BEFORE THE JUDICIAL MEMBER-II:
ODISHA SALES TAX TRIBUNAL: CUTTACK.

P r e s e n t: **Shri S.K. Rout,**
2nd Judicial Member

S.A. No. 158(V) of 2020
(Arising out of the order of the learned Joint Commissioner of Sales Tax (Appeal), CT & GST Territorial Range, Bhubaneswar, in First Appeal Case No. AA-106221822000048, disposed of on dtd.28.07.2020)

M/s. Gamma Plastics,
Plot No.306/1803/4145,
Patia, Chandrasekharpur,
Bhubaneswar. ... Appellant

- V e r s u s -

State of Odisha, represented by the
Commissioner of Sales Tax, Odisha,
Cuttack. ... Respondent

For the Appellant ... Mr. Diptiram Mohanty, Advocate
For the Respondent ... Mr. S.K. Pradhan, A.S.C.

Date of hearing: 02.06.2023 *** Date of order: 03.06.2023

O R D E R

The dealer prefers this appeal challenging the order dtd.28.07.2020 passed by the learned Joint Commissioner of Sales Tax (Appeal), CT & GST Territorial Range, Bhubaneswar (hereinafter referred to as, JCST/first appellate authority) in First Appeal Case No. AA-

106221822000048, thereby confirming the order of assessment passed by the learned Sales Tax Officer, Bhubaneswar II Circle, Bhubaneswar (hereinafter referred to as, learned STO/Assessing Officer) u/s.43 of the Orissa Value Added Tax Act, 2004 (in short, the OVAT Act) for the period 01.04.2013 to 31.03.2017 raising a demand of ₹12,65,784.00 including penalty of ₹8,43,856.00 imposed u/s.43(2) of the said Act.

2. The case at hand is that, the dealer is a proprietorship concern and engaged in manufacturing of packaged drinking water. Pursuant to Tax Evasion Report (in short, TER), assessment proceeding u/s.43 of the OVAT Act was initiated against the dealer and the demand as mentioned above was raised against it.

3. Against such tax demand, the dealer preferred first appeal before the learned Joint Commissioner of Sales Tax (Appeal), CT & GST Territorial Range, Bhubaneswar who confirmed the tax demand.

4. Further, being dissatisfied with the order of the learned first appellate authority, the dealer has preferred the

present second appeal as per the grounds stated in the grounds of appeal.

5. Cross objection in this case is filed by the State-respondent.

6. The learned Counsel appearing for the dealer-assessee contended that the orders passed by the learned forums below are illegal and arbitrary. No assessment u/s.39, 42 or 44 was made before initiation of proceeding u/s.43 of the OVAT Act. Since the concept of deemed assessment of the return has been introduced for the first time since 1st October, 2015, the impugned order of reassessment is liable to be quashed for the period under challenge.

7. Per contra, the learned Standing Counsel appearing for the Revenue argued that the learned first appellate authority has disposed of the appeal which is based on the provisions of law and factual position.

8. Heard the contentions and submissions of both the parties in this regard. The sole contention of the dealer-appellant is that the assessment order is not maintainable. It was vehemently urged by the learned Counsel for the dealer-assessee that the initiation of proceeding u/s.43 of the OVAT Act is illegal and bad in

law in absence of formation of independent opinion by the assessing authority as required u/s.43(1) of the Act. The escaped turnover assessment could not have been initiated u/s.43 of the OVAT Act when the dealer-assessee was not self-assessed u/s.39 of the Act. Further, contention of the dealer-assessee is that the initiation of such proceeding by the assessing authority u/s.43 of the OVAT Act without complying the requirement of law and in contravention to the principles laid down by the Hon'ble High Court of Orissa in case of **M/s. Keshab Automobiles v. State of Odisha (STREV No.64 of 2016 decided on 01.12.2021)** is bad in law. He vehemently urged that there is nothing on record to show that the dealer-assessee was self-assessed u/s.39 of the OVAT Act after filing the return and it was communicated in writing about such self-assessment. So when the initiation of proceeding u/s.43 of the OVAT Act is bad in law, the entire proceeding becomes nullity and is liable to be dropped.

9. After a careful scrutiny of the provisions contained u/s.43 of the OVAT Act, one thing becomes clear that only after assessment of dealer u/s.39, 40, 42 or 44 for any tax period, the assessing authority, on the basis of any information in his possession, is of the opinion that the whole or any part of the turnover of the dealer in respect of such tax period or tax periods has escaped assessment, or been under assessed, or been assessed at a rate lower than the rate at which it is assessable, then giving the dealer a reasonable opportunity of hearing and after making such enquiry, assess the dealer to the best of his judgment. Similar issue also came up before the Hon'ble High Court in case of **M/s. Keshab Automobiles (supra)** wherein the Hon'ble Court interpreting the provisions contained u/s.43 of the OVAT Act, in paras 13 to 16 of the judgment observed that "the dealer is to be assessed under Sections 39, 40, 42 and 44 for any tax period". The words "where after a dealer is assessed" at the beginning of Section 43(1) prior to 1st October, 2015 pre-supposes that there has to be an

initial assessment which should have been formally accepted for the periods in question i.e. before 1st October, 2015 before the Department could form an opinion regarding escaped assessment or under assessment ….".

10. So the position prior to 1st October, 2015 is clear. Unless there was an assessment of the dealer u/s.39, 40, 42 or 44 for any tax period, the question of reopening the assessment u/s.43(1) of the OVAT Act did not arise. The Hon'ble Court in para-22 of the judgment has categorically observed that if the self-assessments u/s.39 of the OVAT Act for the tax periods prior to 01.10.2015 are not accepted either by a formal communication or an acknowledgment by the Department, then such assessment cannot be sought to be reopened u/s.43(1) of the OVAT Act. In the instant case, the impugned tax relates to pre-amended provisions of Section 43 of the OVAT Act i.e. prior to 01.10.2015. This apart the returns filed by the appellant were also not accepted either by a formal communication or an acknowledgement issued by the Department. The similar

matter has also been decided by the Full Bench of OSTT in various cases such as M/s. Swati Marbles v. State of Odisha, S.A. No.209(V) of 2013-14 (Full Bench dtd.06.06.2022), State of Odisha v. M/s. Jaiswal Plastic Tubes Ltd., S.A. No.90(V) of 2010-11 (Full Bench dtd.06.06.2022), M/s. Jalaram Tobacco Industry v. State of Odisha, S.A. No.35(V) of 2015-16 (Full Bench dtd.16.08.2022), M/s. Eastern Foods Pvt. Ltd. v. State of Odisha, S.A. No.396 (VAT) of 2015-16 (Full Bench dtd.23.08.2022) and M/s. Shree Jagannath Lamination and Frames v. State of Odisha, S.A. No.25(VAT) of 2015-16 (Full Bench dtd.15.10.2022).

11. In view of the law expounded by the Hon'ble High Court in case of **M/s. Keshab Automobiles (supra)** and subsequently confirmed by the Hon'ble Apex Court, the proceeding u/s.43 of the OVAT Act has been initiated by the assessing authority without complying with the requirement of law and without giving any finding that the dealer-assessee was formally communicated about the

acceptance of self-assessed return, the proceeding itself is not maintainable.

12. In the result, the appeal preferred by the dealer is partly allowed and the order of assessment for the tax period from 01.04.2013 to 30.09.2015 is hereby quashed and the assessment for the tax period from 01.10.2015 to 31.03.2017 is hereby set aside. The case is remanded back to the learned Assessing Officer for reassessment of tax for the tax period from 01.10.2015 to 31.03.2017 as per the observations made above within a period of three months of receipt of this order. The cross objection is disposed of accordingly.

Dictated & corrected by me,

Sd/-	Sd/-
(S.K. Rout)	(S.K. Rout)
2nd Judicial Member	2nd Judicial Member