

C CONTENTS

MAGAZINE

- ◆ Case Law Browser 111
- ◆ GST Buzz 114
- ◆ Place of supply of telecommunication services under GST//NIRALI AKHANI 116
- ◆ Recent Amendment in tour Operator Services and their impact//DIPAK N. JOSHI 120
- ◆ Service Tax Budget 2017 changes//V.S. DATEY 124
- ◆ Your Queries on GST 130

CASE LAW

TABLE OF CASES REPORTED

- ◆ Banswara Syntex Ltd. v. Union of India (Raj.) 446
- ◆ G.D. Goenka (P.) Ltd. v. State of U.P. (All.) 421
- ◆ Gulf Oil Lubricants India Ltd. v. CCT (Ker.) 443
- ◆ Pepsico India Holding (P.) Ltd. v. CCE (Mum. - CESTAT) 451
- ◆ Piyush Marketing v. State of Gujarat (Guj.) 385
- ◆ Pr. CCE v. Advinus Therapeutics Ltd. (Mum. - CESTAT) 411
- ◆ Samsung India Electronics (P.) Ltd. v. State of Bihar (Patna) 392
- ◆ Shreenath Mhaskoba Sakhar Karkhana Ltd. v. CCE (Mum. - CESTAT) 407

SUBJECT INDEX

BIHAR VALUE ADDED TAX ACT, 2005

■ Assessment or reassessment of tax of escaped turnover

- Where Assessing Officer framed original assessment of assessee dealing in mobile phones under section 31 or section 33 and subsequently he on basis of a judgment of SC issued on assessee a notice under section 31 seeking to reopen his assessment, issuance of notice would amount to change of opinion - *Samsung India Electronics (P.) Ltd. v. State of Bihar* (Patna) 392

BIHAR VALUE ADDED TAX ACT, 2005

- Section 31 392

CENTRAL EXCISE ACT, 1944

■ Refund of duty

- Where assessee was allowed to export goods on 4-1-2007, but due to disputes at customs shipping bill was given only on 28-1-2008 and thereafter assessee submitted application on 17-3-2008 for rebate of duty, rejection of application on plea that it was barred by limitation as per section 11B of Central Excise Act not justified - *Banswara Syntex Ltd. v. Union of India* (Raj.) 446

CENTRAL EXCISE ACT, 1944

- Section 11B **446**

CENVAT CREDIT RULES, 2004

■ Cenvat credit**GENERAL**

- Denial of benefit of cenvat credit on allegations that (i) assessee availed cenvat credit on invoices, wherein serial number was not printed but was written by hand, and (ii) in one invoice credit was taken on Xerox copy of invoice, not justified - *Pepsico India Holding (P.) Ltd. v. CCE* (Mum. - CESTAT) **451**

REFUND OF

- Whether where goods supplied to assessee-EOU were subjected to alteration in course of research and it was not asserted anywhere that these goods in its altered or unaltered form were sent back to service recipient, provisions of rule 4 of Place of Provision of Services Rules would not be attracted - *Pr. CCE v. Advinus Therapeutics Ltd.* (Mum. - CESTAT) **411**

CENVAT CREDIT RULES, 2004

- Rule 3 **451**

- Rule 5 **412**

CIRCULARS & NOTIFICATIONS

- Notification No. 32/2004 - ST, dated 3-12-2004 **407**

FINANCE ACT, 1994

■ Charge of service tax

- Where assessee, a sugar factory, paid charges for transportation of sugarcane from fields to its factory and deducted same from sale bills of farmers, it was not liable to pay service tax on amount of transportation charges - *Shreenath Mhaskoba Sakhar Karkhana Ltd. v. CCE* (Mum. - CESTAT) **407**

FINANCE ACT, 1994

- Section 66 **407**

GUJARAT SALES TAX ACT, 1969

■ Determination of disputed questions

- Where liability to pay sales tax arises on transaction and/or sale, determination order in force at time when transaction/sale takes place is required to be considered - *Piyush Marketing v. State of Gujarat* (Guj.) **385**

GUJARAT SALES TAX ACT, 1969

- Section 62 **385**

KERALA VALUE ADDED TAX ACT, 2003

■ Trade discount etc. deemed to be sale in certain cases

- Where assessee had only effected sale of goods by providing quantity discounts, Assessing Officer could not have included quantity discount given to dealers as part of turnover - *Gulf Oil Lubricants India Ltd. v. CCT* (Ker.) **443**

KERALA VALUE ADDED TAX ACT, 2003

- Section 7 **443**

UTTAR PRADESH VALUE ADDED TAX ACT, 2008**■ Sale**

- Where assessee was engaged in business of imparting education and it entered into agreement with a franchisee to grant non-exclusive licence for use of its brand name for consideration, grant of licence to franchisee was a sale exigible to tax - *G.D. Goenka (P.) Ltd. v. State of U.P. (All.)* **421**

UTTAR PRADESH VALUE ADDED TAX ACT, 2008

- Section 2(ac) **421**

FOUNDER EDITOR :
U.K. BHARGAVA

EDITOR :
RAKESH BHARGAVA

HONY. CONSULTING EDITOR :
V.S. DATEY

Goods & Service Tax Cases comes in Six Volumes, subscription for Jan.- Dec. 2017 is Rs. 6975. Single copy Rs. 150 only.

Goods & Service Tax Cases is published on Every Tuesday.

Non-receipt of part must be notified within 60 days of the due date.

Address your editorial and subscription correspondence to :
Taxmann Allied Services (P.) Ltd.,
59/32, New Rohtak Road, New Delhi-110 005.
Phone : 91-11-45562222
Fax : 91-11-45577111.

Printed and Published by
Amit Bhargava on behalf of Taxmann Allied Services (P.) Ltd. and Printed at Tan Prints (India) Pvt. Ltd., 44 Km. Mile Stone, National Highway, Rohtak Road, Village Rohad, Distt. Jhajjar (Haryana) and Published at 59/32, New Rohtak Road, New Delhi-110 005
Editor : Rakesh Bhargava

Material published in this part is the exclusive copyrighted property of Taxmann Allied Services (P.) Ltd. and cannot be reproduced or copied in any form or by any means without written permission of the Publisher.

Editors do not necessarily agree with the views expressed by authors of articles/features. Views so expressed are the personal views of author(s).

This publication is sold with the understanding that authors/editors and publishers are not responsible for the result of any action taken on the basis of this work nor for any error or omission to any person, whether a purchaser of this publication or not. All disputes are subject to jurisdiction of the Delhi High Court.

Email:sales@taxmann.com
Website: http://www.taxmann.com

MODE OF CITATION [2017] 59 GST... (..)
TOTAL PAGES [100]