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ORAL RULING
(By Sirpurkar J)

Heard Shri Kuryan Thomas, Advocate for the applicant and Sh. Ranjan
Khanna for the department. This matter is covered by our previous ruling reported in
2015 (40) STR 393 AAR. In that case we had the occasion to consider the input
services and whether cenvat credit can be taken on input services. We had held that
cenvat credit can be taken for input services. The matter is absolutely similar if not
identical to the questions that we have answered in that ruling. We, accordingly hold
that the applicant would be entitled to the expenses meant for input services and would
be entitled to the cenvat credit only in respect of the input services.

One more argument was made by Shri Khanna to the effect that in the cases of
M/s Bharati Airtel Vs Commissioner of Central Excise Act, Pune-III, Bomaby High Court
and also Indus Tower (Tribunal) Larger Bench-2016-TIOL-539 which has been decided
by this Tribunal. The view was taken that the inputs which are embedded to earth are not the goods and hence they cannot become capital goods. Sh. Khanna reiterates that the analogy is applicable to this matter also as pipeline is embedded and therefore cannot be the input. It is pointed out that in those cases the term “input services” was not for consideration, the term for consideration was only “input”. We are quite convinced that input is different from input service. This being a major difference, those rulings will not be applicable to the present case where we have considered the terminology “input service”. We, therefore, reject the arguments of Shri Khanna.
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