

For Departmental Use Only



Government of India

MONTHLY AUDIT BULLETIN – AUGUST, 2012

**Directorate General of Audit
Customs, Central Excise & Service Tax
Central Revenue Building
New Delhi**

INDEX

Sr. No.	Topic	Page No.
Central Excise		
1.	Short payment of duty for extra consideration collected by the assessee from the buyer i.e., amount collected for freight etc	1
2.	Wrong availment of CENVAT Credit on input Service utilized for Traded goods	1
3	Wrong availment of Credit on Input Services notified in negative list	2
4.	Wrong availment of credit in balance after opting out as Large Tax Payers Unit	3
5.	payment of duty on DTA sales	3
Service Tax		
6.	Non payment of Service Tax on Legal Consultancy Charges paid to overseas service providers	5
7.	Non payment of Service Tax on Manpower Supply Services	5
8.	Non payment of Service Tax on token charges income under “Other Port Services”	7
9.	Wrong availment of CENVAT Credit on capital goods	7
10.	Non payment of Service Tax on Renting of Immovable Property	8
11.	Non- payment of Service Tax on Job work	9
12	CENVAT Credit Availment on Invoices received from Associated Enterprises before making payment - Pre-matured availment & Interest for early availment	10
13	Short Payment of Service Tax on CSMC Services on account of availing adhoc abatement from the value of taxable service	11
14.	Nonpayment of Service Tax on charges collected for car parking, construction, catering services and import of franchisee services	12

Sr. No.	Topic	Page No.
15.	Quarterly Audit Performance Index (API) of the Central Excise Commissionerates for the Q.E. June, 2012	13
16.	Audit Performance Index (API gradings-Service Tax only) of the exclusive Service Tax Commissionerates and Composite Central Excise Commissionerates (Central Excise + Service Tax) for the Q.E. June, 2012	18

For Official Use Only



Government of India

MONTHLY AUDIT BULLETIN – AUGUST 2012

**Directorate General of Audit
Customs & Central Excise
Central Revenue Building,
I.P. Estate
New Delhi-110109**

MONTHLY AUDIT BULLETIN – AUGUST, 2012
CENTRAL EXCISE

- (1) **GIST OF THE OBJECTION : Short payment of duty for extra consideration collected by the assessee from the buyer i.e., amount collected for freight etc**

COMMISSIONERATE : Central Excise Commissionerate, Vadodara-I

The assessee is a manufacturer of railway or tramway passenger coaches. During the course of audit, it was noticed that the assessee was supplying coaches to M/s. DMRC, New Delhi out of which some were supplied under International Competition Bidding Project (ICBP) which are exempted from Central Excise duty. As per the agreement, for the coaches which were not the part of ICBP, the assessee was charging price of such coaches and paying Central Excise duty on them. On verification of invoices it was noticed that the assessee have charged certain amount towards freight and handling charges from DMRC and not included this in assessable value and not paid duty on that amount.

As per the details submitted by the assessee it was found that the assessee have collected Rs.21,87,89,716/- as freight and handling charges and has paid Rs.13,21,89,428/- as freight to transporters.

The total excess amount collected towards freight and handling charges by the assessee was Rs.8,48,00,288/- on which Central Excise duty worked out to Rs.87,34,430/- alongwith interest of Rs.24,65,966/-, which was agreed by the assessee.

- (2) **GIST OF THE OBJECTION : Wrong availment of CENVAT Credit on input Service utilized for Traded goods**

COMMISSIONERATE : Central Excise Commissionerate, Mumbai-II

During the course of Audit of the assessee, verification of the data submitted by the assessee, revealed that the assessee have availed of CENVAT Credit on input services amounting to Rs.136811892/- (during 2010-11), on invoice/documents received from various service providers and also on Service Tax credit availed and distributed by their head office, for manufacture/clearance of goods from the factory / depot/place of removal. Further, it is also seen that apart from manufacturing and sales of HSD, SKO, MS, ATF etc., they are also engaged in.

the activity of trading of the said goods viz. HSD, SKO, MS, ATF, Body Coil from manufacturing premises / depot place of removal. Central Excise dealers license has also been obtained for dealing in the above bought out items, from the manufacturing premises / depots.

The assessee was also not maintaining separate account for common inputs / services utilized for the manufacture / clearance of dutiable and exempted goods and have resorted to the provisions of Rule 6 of the CENVAT Credit Rules, 2004, for the reversal of inadmissible credit on exempted goods.

In the instant case, as the activity of trading involves purchase and sale of goods, which is covered under the Sales Tax Law, it can not be construed as an exempted service. Since trading in itself is not a service, the credit on services attributable to trading is void ab initio and therefore the provisions of Rule 6 are not applicable to trading activity.

In view of the above, the credit availed on those input services, utilized for goods traded from the manufacturing premises / depot / place of removal are required to be reversed in the ratio of trading turnover to total turnover.

The data submitted by the assessee, are as follows :-

- a) Total Sale value as per ER-4 :- Rs.429823183127/-
- b) Value of Traded goods :- Rs.37331527538/-
- c) CENVAT Credit availed in refinery on input Services :- Rs. 136811892 /-
- d) Applying the above formula of trading turnover to total turnover, the ratio works out to 8.69 %.
- e) Therefore, the amount of inadmissible Service Tax credit on traded goods is :- Rs. $136811892 \times 8.69\% = \text{Rs. } 1,18,88,953 \text{ /-}$.

(3) GIST OF THE OBJECTION : Wrong availment of Credit on Input Services notified in negative list.

COMMISSIONERATE : Central Excise Commissionerate, Noida

The assessee had taken credit on inadmissible input services like construction service, pantry services, rent-a-cab services during the period April, 11 to March'12 and also during April, 2012. The amount involved is Rs. 1,07,43,665.00. On being pointed out the assessee

reversed the same vide Entry No.1 dated 23.04.2012 and Entry no. 477 dated 30.04.2012. Interest has also been deposited vide challan No. 50204 & 50205 both dated 11.05.2012.

(4) GIST OF THE OBJECTION : Wrong availment of credit in balance after opting out as Large Tax Payers Unit

COMMISSIONERATE : Central Excise Commissionerate, Noida

The assessee had taken inadmissible credit of the amount left balance in the books of accounts when the assessee was LTU in the name & style of M/s Areva T & D (A LTU) which demerged to M/s Schneider and M/s Alstom w.e.f. 26.11.2011. M/s. Schneider Electric Infrastructure Ltd. has acquired 30% of Business and attained independent unit status. During audit it was found that credit was not permitted to be taken by him as it was the credit left over when it was a LTU unit. The assessee also utilized the said credit for payment of duty for the month of Feb, 2012. On being pointed out the party agreed to reverse the same with interest.

(6) GIST OF THE OBJECTION : Short payment of duty on DTA sales

COMMISSIONERATE : Central Excise Commissionerate, Bhubaneswar I

During the course of audit, on scrutiny of the ER-2 returns of M/s. Mideast Integrated Steel Ltd., Jajpur, along with relevant sales invoices for the year 2010-11, the audit noticed that the assessee had sold 35,935.740 MT of Pig Iron valued at Rs.75,37,26,703/- and 9701.620 MT of Granulated Slag valued at Rs.34,07,441/- in DTA on payment of duty in terms of Sl.No.2 of notification No.23/2003-CE, dated 31.03.2003 as amended. From the ER-2 returns and the Annual Progress report (APR) submitted to DGFT for the year 2010-11, it appeared that there was neither any physical export nor any deemed export of finished goods during the said year.

Since there has been no export of finished goods by the EOU during the year 2010-11, availment of benefit of payment of duty at concessional rate under notification No.23/2003-CE, dated 31.3.2003 as amended, is not admissible in respect of clearance of finished goods and by-products to DTA. The Sr. No. 2 of Annexure to the said Notification No. 23/2003 dated 31.03.2003 as amended, stipulates that the total value of goods being cleared into the Domestic Tariff Area from the unit does not exceed 50% of the Free on Board value of exports made during the year by the said unit. Hence, the aforesaid irregular availment of the benefit under the

said notification has resulted in a short payment/non- payment of duty to the tune of Rs.2,17,82,343/-.

The audit pointed out that the assessee is liable to pay the said short-paid duty of Rs.2,17,82,343/- along with appropriate interest payable thereon in terms of Section 11A read with Section 11AB (Now Section 11AA) of the Central Excise Act, 1944.

SERVICE TAX

(6) GIST OF OBJECTION: Non payment of Service Tax on Legal Consultancy Charges paid to overseas service providers

COMMISSIONERATE: Central Excise Commissionerate, Rajkot

The assessee is engaged in manufacturing Clinker falling under Chapter 25. During the course of audit it was noticed that the assessee had shown expenditure in foreign currency in the year 2009-10 in their balance Sheet. On further verification it was revealed that the assessee had incurred expenses for receiving legal consultancy from abroad. It was seen that the assessee had paid Rs.246.75 lakh in foreign currency to their overseas advisors. The said services received by the assessee are covered under 'Legal Consultancy Service'. The legal consultancy services were made taxable from 01.09.2009. Further it was learnt that, the said overseas consultants do not have any office or establishment in India and as per Section 66A of the Finance Act, 1994, read with Rule 3(iii) of Taxation of Services Rule 2006 where service is provided by a person who has a usual place of residence, permanent address or a fixed establishment in any country other than India, such Service Tax would be payable by the service receiver in India. Therefore, the assessee is liable to pay Service Tax under reverse charge mechanism on the Legal Consultance Service received by them.

(7) GIST OF OBJECTION : Non payment of Service Tax on Manpower Supply Services

COMMISSIONERATE : Central Excise Commissionerate, Jaipur

The assessee is engaged in manufacturing of Body assembly throttle, Carburetor, Plastic Intake Manifold falling under Chapter 87 & 84. During the course of audit of records of the assessee it is observed that the assessee has some Japanese staff working in their factory. On being asked about the terms and conditions of employment, they produced a copy of the cost reimbursement agreement from which it is evident that the Japanese personal working there are employees of their parent company, who have been deputed to work at the premises of the assessee.

Section 65(68) of the Finance Act, 1994 provides that "Manpower recruitment or supply agency" means any person engaged in providing any service, directly or indirectly, in any manner for recruitment or supply of manpower, temporarily or otherwise, to any other person.

As per Section 65(105)(k) of the Finance Act, 1994 - "any service provided or to be provide to any person, by a manpower recruitment or supply agency in relation to recruitment or supply of manpower, temporarily or otherwise in any manner is Taxable Service" and Service Tax is payable on it under Section 66 of the Finance Act, 1994.

In the instant case the agreement showing the arrangement between the parent company and the assessee clearly shows the Secondment of employees from parent company to the assessee and the act is squarely covered under Manpower recruitment or supply agency Services.

The Salary, Bonuses, Traveling and all other expenses made payable to the seconded employees during the period of their Secondment to the assessee shall be paid by parent company to the seconded employees. Thus, the salary to the seconded employees is being paid by parent company and not by the assessee. From the agreement it is amply clear that the employees seconded by parent company to the assessee are in all capacities employees of parent company. However, their expenses are being paid by the assessee.

The parent company of the assessee in Japan has sent / supplied their Manpower to the company in India for which they have received payment in Japan. A part of the amount has been paid to the employees in India for their well being. Thus, the assessee has received services of Manpower recruitment and supply from parent company.

As per facts and circumstances enumerated above the assessee is liable to pay Service Tax under the provisions of Section 66A (1) of the Finance Act, 1994 in as much as in terms of Sub-Section (2) of Section 66A of the act *ibid* where a person is carrying on business through a permanent establishment in India and through another permanent establishment in a country other than India, such permanent establishment shall be treated as separate for the purpose of this Section.

From the above it is amply clear that the assessee had received Services of manpower Recruitment and Supply from the company not having permanent address or usual place of residence in India. Thus, the assessee is liable to pay Service Tax under manpower Recruitment and Supply Agency Services in terms of Section 66A of the Finance Act, 1994. Thus Service

Tax along with interest is recoverable under Section 73 and 75 of the Finance Act, 1994 from the assessee.

(8) GIST OF OBJECTION : Non payment of Service Tax on token charges income under “Other Port Services”

COMMISSIONERATE : Service Tax Commissionerate, Ahmedabad

During the course of audit, it was seen that assessee had generated income and reflected the same under the general ledger head “Miscellaneous income” during the year 2007-08 and 2008-09. The miscellaneous income shown in ledgers of 2007-08 and 2008-09 was found to be Rs.9,69,78,389/- and Rs.21,17,67,680/- for the financial year 2007-08 and 2008-09 respectively. The examination of various heads of miscellaneous income revealed that a sum of Rs.1,20,66,200/- and Rs.59,11,757/- for the financial year 2007-08 and 2008-09 respectively was related to “Token Fee” collected for various cargo trucks entering into port of Beletery.

It is noted from the copy of sample “token slip” issued by assessee to the trucks/Lorries entering into port of Beletery that they were allowed to unload cargo at the given place in the port area after obtaining the Token Slip on payment of Token fee.

The term “Port Service” is defined in Section 65(82) of the Finance Act, 1994 as follows:

“Port Service” means any service rendered by a port or other port or any person authorized by such port or other port, in any manner, in relation to a vessel or goods”.

Hence, the assessee is liable to pay Service Tax on the amount collected as “Token Fee”.

(9) GIST OF THE OBJECTION : Wrong availment of CENVAT Credit on capital goods

COMMISSIONERATE : Central Excise Commissionerate, Ranchi

During the course of audit, on scrutiny of records it was observed by the auditors that the assessee is a registered unit under the category of Mining Services[Section 65(105)(zzzy) of the Finance Act, 1994.] and GTA[Section 65(105)zpp of the Finance Act, 1994.] and provided services to a Transport Company at Dhanbad in respect of removal of overburden,

extraction and transportation of coal to Patherdih Washeries and railway siding, allotted by M/s BCCL, Dhanbad. The assessee availed CENVAT Credit as reflected by them in their ST- 3 Returns filed for the half year ended March,2010 and started paying Service Tax from the month of May-2011 onwards, on receipt basis through Cash and CENVAT Credit as well. They took capital goods CENVAT Credit against the Central excise duty paid on Volvo make "Tippers" falling under Chapter 87.

Months	Irregular credit taken against cent rid this excise duty (including Cess) paid on "Tippers" in (Rs)
Feb – 10	4640353
Mar – 10	5747697
Total	10388050

It was also observed that "**Tippers**", falling under Chapter 87 of the First Schedule to the Central Excise Tariff Act. 1985 registered in the name of providers of output service for providing "Mining of Mineral. Oil or Gas Services" were brought within the ambit of capital goods since **22/6/2010; vide notification No.25/2010 - Central Excise(NT)**, dated **22/06/2010**. On the other hand, the said Tippers were already kept out from the definition of inputs as laid down in rule 2 of the CENVAT Credit Rules, 2004.

It was further observed that similar kind of issue was decided by the Hon'ble CESTAT. New Delhi in the case of **CCE v.Surya Roshni Ltd.** as reported in [(2003) 155 Et T 481 (CESTAT)] and upheld by the Hon'ble **Supreme Court** [2003(158) ELT A273] wherein it was held that eligibility of CENVAT Credit on capital goods is required to be decided on the basis of eligibility on the date when goods were received in the factory. Subsequent eligibility does not revive the question of admissibility.

Therefore, the audit is of the view that prior to 22/06/2010, the assessee were not entitled to take the benefit of credit against central excise duty paid on Tippers.

Hence, the credit of Rs.1,03,88,050/- is liable to be recovered from the assessee.

(10) GIST OF OBJECTION : Non payment of Service Tax on Renting of Immovable Property

COMMISSIONERATE : Service Tax Commissionerate, Kolkata III

The auditors at the time of desk review observed an income of (i) ₹ 40, 01, 361/- in the year 2008- 09 (ii) Rs.35,27,840/- in the year 2009-10 (iii) Rs.16, 50,780/- during 2010-11 recorded in the Balance Sheet for 2008-09, 2009-10 and 2010-11 as 'conversion charge'. This point was taken up for verification during the course of Audit.

On scrutiny of the relevant records, it was revealed that the aforesaid amount represents amounts collected from a job worker who was found to have used the assessee's Foundry premises for the purpose of job work of other parties in addition to job work for the assessee. It thus follows that the assessee had actually let / leased the portion of their manufacturing premises for job work. Therefore, it appears that the activity of the assessee is nothing but letting / leasing / licencing of "immovable property" for use in course of furtherance of business or commerce as per Section 65 (90a) of the Finance Act, 1994.

Income on account of above terms comes under the perview of 'Renting of Immovable Property Service' in terms of Section (65) (105) (zzzz) of the Finance Act, 1994. On being pointed out by the auditors, the assessee paid the Service Tax along with interest of Rs.39,217/-.

(11) GIST OF THE OBJECTION : Non- payment of Service Tax on Job work

COMMISSIONERATE : Central Excise Commissionerate, Mumbai-II

During the course of audit, it was noticed that the assessee had entered into contract for the job work with the various companies, for an activity described by assessee as **repair or maintenance service**. On verification of their books of accounts, it was noticed that the assessee was paying the Service Tax only on those contracts which are entered with HPCL Mumbai. On other contracts which are entered with other companies such as HPCH Hyderabad, IOCL Panipat, Gail and Madras Refinery Ltd, the assessee is not paying Service Tax. Further, the assessee has not declared the income of these contract / jobwork to the Service Tax department.

Thus, the assessee suppressed the fact from the department with intent to evade payment of Service Tax. On being pointed out, by the audit during the course of EA-2000 Audit, the liability of Service Tax of Rs. 27,60,452/- for the period 2010-11 and 2011-12 (upto 31st Jan 2011) was paid by the assessee on 24.02.2011 through CENVAT Credit debit entry no. 130 to 135 along with the interest of Rs.3,07,908/- vide GAR challan dtd. 2.03.2012 and 03.03.2012.

(12) GIST OF THE OBJECTION: CENVAT Credit Availed on Invoices received from Associated Enterprises before making payment- Pre-matured availment & Interest for early availment

COMMISSIONERATE : Service Tax Commissionerate, Bangalore

The assessee is paying brand royalty / management fees to its parent company for using its brand name. As per an agreement the assessee is liable to pay an amount equivalent to 3.5% per annum plus the statutory taxes on total turnover of their company as per audited accounts. The parent company raises a debit note annually on 31st of March of the financial year towards management service for the said year which also indicated Service Tax at the appropriate rate.

On receipt of the invoice from the said service provider they are availing the Cenvat even before making the payment of Service Tax. On a further scrutiny of the Management Fees Ledger *Alc*, it was observed that they were not making the full payment but are staggering the payment for the full next financial year.

Prior to 1.4.2011, the provisions of sub Rule (7) of Rule 4 of the CENVAT Credit Rule, 2004 are as follows:

"(7) The CENVAT Credit in respect of input services shall be allowed, on or after the day which payment is made of the value of input services and the Service Tax paid or payable as is indicated in invoice, bill or as the case may be, "

After 1.4.2011 The provisions of sub Rule (7) of Rule 4 of CENVAT Credit Rule, 2004 is as follows:-

The CENVAT Credit in respect of input service shall be allowed, on or after the day on which the invoice, bill or, as the case may be, challan referred to in rule 9 is received.

Provided further that in case the payment of the value of input service and the Service Tax paid or payable as indicated in the invoice, bill or as the case may be, challan referred to in rule 9 is not made within the three months of the date of the invoice, bill or the case may be, challan, the manufacturer or the service provider who has taken credit on such input service, shall pay an amount equal to the CENVAT Credit availed on such input service and in case the said payment is made, the manufacturer or output service provider, as the case may be shall be entitled to take the credit of the amount equivalent to the CENVAT Credit paid earlier subject to the other provisions of these rules.

It appears that in violation of the above provisions the assessee have availed the

CENVAT Credit pertaining to the services received from the above said Associated Enterprise even before making payment of the consideration and Service Tax. The Cenvat wrongly availed before making payment is Rs.26,40,550/-. Also for pre-mature availment they are also liable to pay interest of Rs.12,84,469/-.

On being pointed out by the audit the assessee has partially accepted the audit observation and reversed the CENVAT Credit of Rs.26,40,550/- but not paid the interest, claiming that they have not utilized the availed credit.

(13) GIST OF THE OBJECTION: Short Payment of Service Tax on CSMC Services on account of availing adhoc abatement from the value of taxable service

COMMISSIONERATE : Central Excise Commissionerate, Pondicherry

During the course of audit it was noticed that Comprehensive service and Maintenance (CSMC Services) contract was being rendered, which involves both supply of material and provision of services.

On perusal of the invoices raised for this service, it was revealed that the assessee has charged Service Tax only on 20% of the total value of the consideration charged for this service and had paid VAT on the balance 80% of the consideration.

However, sale value can be excluded from the taxable amount only if the conditions mentioned in notification No.12/2003-ST, dated 20th June 2003 are complied with. i.e., only when the assessee has 'sold' goods and materials to the recipient of service and produces documentary evidence for the same. The material value (80%) excluded by the assessee is nothing but the cost of consumables used in providing the service. In the absence of any documentary evidence to prove any sale of goods in the subject case, ad hoc exclusion of 80% of the value for the purposes of computation of Service Tax is not in order. Hence, the entire consideration for the services including the value of material cost is to be charged for Service Tax.

The Service Tax payable works out to Rs.5,52,67,269/- which is payable alongwith interest.

(14) GIST OF THE OBJECTION : Nonpayment of Service Tax on charges collected for car parking, construction, catering services and import of franchisee services

COMMISSIONERATE : Central Excise Commissionerate, Noida

The assessee had collected charges in respect of car parking in the course of rendering of service under the category of construction of residential complex but has not paid Service Tax amounting to Rs.45,00,000/- on the same which is recoverable from them along with interest.

The assessee had hosted Formula 1 Grand Prix of India motor racing event at its circuit at Budha International Circuit, Gr. Noida. The unit had given contract for catering and collected commission from the contractors. The unit has not paid Service Tax amounting to Rs.5,00,000/- on the commission which is recoverable from it along with interest.

For hosting the same event, the unit had entered into an agreement with Formula One World championship Ltd. (FOWC) which is foreign based company. As per the agreement the unit paid Rs.197 crore to FOWC for the rights to host, stage and promote the motor racing event as Formula 1 Indian Grand Prix. The activity is well covered under the taxable service category of commercial use or exploitation of event defined under Section 65 (105) (zzzzr). The activity is also well covered under the taxable service category of Franchise service defined under Section 65 (105) (zze). Applying the provisions of classification given under Section 65 A of the Finance Act' 1994, the said activity should be classified under the latter category, i.e. Franchise Service. Also, since FOWC is a foreign based company, the liability to pay Service Tax is on the unit as per the provisions under Section 66 A of the Finance Act, 1994. As per the party ledger the amount of Rs.197 crore was paid to FOWC on 28.10.2011. Accordingly, the assessee should have paid Service Tax by 05.11.2011 but it has failed to do so. Therefore, Service Tax on Rs.197, 70, 15, 716.00 is recoverable from the unit along with interest.

**Quarterly Audit Performance Index (API) of the Central Excise Commissionerates
for the Q.E. June, 2012**

Sr.No.	Commissionerate	Detection per Audit (Rs. In Lakhs)	Recovery per Audit (Rs. In Lakhs)	No of MCMs held during QE June 2012	Audit Performance Index (API) for QE June 2012	Relative Ranking
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	Allahabad	832.53	46.31	3	58.91	1
2	Hyderabad-IV	12.31	14.73	3	51.44	2
3	Chennai-IV	11.59	9.80	3	45.95	3
4	Panchkula	4.21	4.21	3	37.42	4
5	Bhubaneswar- I	2.61	1.25	3	36.75	5
6	Delhi-IV	2.56	4.11	3	35.52	6
7	Ahmedabad-I	5.13	2.15	3	34.37	7
8	Bangalore-III	1.17	1.23	5	31.55	8
9	Kolkata-I	0.85	1.01	3	31.33	9
10	Vadodara-I	13.62	11.93	2	31.02	10
11	Jammu & Kashmir	1.48	1.48	3	30.97	11
12	Goa	0.78	0.78	3	30.96	12
13	Hyderabad-I	2.15	2.01	3	30.67	13
14	Rohtak	0.62	0.81	3	30.51	14
15	Jalandhar	1.60	1.45	3	29.80	15
16	Hyderabad-III	1.89	1.67	3	29.32	16
17	Delhi-I	2.03	1.78	3	29.22	17
18	Siliguri	0.67	0.60	3	28.86	18

Sr.No.	Commissionerate	Detection per Audit (Rs. In Lakhs)	Recovery per Audit (Rs. In Lakhs)	No of MCMs held during QE June 2012	Audit Performance Index (API) for QE June 2012	Relative Ranking
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19	Kolkata-III	545.65	1.64	3	28.47	19
20	Pune-III	15.01	8.92	3	27.62	20
21	Ludhiana	1.63	1.28	3	27.30	21
22	Bhubaneswar- II	9.04	5.97	3	27.12	22
23	Surat-II	6.07	4.20	2	26.56	23
24	Gauwahati	12.99	10.60	1	25.90	24
25	Kolkata-IV	117.17	0.70	3	24.62	25
26	Madurai	5.38	3.77	2	24.61	26
27	Nasik	2.11	1.72	2	24.40	27
28	Coimbatore	1.46	0.95	3	24.29	28
29	Ahmedabad-III	2.05	1.23	2	23.30	29
30	Hyderabad-II	0.53	0.53	0	22.92	30
31	Kolkata-VI	0.02	0.02	1	22.70	31
32	Meerut-II	2.74	1.50	3	22.58	32
33	Daman	2.58	1.60	2	22.44	33
34	Bangalore-II	5.81	2.99	3	22.33	34
35	Mumbai-I	4.13	3.46	1	22.06	35
36	Bangalore-I	54.33	7.38	3	22.04	36
37	Pune-I	3.83	1.88	3	21.90	37

Sr.No.	Commissionerate	Detection per Audit (Rs. In Lakhs)	Recovery per Audit (Rs. In Lakhs)	No of MCMs held during QE June 2012	Audit Performance Index (API) for QE June 2012	Relative Ranking
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
38	Mumbai-V	1.18	0.83	2	21.80	38
39	Pondicherry	153.27	2.71	3	21.74	39
40	Chennai-III	3.98	2.04	3	21.70	40
41	Delhi-II	1.44	0.74	3	21.15	41
42	Raigad	8.69	3.33	3	20.92	42
43	Ahmedabad-II	8.41	3.19	3	20.83	43
44	Mysore	0.13	0.25	0	20.24	44
45	Rajkot	5.44	2.22	3	19.80	45
46	Trivandrum	1.16	0.49	2	19.06	46
47	Chennai-II	8.63	2.41	3	18.81	47
48	Chandigarh -I	0.44	0.18	3	18.78	48
49	Thane-I	12.20	2.30	3	18.61	49
50	Bolpur	1.60	1.15	1	18.43	50
51	Raipur	15.39	4.07	3	18.00	51
52	Vapi	7.04	1.83	2	17.97	52
53	Ghaziabad	7.83	2.29	3	17.79	53
54	Salem	2.48	0.86	3	17.78	54
55	Jaipur-II	24.47	4.81	3	17.31	55
56	Kanpur	0.41	0.15	3	17.27	56

Sr.No.	Commissionerate	Detection per Audit (Rs. In Lakhs)	Recovery per Audit (Rs. In Lakhs)	No of MCMs held during QE June 2012	Audit Performance Index (API) for QE June 2012	Relative Ranking
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
57	Noida	48.63	3.06	3	17.25	57
58	Thane-II	17.77	2.31	2	16.982	58
59	Visakhapatnam - II	52.27	3.90	3	16.979	59
60	Bhavnagar	7.30	1.79	3	16.81	60
61	Bhopal	159.12	2.54	3	16.72	61
62	Tiruchirappalli	20.65	3.60	3	16.66	62
63	Vadodara-II	3.74	1.00	3	16.62	63
64	Kolkata-II	0.88	0.53	1	16.43	64
65	Jaipur-I	7.83	1.57	3	16.27	65
66	Aurangabad	1.39	0.37	3	15.88	66
67	Belapur	64.08	2.45	3	15.85	67
68	Mumbai-II	132.96	3.50	3	15.68	68
69	Cochin	3.55	0.83	3	15.26	69
70	Delhi-III	9.48	1.25	3	14.74	70
71	Lucknow	169.63	0.84	3	14.72	71
72	Tirupathi	45.01	2.41	3	14.40	72
73	Jamshedpur	2.94	0.58	3	14.34	73
74	Shillong	46.67	3.05	3	14.32	74
75	Chennai I	3.29	0.59	3	14.23	75

Sr.No.	Commissionerate	Detection per Audit (Rs. In Lakhs)	Recovery per Audit (Rs. In Lakhs)	No of MCMs held during QE June 2012	Audit Performance Index (API) for QE June 2012	Relative Ranking
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
76	Guntur	18.81	3.40	2	13.90	76
77	Belgaum	61.68	1.83	2	13.57	77
78	Calicut	2.76	0.80	2	13.38	78
79	Visakhapatnam - I	24.94	0.67	3	13.21	79
80	Kolkata-V	7.37	0.54	3	12.81	80
81	Ranchi	117.79	3.12	2	12.03	81
82	Meerut-I	3.30	1.28	1	11.95	82
83	Mumbai-III	4.82	0.28	3	11.76	83
84	Nagpur	30.38	0.40	3	11.55	84
85	Indore	14.20	0.45	3	11.41	85
86	Kolhapur	7.24	2.03	1	10.78	86
87	Dibrugarh	9.34	0.04	3	10.35	87
88	Mangalore	2.08	0.00	3	10.07	88
89	Patna	6.71	0.53	2	8.68	89
90	Surat-I	83.81	0.99	1	7.28	90
91	Haldia	12.04	0.93	1	5.73	91
92	Tirunelveli	0.76	0.07	1	5.22	92

{Note:-(i)As the %age Recovery to Detection in Col. No, 11 against S. Nos.2,6,8,9,14 and 44 is more than 100%, their respective performance in Col. No. 12 have been restricted to maximum of the 0 to 20 percentile. (ii) Kolkata- VII Commissionerate did not conduct any audit of Central Excise units in this quarter. Hence no API ranking could be generated for them.}

Audit Performance Index (API gradings-Service Tax only) of the exclusive Service Tax Commissionerates and Composite Central Excise Commissionerates (Central Excise + Service Tax) for the Q.E. June, 2012

Sr.No.	Commissionerate	Detection per Audit (Rs. In Lakhs)	Recovery per Audit (Rs. In Lakhs)	No of MCMs held during QE June 2012	Audit Performance Index (API) for QE June 2012	Relative Ranking
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	Hyderabad-III	208.44	173.98	0	52.58	1
2	Visakhapatnam - I	22.36	7.04	3	43.47	2
3	Mumbai ST I	73.72	67.51	3	41.85	3
4	Delhi ST	387.37	37.10	3	37.30	4
5	Rajkot	17.94	36.18	3	36.26	5
6	Allahabad	7.16	14.45	3	32.84	6
7	Bangalore ST	378.63	12.90	3	32.44	7
8	Noida	9.29	9.29	3	31.96	8
9	Hyderabad-IV	8.37	8.37	3	31.70	9
10	Raigad	3.03	10.21	3	31.66	10
11	Vadodara-II	5.05	5.05	3	31.03	11
12	Trivandrum	7.16	6.93	2	30.85	12
13	Pondicherry	4.11	4.11	3	30.81	13
14	Hyderabad-II	362.45	7.71	3	30.69	14
15	Jalandhar	2.51	2.97	3	30.62	15
16	Chennai-III	0.63	0.63	3	30.13	16
17	Vapi	1.52	1.48	3	29.70	17
18	Visakhapatnam-II	3.18	2.97	3	29.31	18

Sr.No.	Commissionerate	Detection per Audit (Rs. In Lakhs)	Recovery per Audit (Rs. In Lakhs)	No of MCMs held during QE June 2012	Audit Performance Index (API) for QE June 2012	Relative Ranking
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19	Panchkula	1.15	1.09	3	29.16	19
20	Ludhiana	7.67	6.71	3	28.92	20
21	Goa	7.12	5.98	3	28.12	21
22	Daman	6.34	6.34	2	27.95	22
23	Surat-I	2.62	3.39	2	27.49	23
24	Chandigarh -I	8.96	7.04	3	27.31	24
25	Ahmedabad-III	10.95	8.27	2	27.08	25
26	Shillong	3.34	2.55	3	25.89	26
27	Hyderabad-I	26.06	15.55	3	25.77	27
28	Meerut-II	1.29	0.99	3	25.69	28
29	Coimbatore	4.19	3.11	3	25.65	29
30	Nasik	3.87	3.49	2	25.54	30
31	Kolhapur	17.40	16.20	1	25.27	31
32	Vadodara-I	7.54	4.61	3	25.07	32
33	Tirupathi	2.50	1.78	3	24.90	33
34	Bhubaneswar-I	27.94	2.99	3	24.83	34
35	Gauwahati	2.78	2.78	1	23.91	35
36	Mumbai ST II	22.26	10.91	3	22.54	36
37	Guntur	17.44	11.16	2	22.16	37
38	Siliguri	0.77	0.46	3	21.98	38
39	Mysore	0.82	8.78	0	21.48	39

Sr.No.	Commissionerate	Detection per Audit (Rs. In Lakhs)	Recovery per Audit (Rs. In Lakhs)	No of MCMs held during QE June 2012	Audit Performance Index (API) for QE June 2012	Relative Ranking
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
40	Salem	47.83	13.54	3	20.32	40
41	Aurangabad	2.07	1.03	3	20.24	41
42	Rohtak	1.17	0.58	3	19.98	42
43	Pune-III	21.39	7.87	3	19.63	43
44	Ahmedabad-ST	54.71	18.55	2	19.06	44
45	Chennai ST	23.35	7.66	3	19.03	45
46	Bhubaneswar-II	4.36	1.82	3	18.87	46
47	Tiruchirappalli	14.78	4.95	3	18.25	47
48	Kolkata-ST	122.20	5.75	2	18.10	48
49	Jaipur-II	5.91	2.13	3	17.94	49
50	Cochin	8.83	3.05	3	17.93	50
51	Tirunelveli	5.65	3.83	1	17.85	51
52	Madurai	16.71	7.61	2	17.84	52
53	Jamshedpur	10.49	3.11	3	17.02	53
54	Bolpur	8.60	5.25	1	16.85	54
55	Jaipur-I	15.83	4.07	3	16.66	55
56	Ghaziabad	21.96	4.92	3	16.45	56
57	Dibrugarh	15.90	3.69	3	16.16	57
58	Indore	17.24	3.96	3	16.12	58
59	Pune-I	41.65	5.96	3	16.03	59
Sr.No.	Commissionerate	Detection per Audit (Rs. In Lakhs)	Recovery per Audit (Rs. In Lakhs)	No of MCMs held during QE June 2012	Audit Performance Index (API) for QE June 2012	Relative Ranking

Sr.No.	Commissionerate	Detection per Audit (Rs. In Lakhs)	Recovery per Audit (Rs. In Lakhs)	No of MCMs held during QE June 2012	Audit Performance Index (API) for QE June 2012	Relative Ranking
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
60	Belgaum	77.18	3.61	2	15.67	60
61	Nagpur	43.05	2.10	3	13.65	61
62	Kanpur	3.22	0.53	3	13.52	62
63	Patna	98.05	3.30	2	13.35	63
64	Bhopal	26.28	1.95	3	13.17	64
65	Calicut	12.06	2.82	2	12.69	65
66	Ranchi	76.99	2.81	2	12.17	66
67	Lucknow	37.92	0.26	3	12.16	67
68	Mangalore	8.25	0.26	3	11.13	68
69	Bhavnagar	2.94	0.09	3	10.79	69
70	Meerut-I	14.59	2.00	1	7.21	70
71	Haldia	14.18	1.50	1	6.55	71

{Note:-(i)As the %age Recovery to Detection in Col. No, 11 against S. Nos. 5,6,10,15,23 and 39 is more than 100%, their respective performance in Col. No. 12 have been restricted to maximum of the 0 to 20 percentile.

(ii) Surat-II and Raipur Commissionerates did not conduct any audit of Service Tax assesseees in this quarter. Hence no API ranking could be be generated for them. }

Disclaimer

The compilation is based upon the audit reports approved in the monthly Monitoring Committee Meetings (MCM) sent through the zonal Additional Directors General (Audit). In case of any doubts about the Audit Objections reported herein, the concerned Commissionerate may be contacted.