

M/s. Punjab Khandsari-Udyog, Sonapat v. State (Tuli, J.)

giving of selection grade is entirely within the power of the Management and the Labour Court had no jurisdiction to interfere with the exercise of such a managerial function. Thus, as earlier observed, this contention too has no merit.

(17) No other point was urged.

(18) For the reasons recorded above, this petition fails and is dismissed. But in the circumstances of the case I make no order as to costs.

D.K. Mahajan, J.—I agree.

B.R. Tuli, J.—I also agree and have nothing to add.

K.S.K

FULL BENCH

*Before D. K. Mahajan, Bal Raj Tuli and Prem Chand Jain, JJ.*

M/S. PUNJAB KHANDSARI UDYOG, SONEPAT,—*Petitioner.*

*versus.*

STATE,—*Respondent.*

**General Sales Tax Reference 9 of 1970.**

April 25, 1972.

*Punjab General Sales Tax Act (XLVI of 1948)—Section 5(2) (a) (ii), second proviso—Punjab General Sales Tax Rules (1949)—Rule 26—Dealer purchasing gur tax-free for manufacturing khandsari, a tax-free item—Such purchase made on the basis of registration certificate granted under rule 26—Dealer using the gur for the manufacture of khandsari only—Whether liable to pay sales-tax on the purchase of gur—Second proviso to section 5(2) (a) (ii)—Whether applicable.*

*Held*, that where a dealer purchases gur free of tax on the basis of registration certificate granted under Rule 26 of the Punjab General Sales Tax Rules 1949, for manufacture of khandsari and does not use the gur for any purpose other than the manufacture of the khandsari, the second proviso to section 5(2) (a) (ii) of the Punjab General Sales Tax Act is not attracted. He cannot be made liable for the payment of sales tax on the purchase of gur because he does not use that gur for any purpose other than that for which it was sold to him. It is quite a different matter that the dealer was not entitled to purchase free of tax gur for the manufacture

of tax-free goods like *khandsari*, but as he did not use that *gur* for any other purpose the second proviso to section 5(2)(a)(ii) has no application. There is no other provision of the Act under which the State can assess the dealer to tax on the purchase price of *gur* which was purchased by him for the manufacture of *khandsari* on the basis of its certificate of registration and declaration in form S. T. XXII. The selling dealer may not be entitled to claim deduction for the sale turnover of *gur* sold tax-free for the manufacture of *khandsari* from his gross turnover and if he claims such deduction, it can be disallowed by the assessing authority but the purchasing dealer of *gur* cannot be made liable for the payment of tax to the State Government as the selling dealer is liable to the Government to pay tax on his sale turnover of *gur*. If the selling dealer has defaulted in collecting the tax from the purchasing dealer, he may have a cause of action against the latter but not the State Government. The State Government cannot act on behalf of the selling dealer and cannot invoke the provisions of the second proviso to section 5(2)(a)(ii) of the Act for collecting sales tax from the purchasing dealer. (Para 8)

*Case referred by the Division Bench of this Hon'ble High Court consisting of Hon'ble Mr. Justice D. K. Mahajan and Hon'ble Mr. Justice P. C. Jain on 9th February, 1972 to a Larger Bench for opinion of an important question of law involved in the case. The Larger Bench consisting of Hon'ble Mr. Justice D. K. Mahajan, Hon'ble Mr. Justice Bal Raj Tuli and Hon'ble Mr. Justice Prem Chand Jain finally disposed of the Case on 25th April, 1972.*

*Reference made under Section 22 of the Punjab General Sales Tax Act to this Hon'ble High Court for decision of the below noted important questions of law arising out of the order of the Court of Shri S. K. Chhibber, Sales Tax Tribunal, Haryana, dated 28th November, 1969, in S. T. A. No. 55 of 1969-70 for the Assessment year 1965-66 :—*

No. I. "Whether in the circumstances and on the facts of the case, the provision of second proviso to section 5(2)(a)(ii) of the Act were rightly invoked to tax purchase value of *Gur* (Rs. 4,50,780.53 paise)? .

No. II. Whether having regard to the admitted fact that 100 quintals of *Gur* yielded 38 quintals of *khandsari* and 62 quintals of molasses and the provisions of the Second proviso to section 5(2)(a)(ii) of the Act, tax can be levied only on 38 per cent of the purchase value of *Gur* purchased on the strength of the Registration Certificate and consumed in the process of manufacturing *Khandsari*?"

M. S. JAIN, J. L. GUPTA AND G. C. GARG, ADVOCATES, for the petitioner.

C. D. DEWAN, ADDITIONAL ADVOCATE-GENERAL, HARYANA, for the respondent.

M/s. Punjab Khandsari Udyog, Sonapat v. State (Tuli, J.)

---

JUDGMENT

B. R. Tuli, J.—This reference came up for hearing before my learned brethren, Mahajan and Jain, JJ., on February 9, 1972, when the learned counsel for the petitioner relied on a Division Bench judgment of this Court in *The State of Haryana and another v. M/S Karnal Gur and Khandsari Industries, Chulkana Road, Smalkha Mandi, District Karnal* (1). Since the correctness of that decision was doubted, the matter was directed to be heard by a Full Bench and that is how this reference has been placed before this Bench for decision.

(2) The petitioner M/s. Punjab Khandsari Udyog, Sonapat, is registered as a dealer under the Punjab General Sales Tax Act (hereinafter referred to as 'the Act') and it carried on the business of manufacture and sale of *Khandsari* during the year 1965-66. A certificate of registration was issued to the petitioner by the assessing Authority on April 21, 1965, certifying that the petitioner had been registered as a dealer under the Act, its business was "manufacture of *Khandsari*" and the sales of Gur, Shakar and Khand and some other goods to it (a) for purposes of manufacture and (b) for resale, would be free of tax. On the basis of this certificate the petitioner purchased *gur* for the manufacture of *Khandsari* without paying any sales-tax thereon.

(13) The assessment of the petitioner under the Act for the year 1965-66 was made by the Assessing Authority Rohtak, by order dated May 18, 1968, in which it was stated that the petitioner had been manufacturing *Khandsari* "which is tax-free goods after purchasing *gur* against registration certificate. He is, therefore, liable to pay tax under second proviso, section 5 (2) (a) (ii) of the Act." The Assessing Authority was of the opinion that section 7 of the Act read with section 5(2)(a)(ii) clearly lays down that "a dealer is entitled to make purchases of goods on the strength of registration certificate for manufacture of goods other than tax-free goods." After setting out the relevant provisions of sections 5 and 7, it was held that since the petitioner had purchased *gur* for the manufacture of *Khandsari*—tax-free goods—it was liable to pay sales tax under the second proviso to section 5(2)(a)(ii) of the Act. The value of *gur* which was purchased by the petitioner against its registration certificate and was used in the manufacture of *Khandsari* was determined as Rs. 5,00,741.00 on which sales-tax at 6 per cent amounting

---

(1) L.P.A. No. 313 of 1970 decided on 5th October, 1970.

to Rs. 30,044,46, was assessed. Against the order of assessment, the petitioner filed an appeal in which it was held that the petitioner could not purchase *gur* for the manufacture of *Khandsari* without paying sales tax thereon, but since it manufactured both *Khandsari* (tax-free goods) and molasses (taxable goods), it was liable to pay tax on the purchase value of the *gur* to the extent of the manufacture of *Khandsari* out of it which was 38 per cent only, the molasses accounting for the remaining 62 per cent. The petitioner was thus held liable to pay sales tax on Rs. 1,71,296.00 which represented 38 per cent of the purchase value of the *Gur* determined as Rs. 4,50,780.53 instead of Rs. 50,074.00. On this amount sales tax at 6 per cent amounting to Rs. 10,277.76 was levied. The order of assessment was accordingly modified and the appeal was accepted in part on July 19, 1968. The Excise and Taxation Commissioner, Haryana *suo motu* took action under section 21(1) of the Act and issued notice to the petitioner to show cause why the order of the Appellate Authority should not be revised. After hearing the petitioner, the Excise and Taxation Commissioner decided that the tax should be levied not on 38 per cent of the purchase value of the *gur* but on the market value of 38 quintals of *Khandsari* out of every 100 quintals of *gur* purchased and setting aside the order of the Appellate Authority remanded the case to the Assessing Authority for fresh assessment on the basis indicated by him. This order was passed on May 9, 1969, and against that order the petitioner filed an appeal before the Sales Tax Tribunal, Haryana. The tribunal set aside the order of the Excise and Taxation Commissioner and restored the original order passed by the Assessing Authority holding the petitioner liable to tax on the purchase value of the entire quantity of *gur* purchased free of tax. The Assessing Authority was directed to recalculate the tax on that basis. This order was passed on July 23, 1969, and feeling aggrieved, the petitioner filed an application under section 22(1) of the Act for referring to this Court certain questions of law mentioned in the application. The learned Sales Tax Tribunal accepted that application by order dated November 28, 1969, and referred the following questions to this Court for decision :—

“(I) Whether in the circumstances and on the facts of the case, the provisions of second proviso to section 5(2)(a) (ii) of the Act were rightly invoked to tax purchase value of *gur* (Rs. 4,780.53 Ps) ?

(II) Whether having regard to the admitted fact that 100 quintals of *gur* yielded 38 quintals of *khandsari* and 62

M/s. Punjab Khandsari Udyog, Sonapat v. State (Tuli, J.)

quintals of molasses, tax under the provisions of the second proviso to section 5(2)(a)(ii) of the Act, can be levied only on 38 per cent of the purchased value on the *gur* purchased on the strength of the registration certificate and consumed in the process of manufacturing *khandsari*.”

(4) That reference came up for hearing before Mahajan and Sandhawalia, JJ., on January 8, 1970, and it was returned to the Tribunal for drawing up a proper statement of the case for reference to this Court. Consequently the Tribunal submitted a fresh statement of the case on August 10, 1970.

(5) Before us the learned counsel for the petitioner sought to argue that *khandsari* is not tax-free goods as it is not ‘sugar’ within the meaning of entry 62 in Schedule B to the Act and there was thus no misuse of the registration certificate. But before the departmental authorities, it was the common case of both the parties that *khandsari* was included in the term ‘sugar’ and was exempt from the payment of sales tax and no tax was levied on the sale turnover of *khandsari*. There is, therefore, no scope for the argument that *khandsari* is taxable goods and not tax-free goods and there was no misuse of the registration certificate by the petitioner.

(6) Section 5(2)(a)(ii) of the Act, as was in force in 1965-66, read as under :—

“5(2) In this Act the expression ‘taxable turnover’ means that part of a dealer’s gross turnover during any period which remains after deducting therefrom—

(a) his turnover during that period on—

(i) the sale of goods declared tax-free under section 6;

(ii) sales to a registered dealer of goods other than sales of goods liable to tax at the first stage under sub-section (I-A) declared by him in a prescribed form as being intended for resale in the State of Punjab or sale in the course of inter-State trade or commerce or sale in the course of export of goods out of the territory of India or of goods specified in his certificate of registration for use by him in the manufacture in Punjab

of any goods, other than goods declared tax-free under section 6, for sale in Punjab and on sales to a registered dealer of containers or other materials for the packing of such goods :

Provided that in case of such sales, a declaration duly filled up and signed by the registered dealer to whom the goods are sold and containing prescribed particulars on a prescribed form obtained from the prescribed authority, is furnished by the dealer who sells the goods :

Provided further that when such goods are used by the dealer to whom these are sold for purposes other than those for which these were sold to him, he shall be liable to pay tax on the purchase thereof at such rate, not exceeding the rate of tax leviable on the sale of such goods, as the State Government may by notification direct in respect of a class of dealers specified in such notification, notwithstanding that such purchase is not covered by clause (ff) of Section 2."

(7) Section 7 of the Act provides for the registration of dealers according to which no dealer liable to pay tax under the Act can carry on business as a dealer unless he has been registered and possesses a registration certificate. Rule 26 of the Punjab General Sales Tax Rules, 1949, relates to the matter mentioned in section 6(2) (a) (ii) of the Act and read as under in 1965-66 :—

"A dealer, who wishes to deduct from his gross turnover the amount in respect of a sale on the ground that he is entitled to make such deduction under the provisions of sub-clause (ii) of clause (a) of sub-section (2) of section 5 of the Act, shall, on demand, produce in respect of such a sale the copy of the relevant cash memo or bill, according as the sale is a cash sale or a sale on credit, and a declaration in writing in Form S.T. XXII by the purchasing dealer or by his agent, that the goods in question are intended for resale in the State of Punjab or such goods are specified in his certificate of registration for use by him in the manufacture in the State of Punjab of any goods for sale."

M/s. Punjab Khandsari Udyog, Sonapat v. State (Tuli, J.)

Form S.T. XXII mentioned in rule 26, as prescribed was in the following terms :—

“FORM S.T. XXII.

Declaration to be furnished by a registered dealer purchasing goods from another registered dealer (See rules 26 and 27-A of the Punjab General Sales Tax Rules, 1949). I . . . . . holder of registration certificate No. . . . . hereby declare that I have purchased the goods hereinafter mentioned for the purpose of :—

- (1) use in the manufacture in the State of Punjab of any goods for sale;
- (2) resale in the State of Punjab; or
- (3) sale in the course of inter-State trade or commerce; or
- (4) sale in the course of export out of territory of India;

and the goods so purchased for the purpose mentioned at (1) above are fully specified in my aforesaid registration certificate.

Description of goods	Quantity	Price	Number and date of cash memo or bill issued by the selling registered dealer	Full signature of the selling dealer
----------------------	----------	-------	--	--------------------------------------

Place.....  
Date .....

Full Signature and complete  
address of the dealer or  
his authorised agent.  
Section

(8) Section 5(2)(a)(ii) of the Act was amended by the Punjab General Sales Tax (Amendment) Act, 1963, (Punjab Act No. 2 of 1963) so as to insert the words “other than goods declared tax-free under section 6 “which were previously not there. That Act came

into force with effect from March 23, 1963, but it appears that the Assessing Authority, Rohtak, who issued the certificate of registration, to the petitioner on April 21, 1965, was not aware of the amendment made by Punjab Act 2 of 1963, and that is why by this certificate of registration the petitioner was permitted to purchase free of tax *gur*, *shakar* and *khand* and some other goods for the manufacture of *khandsari*, which was not permissible under the amended sub-clause (ii) of clause (a) of sub-section. (2) of section 5 of the Act. Either the Assessing Authority did not consider *khandsari* to be sugar and, therefore, tax-free under entry No. 62 in schedule B to the Act or the amendment was not to his knowledge. Rule 26 and from S.T. XXII were also not amended to give effect to this amendment till the Punjab Government issued Notification dated October 8/10, 1966, so as to substitute the words "used in the manufacture in Punjab of any goods, other than goods declared tax free under section 6, for sale in Punjab" for the words "use in the manufacture in the State of Punjab of any goods for sale," in from S.T. VXII. It has' therefore, to be presumed that the declarations furnished by the petitioner to the selling dealers, while purchasing goods from them on the basis of its registration certificate, were in form S.T. XXII before its amendment with effect from October 10, 1966. If, as is argued the petitioner was not entitled to purchase *gur* free of tax on the basis of its registration certificate in view of the amended clause (ii) of section 5(2)(a) of the Act in 1965-66, the selling dealer equally should have satisfied himself as to whether the petitioner was entitled to purchase *gur* for the manufacture of *khandsari* under the provisions of section 5(2)(a)(ii) of the Act as amended and in force in 1965-66, irrespective of the entry in its registration certificate. He should have refused to sell *gur* free of tax to the petitioner for the manufacture of *khandsari* which was tax-free goods. The petitioner did not use *gur*, purchased for the manufacture of *khandsari* on the basis of its certificate of registration and the declarations furnished to the selling dealer (s), for any purpose other than the manufacture of *khandsari*. It cannot therefore, be said that under the second proviso to section 5(2)(a)(ii), set out above, the petitioner could be made liable for the payment of tax on the purchase of *gur* because it did not use that *gur* for any purpose other than that for which it was sold to it. It is quite a different matter that the petitioner was not entitled to purchase free of tax *gur* for the manufacture of tax-free goods like *khandsari* but it did not use that *gur* for any other purpose. To repeat, the *gur* was purchased for the manufacture of *khandsari* and was used



M/s. Punjab Khandsari Udyog, Sonapat v. State (Tuli, J.)

---

for that very purpose. The second proviso to section 5(2)(a)(ii) has, therefore, no application and no other provision of the Act has been brought to our notice under which the State can assess the petitioner to tax on the purchase price of *gur* which was purchased by it for the manufacture of *khandsari* on the basis of its certificate of registration and declarations in form S.T. XXII. It is quite manifest that under section 5(2)(a)(ii), as amended and in force in 1965-66, the selling dealer was not entitled to claim deduction for the sale turnover of *gur* sold to the petitioner tax-free for the manufacture of *khandsari* from his gross turnover and, if claimed, the Assessing Authority should have disallowed it. If the selling dealer has been allowed that deduction, it can be only on the basis that *khandsari* is not tax-free goods. If that be so, then a different interpretation cannot be placed on *khandsari* in the hands of the petitioner. On that basis, the petitioner is not liable to pay any tax on the purchase of *gur*. Looked at from any point of view, the petitioner cannot be made liable for the payment of tax to the State Government on the purchase price of the *gur* because to the Government the selling dealer is liable to pay tax on his sale turnover of *gur* and if he defaulted in collecting the tax from the petitioner, he may have a cause of action against the petitioner but not the State Government. The State Government cannot act on behalf of the selling dealer who is himself an assessee, but the assessing authority could disallow any deduction from his sale turnover, if claimed under section 5(2)(a)(ii) with regard to the sale of *gur* to the petitioner.

(9) This matter was considered by me in *Karnal Gur and khandsari Industries v. The State of Haryana and another* (2), which is printed as appendix to *Fancy Nets and Fabrics v. The State of Punjab and another* (3). The petitioner in that case had been issued a certificate of registration on June 3, 1965, in which it was stated that the petitioner firm was a dealer in *Gur, khandsari, Bardana* etc. and manufacture of *khandsari* and *Gur-sheera* and was entitled to purchase *gur*, fire-wood, *sajji* and lime for the purpose of manufacture of *gur* etc. for resale free of tax. On the basis of that certificate, the petitioner firm purchased *gur* and other goods, some of which were resold and others were used in the manufacture of *khandsari* and *gur-sheera* during the assessment year 1965-66 (from

---

(2) C. W. No. 1287 of 1968 decided on 10th February, 1970.

(3) (1971) 28 S. T. C. 433.

April 1, 1965 to March 31, 1966). For that year the petitioner submitted quarterly returns and paid the tax in accordance with those returns. The Assessing Authority issued notice to the petitioner-firm for assessment purposes under sections 11(2) and 14 of the Act calling upon him to appear before him on March 20, 1968, with particulars regarding the purchase of *gur* and accounts etc. The Assessing Authority was of the view that the petitioner-firm was liable to pay tax on the purchases of *gur* made by it for the manufacture of *khandsari* under the second proviso to section 5(2)(a)(ii) of the Act. The facts of that case were thus identical with the facts of this case and on those facts I observed as under :—

“It is not the case of the respondents in the written statement nor has the Assessing Authority stated in the order of assessment that the petitioner-firm purchased *gur* for some other purpose and used it for the manufacture of *khandsari*. The registration certificate entitled the petitioner-firm to purchase *gur* for the manufacture of *khandsari* and *gur-sheera* free of tax. It cannot, therefore, be said that the petitioner-firm used *gur* purchased for the manufacture of *khandsari* and *gur-sheera* for any purpose other than that for which it was sold to it. There was thus no misuse of the registration certificate by the petitioner-firm when it purchased *gur* free of tax for the manufacture of *khandsari* and *gur-sheera* on the strength of the registration certificate. The proviso to section 5(2)(a)(ii) of the Act has thus no applicability to this case. The dealer or dealers, who sold *gur* to the petitioner-firm on the basis of this registration certificate for the manufacture of *khandsari* and *gur-sheera*, may not be entitled to deduct from its/their gross turnover the value of such sales as *khandsari* is a tax-free goods but the petitioner cannot be held liable to the Sales Tax Department for the payment of sales tax on the purchase of that *gur*. It was open to the seller to realise it from the purchaser, that is, the petitioner, but it is not open to the department to realise it from the purchaser because it is, under the Act, payable only by the seller. The levy of sales tax on the amount of Rs. 1,31,522.31 at the rate of 6 per cent is, therefore, liable to be quashed.”

(10) Against that judgment an appeal under Clause 10 of the Letters Patent *The State of Haryana and another v. M/s Karnal Gur and Khandsari Industries, Chulkana Road, Samalkha Mandi*

M/s. Punjab Khandsari Udyog, Sonapat v. State (Tuli, J.)

*District Karnal* (1), was filed which was dismissed by a Division Bench which expressly affirmed the above-quoted observations made by me. My decision was also approved by another Division Bench of this Court consisting of Mahajan and Gopal Singh, JJ., in *Fancy Nets and Fabrics v. The State of Punjab and another* (3) (supra). We have not been persuaded to hold that those judgments did not decide the matter correctly and with respect we affirm the same.

(11) The learned counsel for the respondents has placed great reliance on a judgment of their Lordships of the Supreme Court in *Modi Spinning and Weaving Mills Co. Ltd. v. Commissioner of Sales Tax, Punjab* (4), which is quite distinguishable on facts. In that case, Modi Spinning and Weaving Mills Co. Ltd. was a registered dealer and on the basis of its registration certificate purchased raw cotton and after ginning it in its ginning mills in Punjab, sent the bales to its weaving mills in Uttar Pradesh for the manufacture of cloth. In computing its taxable turnover the assessee claimed that the purchases of cotton were free of tax under Section 5(2)(a)(ii) of the Act as there was no condition in the certificate of registration granted to it that the cotton purchased under the certificate should be subjected to manufacture in the State of Punjab. After the grant of the certificate, Section 5(2)(a)(ii) of the Act and rule 26 of the Punjab General Sales Tax Rules, 1949, had been amended to provide for that condition. On those facts it was held that the registration certificate was only evidence that the assessee was a registered dealer for purposes of certain commodities to be used in manufacture, one of them being cotton. The old registration certificate, even though it did not contain the words "in the State of Punjab," would stand impliedly modified by the sections, the rule and the form operating together. The assessee had to comply with the Act and the rules and could not take shelter behind the unamended certificate. In that case the assessee company claimed deductions out of its gross turnover under section 5(2)(a)(ii) of the Act which were disallowed with the following observations :—

"There are three conditions involved: the first is that they must be for the use of the dealer; the second is they must be for manufacture in the State of Punjab; and the third is that the manufacture must result in goods for sale. It is not necessary to decide whether the sale should

also be in the Punjab for the reason that no sale as required took place. The exemption could only be claimed if the Company satisfied all the three conditions. The last condition does not appear to be fulfilled in this case. The words "for sale" show the quality of goods and it is clear the goods that are manufactured in the Punjab must be for sale. According to the section the goods which are the result of manufacture must be for sale and not for use by the manufacturer in some manufacture outside the State resulting in different goods. The goods which the Company manufactured in the State of Punjab were bales of ginned cotton and they were admittedly not for sale because they were sent to its spinning and weaving mills in Uttar Pradesh. The exemption, therefore, could not be claimed in view of the fact that all the requirements of the section were not complied with."

(12) In the present case, the petitioner is not claiming any deductions under section 5(2)(a)(ii) of the Act but is resisting its liability to pay tax which has been levied under the second proviso to clause (ii) of section 5(2)(a) of the Act. On the basis of the Supreme Court judgment, all that can be said is that by virtue of the amendment made in section 5(2)(a)(ii) of the Act by Act 2 of 1964, the petitioner could not purchase free of tax *gur* for the manufacturer of *khandsari* on the basis of its certificate which had been wrongly issued to it by the Assessing Authority. In that view of the matter, the selling dealer/dealers should not have sold *gur* to the petitioner free of tax as he/they were also presumed to know the law as much as the petitioner. The facts of *Fancy Nets and Fabrics case* (3) (supra) were similar to the facts of *Modi Spinning and Weaving Mills case* (4) (supra) and while deciding that case the Bench approved of my decision as already stated.

(13) For the reasons given above, our answer to question No. 2 is in the negative, that is, in favour of the assessee and against the department. In this view of the matter question No. 2 does not arise and no answer is therefore, returned to it. Since the matter was not free from difficulty, we leave the parties to bear their own costs.

K. S. K.