INDIRECT TAX WEEKLY DIGEST

18 July 2023

www.bdo.in

GOODS & SERVICES TAX

LEGISLATIVE UPDATES

PRESS RELEASE

RECOMMENDATIONS MADE BY THE GST COUNCIL IN ITS 50TH MEETING HELD ON 11 JULY 2023

The 50th GST Council meeting was held on 11 July 2023, wherein, various recommendations concerning amendments in the provisions of the Central Goods and Services Tax Act, 2017, Integrated Goods and Services Tax Act, 2017 and Central Goods and Services Tax Rules, 2017 were proposed. The Council also recommended clarifications and changes in GST rates[1].

[Press Release dated 11 July 2023]

EXCISE/ SERVICE TAX

JUDICIAL UPDATES

ONCE THERE IS A SUBSEQUENT JUDGMENT OVERRULING AN EARLIER JUDGMENT, THE EARLIER JUDGMENT CANNOT BE REOPENED OR REVIEWED BASED ON THE SUBSEQUENT JUDGMENT

Historical Background

- In the case of ***Modi Rubber Ltd. & Anr. Vs. Union of India & Ors. [(1986) 4 SCC 66]***, it was held the expression 'duty of excise' cannot be given a broader meaning to include any other duty levied other than the basic excise duty, and hence, the assessee was allowed exemption only in respect of basic excise duty.
- The Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***SRD Nutrients Pvt. Ltd. Vs. CCE [(2018) 1 SCC 105]*** gave a decision contrary to the aforesaid judgement (and without considering the decision in ***Modi Rubber Ltd. (supra)***), holding that where payment of excise duty (ED) is exempt under the Central Excise Act, 1944 (CE Act), the Education Cess (EC) and Secondary and Higher Education Cess (SHEC) is also exempted. Against this, the Tax Authorities had filed a review petition filed before the Hon'ble Supreme Court which was dismissed.
- Subsequently, the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Unicorn Industries Vs. Union of India [(2020) 3 SCC 492]*** overruled the decision in ***SRD Nutrients Pvt. Ltd. (supra)*** holding that exemption from ED granted under a Notification would not exempt the assessee from the payment of EC, and hence, the assessee would not be entitled to claim refund of EC. It was also observed that the decision in SRD Nutrients Pvt. Ltd. (supra) and Bajaj Auto Ltd. Vs. Union of India [2019 (19) SCC 801] were rendered without considering the earlier ruling in Modi Rubber Ltd. (supra) and hence, they are per incuriam. Further, it was also observed that any refund granted to the assessee pursuant to the decision in SRD Nutrients Pvt. Ltd. (supra) was invalid.
- Given that the aforesaid ruling had overruled the earlier ruling in ***SRD Nutrients Pvt. Ltd. (supra)***, the Tax Authorities filed an application in the said matter before the Hon'ble Supreme Court seeking directions for modification of its earlier ruling in ***SRD Nutrients Pvt. Ltd.*** (supra). The two-member Division Bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, vide Order dated 27 September 2021 (Reference Order) directed that since all the three judgements viz., ***Modi Rubber Ltd. (supra)***, ***SRD Nutrients Pvt. Ltd (supra)*** and Unicorn Industries (supra) have been rendered by a three-judge bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, the present application should also be placed before a three-member Bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, after obtaining appropriate directions from the Hon'ble Chief Justice.

Our analysis of the Press Release can be accessed here.

Facts of the case

- Pursuant to the decision in ***SRD Nutrients Pvt. Ltd. (supra)***, M/s. Saraswati Agro Chemicals Pvt. Ltd. (Taxpayer) had filed an application to claim a refund of EC and SHEC paid by the Taxpayer in cases where the goods were exempted from the levy of ED, which was rejected by the Tax Authorities.
- Pursuant to the above, the Taxpayer filed an appeal before the Appellate Authority which was dismissed. Against this, the Taxpayer filed an appeal before the CESTAT which was allowed based on the decision in ***SRD Nutrients Pvt. Ltd. (supra)***, and the Tax Authorities were directed to refund the EC and SHEC paid by the Taxpayer.
- Subsequently, the Taxpayer obtained a refund from the Tax Authorities. Thereafter, the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Unicorn Industries (supra)***, overruled its earlier decision SRD Nutrients Pvt. Ltd. (supra). Based on the above, the Tax Authorities had filed an appeal before the Hon'ble Jammu and Kashmir High Court wherein the question raised before the Hon'ble High Court was whether the Taxpayer is liable to return EC and SHEC on the changed view of law as subsequently laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Unicorn Industries (supra)***, overruling ***SRD Nutrients Pvt. Ltd. (supra)*** basis which the EC and SHEC was refunded to the Taxpayer.
- The Hon'ble High Court dismissed the appeal filed by the Tax Authorities and held under:
  - Since the Taxpayer has been held entitled to the refund of EC and SHEC based on the decision in ***SRD Nutrients Pvt. Ltd. (supra)*** which was in vogue at the relevant time, the Tax Authorities are not entitled to make recovery based on a subsequent decision in ***Unicorn Industries (supra)***.
  - If such an action is permitted, it will open a Pandora's box and the lis between the parties which had attained finality will never come to an end.
- Aggrieved by the aforesaid ruling, the Tax Authorities filed a Special Leave Petition before the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

Contentions by the Tax Authorities

- The present matter is connected to the matter in respect of which, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has issued a Reference Order and hence, the outcome of the said matter would follow in the present case.
- If a judgment is overruled by this Court by a subsequent judgment, then the overruled judgment will have to be reopened and on reopening the said judgment will have to be brought in line with the subsequent judgment which had overruled it.

Observations and Rulings by the Hon'ble Supreme Court

- ***Pursuant to the decision in Unicorn Industries (supra)*** which had overruled the decision in ***SRD Nutrients Pvt. Ltd. (supra)***, the assessee who had paid ED and EC was not entitled to a refund of EC which had been paid. Further, where refund is made pursuant to the judgement in SRD ***Nutrients Pvt. Ltd. (supra)*** was no longer valid.
- There does not exist any requirement to refer the decision in ***SRD Nutrients Pvt. Ltd. (supra)*** to a larger Bench, for the following reasons:
  - The Miscellaneous Application filed by the Tax Authorities seeks for a second review of the aforesaid judgement which is impermissible under the Order XLVII, Rule 9 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (CPC) considering that the Review Petition filed by the Tax Authorities against the aforesaid judgement was dismissed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court.
  - As regards the contention of the Tax Authorities concerning reopening of a judgement after it being overruled, the same is impermissible in law for the following reasons:
    - There has to be finality in litigation and the same is in the interest of the legislature.
    - A person cannot be vexed twice for the same cause.
    - A judicial decision must be accepted as correct.
- In light of the above, Explanation to Order XLVII, Rule 1 of the CPC stipulates that once there is a subsequent judgement overruling an earlier judgement on a point of law, the earlier judgement cannot be reopened or reviewed on the basis of a subsequent judgement.
- The Hon'ble High Court has rightly answered the question raised before it by holding that a subsequent decision (i.e., ***Unicorn Industries (supra)***) cannot have a bearing on the past decisions which had attained finality although they had followed an earlier judgement (i.e., ***SRD Nutrients Pvt. Ltd. (supra)***) which was subsequently overruled. Otherwise, a pandora's box would be opened and there would be no end to litigation, which is against public policy.
- The Reference Order seeks to reopen the matters which have attained finality and hence, the same was unnecessary.
- In light of the above, the Special Leave Petition filed by the Tax Authorities is dismissed, and the order passed by the Hon'ble High Court is upheld.

  [Commissioner of CGST & Central Excise, J&K Vs M/s. Saraswati Agro Chemicals Pvt. Ltd., [2023-VIL-66-SC-CE], dated 4 July 2023]

BOUQUET OF SERVICES RELATING TO PROCUREMENT AND SUPPLY OF GOODS FOR WHICH CONSIDERATION IS ONLY PAYABLE BY THE RECIPIENT CANNOT BE CLASSIFIED AS INTERMEDIARY SERVICES

Facts of the case

- M/s. SNQS International Pvt. Ltd. (Trading Division) (Taxpayer) is inter alia engaged in the provision of a bouquet of services relating to design and product development, evaluation, vendor engagement and other related services (Services) to its customer situated outside India for which, it receives remuneration as a fixed percentage of FOB value of merchandise exported.

- The Taxpayer filed an application for claiming a refund of erroneously paid Service tax on Business Auxiliary Service (BAS) during the period October 2014 to November 2015. However, during the verification of the claim, it was observed that the Taxpayer is engaged in facilitating the procurement and supply of goods to its customer.
- Accordingly, a Show Cause Notice (SCN) was issued to the Taxpayer alleging that the Taxpayer had provided intermediary services to its customers in respect of which, the place of provision of service would be the location of service provider (Rule 9 of the Place of Provision of Service Rules, 2012 (PPS Rules)). Considering the above, the services provided by the Taxpayer would be leviable to Service tax and hence, the refund application is unsustainable.
- The Adjudicating Authority confirmed the aforesaid SCN and rejected the aforesaid refund application. Against this, the Taxpayer filed an appeal before the First Appellate Authority, which had also upheld the aforesaid order (Impugned Order).
- Aggrieved by the above, the Taxpayer filed an appeal before the CESTAT.

Contentions by the Taxpayer

- The services provided by the Taxpayer can either be classified as BAS or as Support Services of Business or Commerce (SSBC) for the following reasons:
  - Services rendered by the Taxpayer were in relation to the procurement of goods and hence, can be classified as auxiliary support services.
  - 'Procurement' is a business process while 'purchase' is a business activity, being one of the elements of the procurement process. The process of 'procurement' cannot be treated as synonymous with 'purchase'.
  - Some of the services are classifiable as BAS under 'procurement of goods for the customer', but not under 'services of a commission agent', which is only limited to transactions of purchase or sale of goods and does not cover the business process of procurement.
  - While certain services provided by the Taxpayer are classifiable as BAS, the Taxpayer also renders some other services which would fit into the description of SSBC.

  While the services provided by the Taxpayer merit classification under both BAS and SSBC, the services should be classified as SSBC being a more specific entry than BAS.
- Reliance was placed on ***Fifth Avenue Vs. CST, Chennai [2009 (15) STR 387 (Tri.-Chennai)], Fifth Avenue Sourcing Pvt. Ltd. Vs. CST, Chennai [2014 (34) STR 291 (Tri.-Chennai)] and GECAS Services India Pvt. Ltd. Vs. CST, New Delhi [2014 (36) STR 556 (Tri.-Del.)]*** wherein the issues involved were identical to the present case.
- Relying on ***M/s. Provincial Lifestyle Retail Services Vs. CCE, Nagpur [2014 (36) S.T.R. 305 (Tri. - Mumbai)]***, it was submitted that the mode of quantification of remuneration for the services rendered by them is not relevant for the determination of the description of services, but only the activities performed are relevant for arriving at the appropriate description of services.
- In respect of the services provided to the customer, the place of service ought to be determined as per the general rule viz., Rule 3 of the PPS Rules which provides that the place of provision of service would be the location of the recipient of service (i.e., outside India). As a result, the transaction in the present case would be treated as an 'export of service' and hence, the Taxpayer would be entitled to claim a refund of Service tax which was paid erroneously.

Contentions by the Tax Authorities

- The decisions relied upon by the Taxpayer pertain to the period prior to 1 July 2012 and hence, the same are inapplicable to the present case which pertains to October 2014 to November 2014 i.e., after the introduction of the negative regime and would be governed by the PPS Rules.
- The Taxpayer arranges or facilitates the supply of goods by its customer in respect of which, the remuneration is paid as a percentage of the FOB value of merchandise exported by the customer. As a result, the services provided by the Taxpayer can be classified as 'intermediary services' under Rule 2(f) of the PPS Rules.
- As per Rule 9 of PPS Rules, the place of provision of the service provided by the Taxpayer would be the location of the service provider i.e., in India. As a result, the Taxpayer has correctly discharged Service tax in the present case and the same is not liable to be refunded.

Observations and Ruling of the CESTAT

- The Taxpayer is providing a comprehensive bouquet of services like designing and product development including creating new patterns and graphics that are shared with the customers and arrangement of pre-production samples to the foreign client for approval, quality monitoring, providing logistics and operational assistance for export of cargo till it reaches destination. Consideration/ remuneration for the above service is computed as a percentage of the FOB value of merchandise exported by the customer which is received in convertible foreign exchange.
- **Classification of the services – BSS or SSBC**: The services provided by the Taxpayer would be more appropriately classifiable as SSBC on account of the following:
  - BAS are general in nature as compared to SSBC.
  - The Taxpayer's services are not limited to that of a commission/ buying agent since the services provided by the Taxpayer are not limited to procurement and dispatch but include a wide range of services from the stage of designing to testing and quality monitoring and getting the goods manufactured till the final exports including assistance in transportation and dispatch of goods.
  - The decisions in Fifth Avenue (supra), Fifth Avenue Sourcing Pvt. Ltd. (supra) and GECAS Services India Pvt. Ltd. (supra) relied upon by the Taxpayer are squarely applicable to the present case.
- **Whether the services provided by the Taxpayer can be classified as 'intermediary services'**: The services are not provided as an 'intermediary' for the following reasons:

- The Taxpayer is providing services of design and product development essentially for its foreign client to keep track of updates in fashion trends in knitted goods, evaluation and development of customers including quality monitoring and logistics and operational assistance.
- By the amendment to the definition of 'intermediary' under Rule 2(f) of PPS Rules, a commission agent i.e., a buying and selling agent for the supply of goods has also been included as an intermediary.
- A perusal of the definition of 'Intermediary' under Rule 2(f) of POPS Rules clarifies that:
  - The words 'broker' and 'agent' have been used synonymously though there is a fine difference between a broker and a commission agent, and the term 'intermediary' has to be analysed as per the facts of every case.
  - There are two supplies which take place in a transaction involving an 'intermediary' viz., (i) supply between the principal and the third party, and (ii) supply of the intermediary's service to its principal.
- In the present case, there is only one supply of service by the Taxpayer to the principal i.e., the customer which is on the Taxpayer's account. A service provider and service recipient relationship between the Taxpayer and the vendors engaged by it (who would supply goods to the customer) does not exist as no consideration is paid by the vendors engaged to the Taxpayer and the supply of goods by such vendors is incidental to the Taxpayer's services.
- Further, the Taxpayer has not entered into any agreement with the vendors engaged either on their own account or on behalf of the Client.
- The Taxpayer has not engaged any other service provider in the procurement process of the goods exported to the Client. All the services are rendered to the Client only on Taxpayer's own account for which the Taxpayer receives consideration.
- The decision of ***GoDaddy India Web Services Pvt. Ltd. [2016 (46) STR 806 (AAR)]*** is squarely applicable to the facts of the present case.

- **Whether the services are to be treated as an export of services:** The services provided by the Taxpayer must be treated as an 'export of services' for the following reasons:
  - It is undisputed that all the conditions (except the condition pertaining to the place of provision of service)provided under Rule 6A of Service Tax Rules, 1994 (ST Rules) are satisfied in the present case.
  - Based on the aforesaid analysis, the services provided by the Taxpayer would be classified as SSBC. In respect of such service, the place of provision would be determined as per the general rule i.e., Rule 3 of the PPS Rules and Rule 9 of PPS Rules would not apply in the present case. Accordingly, the place of provision of service in the present case would be the location of the recipient of service which is outside India. Thus, satisfying the condition concerning the place of provision of service as provided under Rule 6A of the ST Rules stands satisfied.
- In light of the above, the appeal filed by the Taxpayer is allowed, and the Impugned Order is set aside.

  [M/s. SNQS International Pvt. Ltd. (Trading Division) Vs. CCE & ST, Coimbatore, [2023-VIL-578-CESTAT-CHE-ST], dated 23 June 2023]

INSTRUCTIONS

INSTRUCTION TO INFORM THE CUSTOMS OFFICIALS REGARDING THE AMENDMENT IN IMPORT POLICY CONDITION OF CIGARETTE LIGHTERS

The CBIC has issued an instruction informing the Customs officials that the import of Cigarette Lighters is now prohibited in cases where the CIF value is less than INR 20 per lighter as per Notification no:15/2023 dated 29 June 2023[2] issued by DGFT.

[Instruction no:21/2023-Customs dated 5 July 2023]

FOREIGN TRADE POLICY (FTP)

JUDICIAL UPDATES

THE TERM 'MANUFACTURE' IN THE CONTEXT OF 'DEEMED EXPORT' UNDER THE EXIM POLICY HAS A WIDE INTERPRETATION

Facts of the case

- M/s. XOMOX Sanmar Ltd. (Taxpayer) is inter alia engaged in the manufacture of industrial valves. The Taxpayer received a purchase order from M/s. Thyssenkrupp (customer) for the supply of industrial valves to be made to Special Economic Zone (SEZ) unit.
- Since the customer was in possession of advance authorisation, the Taxpayer had imported inputs without payment of Customs Duty under the Advance Authorisation scheme. This scheme was subject to the condition that imported inputs must be used for 'manufacture'.
- In this regard, the Tax Authorities sought information pertaining to operational/ manufacturing activities carried out by the Taxpayer which was duly furnished. Subsequently, the Tax Authorities rejected the Taxpayer's stance and communicated that the items imported and ultimately exported were the same and there was no manufacturing activity involved that brought into existence a new product with a distinct name and identity.
- Subsequently, the aforesaid communication was confirmed by the Deputy Director of Foreign Trade and Convenor Norms Committee I. Pursuant to the above, the Tax

Our analysis of the Notification can be accessed here.

Authorities demanded customs duty along with interest in respect of the Advance Authorisation claims, which have been paid by the Taxpayer under protest.

- While the Taxpayer had further filed a representation, the same was rejected confirming the position that no manufacturing activity was involved in the present case and hence, the advance authorisation benefit has been rightly rejected (Impugned Order).
- Aggrieved by the above, the Taxpayer filed a Writ Petition before the Hon'ble Madras High Court.

Contentions by the Taxpayer

- After import, the industrial valves undergo various processes including the fitting of indigenously procured actuators, gearboxes and subsequent assembly.
- There is a process of hydro-testing and re-assembly to meet customer-specified technical standards, pursuant to which, the manufacturing process attains completion and valves would be given to customers for inspection.
- The aforementioned process render valves commercially fit for use. Further, the definition of 'manufacture' under the Export-Import Policy (EXIM Policy) includes processes like testing.
- Therefore, the activities carried out by the Taxpayer would fall within the definition of the term 'manufacture'. In this regard, reliance was placed on various decisions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the context of the interpretation of the phrases viz., 'in relation to', 'means' and 'includes' to support its contention.

Contentions of the Tax Authorities

- The Taxpayer had concurrently received three orders which had rejected its contention that the aforesaid process would be covered under the purview of the term 'manufacture'. Further, the Taxpayer's contention regarding the use of indigenous items for fitting into industrial valves is factually incorrect.
- As regards hydro-testing, the imported valves were already subjected to the said process in the country of its manufacture under the Indian Boiler Regulations. Even if it is assumed that the Taxpayer has conducted the said process once again, it would not amount to manufacture.

Observations and Rulings by the Hon'ble High Court

- It is undisputed that the imported valves are mounted with electric actuators, and subsequently, limit switches are fixed after fabrication and welding to the imported valves, post which, they are re-assembled, tested, packed and shipped to the SEZ unit.
- Neither the Impugned Order nor the counter filed by the Tax Authorities examines whether the processes carried out by the Taxpayer are tantamount to 'manufacture'.
- The scope of supply as per the Purchase Order is inclusive of packaging and forwarding as per the technical specifications of the customer. Further, to comply with the technical specifications, the Taxpayer is mandated to undertake testing activity.
- The definition of 'manufacture' in Para 9.6 of the Exim Policy is wide and exclusive. In this regard, the phrases 'in relation to', 'means' and 'includes' have been interpreted as under:
  - The phrase 'in relation to' has been interpreted to be one of the widest amplitude.
  - The word 'includes' is an inclusive definition and expands the meaning.
  - The expressions 'means' and 'includes' indicates the legislative intent to extend the definition to bring in various other persons/ activities that would otherwise be excluded.
- The fact that 'testing' of the goods is included in the ambit of 'manufacture' and since admittedly, such testing is carried out by the Taxpayer, this would suffice to entitle the claim under the Advance Authorisation scheme.
- In the present case, the inclusion of various activities in the latter part of the definition of 'manufacture' creates a deeming fiction to expand the ambit of the term 'manufacture'. By including processes such as refrigeration, re-packing, polishing, labelling, re-conditioning, repair, remaking, refurbishing, testing, calibration and re-engineering within the ambit of manufacture itself, the legislature clearly intended an expansive understanding of what constituted 'manufacture' for the purposes of 'deemed export'.
- The argument that both the imported and sold product remains the same i.e., valves, is not valid because the condition of the emergence of a commercially distinct commodity is satisfied by the activity of inspection and testing, which falls within the purview of 'manufacture'. Reliance was placed on ***Flex Engineering Ltd. Vs. Commissioner of Central Excise [AIR 2012 SC 1219]***.
- It is not necessary that the end product must be unrecognisable from the inputs that constitute it as long as the process carried out would satisfy the statutory definition of 'manufacture'.
- Irrespective of procurement and addition (of indigenous goods) to the imported inputs, the process of testing the valves prior to final supply would suffice to satisfy the definition of 'manufacture' under Para 9.36 of the Exim Policy.
- Reliance was placed on ***Commissioner Vs. Hewlett Packard India Sales Pvt. Ltd. [2011 (4) TMI 1281 – Karnataka High Court]***, wherein it was held that the process of testing, repacking, and relabeling of imports would satisfy the definition of 'manufacture' under the Foreign Trade Policy. However, the Tax Authorities have filed SLP against the aforesaid matter which is admitted and the same is currently pending before the Hon'ble Supreme Court.
- In view of the above, the matter is remanded back to the Tax Authorities to reconsider whether the Taxpayer added any indigenous products to the imported industrial valves and accordingly pass a fresh decision.

  [M/s. XOMOX Sanmar Ltd. Vs. The Director General of Foreign Trade, [TS-325-HC-2023(MAD)-FTP], dated 6 June 2023]

LEGISLATIVE UPDATES

NOTIFICATION

REVISION OF GENERAL NOTES REGARDING IMPORT POLICY UNDER SCHEDULE I, ITC(HS), 2022

The General Notes (Para 4(D)) concerning Import Policy under Schedule I, ITC(HS), 2022 has been amended to incorporate relevant details pertaining to Food Import Entry Points in line with the notifications issued by FSSAI.

[Notification no:18/2023 dated 10 July 2023]

AMENDMENT IN IMPORT POLICY CONDITION OF GOLD

The import policy of gold covered under ITC(HS) Codes 71131911, 71131919 and 71141910 is revised from 'Free' to 'Prohibited'. However, the import of gold covered under HS Code 7113191 is permitted freely without an import license under a valid India-UAE Comprehensive Economic Partnership Agreement Tariff Rate Quota (TRQ).

[Notification no:19/2023 dated 12 July 2023]

PUBLIC NOTICE

AMENDMENT IN ITC(HS) CODES UNDER INDIA-AUSTRALIA COOPERATION AND TRADE AGREEMENT (ECTA)

The ITC (HS) codes for Cotton under India-Australia ECTA TRQ have been revised in line with Notification no:38/2023-Customs dated 23 May 2023[3]. Accordingly, TRQ of cotton shall be considered for HS Codes 52010024 and 52010025 (i.e., cotton of minimum 28 mm staple length), substituting the earlier HS Code 52010020.

[Public Notice no:21/2023 dated 10 July 2023]

CONDONATION OF DELAY IN SUBMISSION OF INSTALLATION CERTIFICATE UNDER EPCG SCHEME

- With a view to promoting Ease of Doing Business, it has been decided to regularise delays in furnishing installation certificates under the Export Promotion Capital Goods (EPCG). Accordingly, the Regional Authorities (RA) may accept installation certificates under the EPCG Scheme up to 31 December 2023 along with a late fee of INR 10,000 per authorisation (in addition to composition fee, wherever applicable), subject to the following conditions:
  - The authorisations have been issued under FTP, 2009-14 and 2015-20.
  - Installation certificate has been obtained within the prescribed period but the same could not be submitted to the RA within the prescribed time.
  - The authorisation holder has given bonafide reasons for a delay in furnishing the installation certificate to RA.
  - The subject EPCG authorisation is not under investigation/ adjudicated by RA/ Customs Authority/ any other investigating agency.

  [Public notice no:22/2023 dated 13 July 2023]

TRADE NOTICE

RELEASE OF CURRICULUM FOR SKILLING AND MENTORSHIP OBLIGATION FOR STATUS HOLDERS

The DGFT has issued a Trade Notice in reference to Para 1.30(b) of FTP 2023 states that a model training program with a minimum duration of 6 weeks would be made available in the public domain for guidance. Accordingly, the curriculum for the industry-led skilling and mentorship initiative has been notified in the Annexure to the Trade Notice.

[Trade Notice no:14/2023-24 dated 12 July 2023]

NEWS FLASH

"28% GST on online gaming 'unconstitutional', will lead to job losses, say industry experts"

https://www.businesstoday.in/technology/news/story/28-gst-on-online-gaming-unconstitutional-will-lead-to-job-losses-say-industry-experts-389294-2023-07-12

[Source: Business Today, 12 July 2023]

"F&B sold at cinemas to attract 5% GST, industry welcomes move"

https://economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/economy/policy/fb-sold-at-cinemas-to-attract-5-gst-industry-welcomes-move/articleshow/101690569.cms?from=mdr

[Source: Economic Times, 12 July 2023]

"GST hike on SUVs unlikely to put the brakes on auto sales"

https://www.financialexpress.com/business/express-mobility-gst-hike-on-suvs-unlikely-to-put-a-brake-on-auto-sales-3167352/

[Source: Financial Express, 12 July 2023]

"GST Appellate Tribunal rules to be out by August 1"

https://cfo.economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/tax-legal-accounting/gst-appellate-tribunal-rules-to-be-out-by-august-1/101689790

[Source: Economic Times, 12 July 2023]

Our summary of this notification can be here.

ABOUT BDO GLOBAL

BDO is a leading professional services organisation and are global leaders of the mid-tier, with a presence in 160+ countries and over 111,300 people working out of more than 1,800 offices. We endeavor to deliver an exceptional client experience through a tailored solutions approach, while partnering with our employees and clients globally.

ABOUT BDO IN INDIA

BDO in India offers Assurance, Tax, Advisory, Business Services & Outsourcing and Digital Services for both domestic and international clients across industries. The team at BDO in India consists of over 7,500 professionals led by more than 270 partners and directors operating out of 18 offices, across 12 key cities.

CONTACT US

For any content related queries, you may please write to the service line experts at taxadvisory@bdo.in

For any other queries or feedback, kindly write to us at marketing@bdo.in

BDO IN INDIA OFFICES

Ahmedabad
The First, Block C – 907
Behind ITC Narmada, Keshavbaug
Vastrapur, Ahmedabad 380015, INDIA

Bengaluru - Office 1
Prestige Nebula, 3rd Floor,
Infantry Road,
Bengaluru 560095, INDIA

Bengaluru - Office 2
SV Tower, No. 27, Floor 4
80 Feet Road, 6th Block, Koramangala
Bengaluru 560095, INDIA

Chandigarh
Plot no. 55, Floor 5,
Industrial & Business Park,
Phase 1, Chandigarh 160002, INDIA

Chennai
No. 443 & 445, Floor 5, Main Building
Guna Complex, Mount Road, Teynampet
Chennai 600018, INDIA

Coimbatore
Pacom Square, Floor 3, 104/1, Sakthi
Main Road, Bharathi Nagar, Ganapathy
Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu – 641 006

Delhi NCR - Office 1
The Palm Springs Plaza
Office No. 1501-10, Sector-54,
Golf Course Road, Gurugram 122001, INDIA

Delhi NCR - Office 2
Windsor IT Park, Plot No: A-1
Floor 2, Tower-B, Sector-125
Noida 201301, INDIA

Goa
701, Kamat Towers
9, EDC Complex, Patto Plaza
Panaji, Goa 403001, INDIA

Hyderabad
1101/B, Manjeera Trinity Corporate
JNTU-Hitech City Road, Kukatpally
Hyderabad 500072, INDIA

Kochi
XL/215 A, Krishna Kripa
Layam Road, Ernakulam
Kochi 682011, INDIA

Kolkata
Floor 4, Duckback House
41, Shakespeare Sarani
Kolkata 700017, INDIA

Mumbai - Office 1
The Ruby, Level 9, North West Wing
Senapati Bapat Marg, Dadar (W)
Mumbai 400028, INDIA

Mumbai - Office 2
601, Floor 6, Raheja Titanium, Western
Express Highway, Geetanjali, Railway
Colony, Ram Nagar, Goregaon (E),
Mumbai 400063, INDIA

Mumbai - Office 3
Floor 20, 2001 & 2002 - A Wing, 2001 F
Wing, Lotus Corporate Park, Western
Express Highway, Ram Mandir Fatak Road,
Goregaon (E) Mumbai 400 063, INDIA

Mumbai - Office 4
The Ruby, Level 9, South East Wing
Senapati Bapat Marg, Dadar (W)
Mumbai 400028, INDIA

Pune - Office 1
Floor 6, Building No. 1
Cerebrum IT Park, Kalyani Nagar
Pune 411014, INDIA

Pune - Office 2
Floor 2 & 4, Mantri Sterling, Deep Bunglow,
Chowk, Model Colony, Shivaji Nagar
Pune 411016, INDIA

Visit us at www.bdo.in