

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

I.A. NOS.8-10 IN CIVIL APPEAL NOS.3460-3462 OF 2004

COMMNR. OF CENTRAL EXCISE, GOA & ANR. Appellant (s)

VERSUS

M/S. FUNSKOOL (INDIA) LTD. & ANR Respondent(s)

(For rectification of order passed earlier and office report)

Date: 25/01/2010 These Matters were called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.H. KAPADIA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AFTAB ALAM

For Appellant(s) Mr. H.P. Raval,ASG.
Mr. T.V. Ratnam,Adv.
Mr. D. Mohta,Adv.
Mr. B. Krishna Prasad,Adv.

For Respondent(s)/ Mr. M. Chandrasekharan,Sr.Adv.
Applicant(s) Mr. K.R. Nambiar,Adv.

UPON hearing counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

IA Nos. 8 - 10 of 2009 in Civil Appeal Nos.
3460-3462 of 2004 stand allowed.

Accordingly, the Civil Appeals filed by the
Department are allowed with no order as to costs.

[T.I. Rajput] [Madhu Saxena]
A.R.-cum-P.S. Court Master

[Signed Reportable order is placed on the file]

REPORTABLE

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

I.A. Nos. 8-10 of 2009 in
CIVIL APPEAL NOS. 3460-3462/2004

The Commissioner of Central Excise,
Goa & Anr.

... Applicant (s)

Versus

O R D E R

1. In view of factual errors committed through oversight in stating particulars of items in dispute (though there is no mistake in recording findings/conclusion), we recall our order dated 12th November, 2009 in Civil Appeal Nos. 3460-3462 of 2004 in the case of Commissioner of Central Excise, Goa & Anr. v. M/s. Funskool (India) Ltd. & Anr. ("FIL" for short).

Accordingly, IA Nos. 8 - 10 of 2009 in Civil Appeal Nos. 3460-3462 of 2004 stand allowed.

2. By consent, Civil Appeal Nos. 3460-3462 of 2004 are taken up for hearing and disposed of.

3. By our judgment dated 12th November, 2009, in the case of M/s. Pleasantime Products and Anr. v. Commissioner of Central Excise, Mumbai - I [Civil Appeal Nos. 4309-4311

....2/-

- 2 -

of 2008], this Court held that the product "Scrabble/Upwords" is classifiable under CSH 9504.90 of the First Schedule to the Central Excise and Tariff Act, 1985. The said CSH 9504.90 comes under CH 95.04 which refers to "Articles for funfair, table or parlour games, including pintables, billiards, special tables for casino games and automatic bowling alley equipment". In the afore-stated judgment, we have taken the view that the product "Scabble/Upwords" falls under CH 95.04 and we have rejected the argument of the assessee that the said product fell under CSH 9503.00 which refers to the words "other toys; reduced-size models; puzzles of all kinds". The decision in the case of M/s. Pleasantime Products (supra) was given on 12th November, 2009. On that day, the connected matter was M/s. FIL (supra).

4. The appeal filed by the Department in the case of M/s. FIL (supra) dealt with 34 items (and not with 12 items as mentioned in our order dated 12th November, 2009, which is now recalled). We may state that three out of 34 items dealt with Scrabble/Upwords, Monopoly, Snake and Ladder. Applying our judgment in the case of M/s. Pleasantime Products (supra), we hold that the said three items, namely, Snake and Ladder, Monopoly and Scrabble/Upwords stand classifiable under CH 95.04 of Central Excise and Tariff Act, 1985.

5. Subject to the question of limitation, we have discussed hereinafter, we remit the case to the Tribunal with the request to examine as to whether each of the remaining 31 items would stand covered by CSH 9504.90 or

...3/-

- 3 -

by CSH 9503.00. For that purpose, the Tribunal needs to apply the tests which we have enunciated in our judgment in the case of M/s. Pleasantime Products (supra).

6. Now, coming to the question of limitation, we are of the view that, on facts and circumstances of this case, in respect of first show-cause notice dated 23rd November, 2001, the claim of the Department has got to be confined to the period after October, 2000, and that too, if at all the decision on merits in the matter of classification goes against the assessee.

As regards second show-cause notice dated 1st May, 2001, the said notice is within limitation and, therefore, the Department would be at liberty to proceed in accordance with law.

7. Before concluding, we may clarify that we have

recalled our order dated 12th November, 2009 only to bring about clarity in our order. We could have corrected our order easily by incorporating the correct number of items. However, we thought it best to recall the order and to re-dictate the said order for the sake of clarity.

8. Accordingly, the Civil Appeals filed by the Department are allowed with no order as to costs.

.....J.
[S.H. KAPADIA]

.....J.
[AFTAB ALAM]

New Delhi,
January 25, 2010.