor,

MG Road, Secunderabad – 500 003. **.....Appellant**

And:

The Additional Commissioner of Service Tax

7th Floor, L.B. Stadium Road, Basheerbagh,

Hyderabad – 500 004 **.....Respondent**

1. The Appellants submit that for the reasons mentioned in the appeal it would be grossly unjustified and inequitable and cause undue hardship to the Appellants if the amount is required to be paid. Having regard to the balance of convenience, which is in their favour, there is no case warranting deposit of the amount confirmed in the subject order.

2. The Appellant submits that they are entitled to be granted an order staying the implementation of the said order of the Respondent pending the hearing and final disposal of this appeal viewed in the light of the fact that the order is one which has been passed without considering the various submissions made during the

25

ALPINE ESTATES SEC'BAD

Hiregange & Associates Chartered Accountants Hyderabad

adjudication. It has been held by the Calcutta High Court in Hooghly Mills Co. Ltd., Vs. UOI 1999 (108) ELT 637 that it would amount to undue hardship if the Appellant were required to pre-deposit when they had a strong prima facie case which in the instant case is present directly in favour of the Appellant.

3. The appellants also plead financial hardship due to the reason that the service tax has not been reimbursed by the recipient and also cash crunch due to the Telanga issue at Hyderabad.

4. The Appellants crave leave to alter, ad to and/or amend the aforesaid grounds.

5. The Appellants wish to be personally heard before any decision is taken in this matter.

ALPINE ESTATES SEC'BAD

Hiregange & Associates Chartered Accountants Hyderabad

PRAYER

WHEREFORE, the Appellants pray that pending the hearing and final disposal of this appeal, an order be granted in their favour staying the order of the Respondent and granting waiver of pre-deposit of the entire duty amount.

Appellant

VERIFICATION

We, M/s. Alpine Estates., Secunderabad, the Appellants herein do declare that what is stated above is true to the best of our information and belief.

Verified today the 6th day of January 2011.

Place: Hyderabad

For ALPINE ESTATES

Partner

Signature of the appellant.

Hiregange & Associates * Chartered Accountants * Hyderabad

BEFORE THE COMMISSIONER (APPEALS),
Hqrs., Offic, 7th Floor, L.B. Stadium Road, Basheerbagh, Hyderabad – 500 004.

Sub: Appeal against the O-I-O No. 44/2010 (Service Tax) (O.R. No. 82/2010-Adjn. ST) dated 08.10.2010 passed by Additional Commissioner Of Service Tax, 7th Floor, L.B. Stadium, Basheerbagh, Hyderabad – 500 004, pertaining to M/s Grandeur Homes Pvt. Ltd., Secunderabad.

I/We, M/s Alpine Estates. hereby authorise and appoint Hiregange & Associates, Chartered Accountants, Hyderabad or their partners and qualified staff who are authorised to act as authorised representative under the relevant provisions of the law, to do all or any of the following acts: -

- **To act, appear and plead in the above noted proceedings before the above authorities or any other authorities before whom the same may be posted or heard and to file and take back documents.**
- **To sign, file verify and present pleadings, applications, appeals, cross-objections, revision, restoration, withdrawal and compromise applications, replies, objections and affidavits etc., as may be deemed necessary or proper in the above proceedings from time to time.**
- **To Sub-delegate all or any of the aforesaid powers to any other representative and I/We do hereby agree to ratify and confirm acts done by our above authorised representative or his substitute in the matter as my/our own acts, as if done by me/us for all intents and purposes.**

This authorization will remain in force till it is duly revoked by me/us.

Executed this 5th day of January 2011 at Hyderabad.

For ALPINE ESTATES

Partner

Signature

I the undersigned partner of M/s Hiregange & Associates, Chartered Accountants, do hereby declare that the said M/s Hiregange & Associates is a registered firm of Chartered Accountants and all its partners are Chartered Accountants holding certificate of practice and duly qualified to represent in above proceedings under Section 35Q of the Central Excises Act, 1944. I accept the above said appointment on behalf of M/s Hiregange & Associates. The firm will represent through any one or more of its partners or Staff members who are qualified to represent before the above authorities.

Dated: 5th January 2011

For Hiregange & Associates
Chartered Accountants

Sudhir V. S.
Partner. (M. No. 219109)

Hiregange & Associates * Chartered Accountants * Hyderabad *

Address for service :
Hiregange & Associates,
"Basheer Villa", House No: 8-2-268/1/16/B,
2nd Floor, Sriniketan Colony,
Road No. 3 Banjara Hills,
Hyderabad – 500 034.,