

PRESIDENT'S SECRETARIAT (PUBLIC)
AIWAN-E-SADR, ISLAMABAD

Federal Tax Ombudsman Suo Moto Action

REPRESENTATION ORDER OF THE IN COMPLAINT NO. 0043/OM/2019	FILED OF THE	BY FEDERAL	FEDERAL TAX	BOARD OF OMBUDSMAN	OF REVENUE DATED	AGAINST 27.02.2020
---	--------------	------------	-------------	--------------------	------------------	--------------------

Kindly refer to your representation received in this Secretariat on 24.03.2020 on the above subject addressed to the President in the background mentioned below:-

This Representation has been filed by the Federal Board of Revenue (FBR) on 24.03.2020 against the recommendations of the learned Federal Tax Ombudsman (FTO) dated 22.02.2020, whereby it has been held that:

"FBR to-

- (i) direct the Chief Commissioner-IR, RTO-II, Karachi to identify the officials/officers who failed to thoroughly scrutinize the claims of the RP and to recover the inadmissible input tax claimed/adjusted and take disciplinary action against them;
- (ii) initiate appropriate action including criminal proceedings leading to prosecution of RP and recovery of amount swindled from public exchequer through claiming inadmissible input tax; and
- (iii) report compliance within 45 days."

2. It was an Own Motion Investigation initiated by the learned FTO while exercising powers conferred under Section 9(1) of the Federal Tax Ombudsman Ordinance, 2000 to investigate irregularities committed by the FBR field formations in processing and sanctioning of bogus Sales Tax Refunds (STR) during the period 2011-14 identified by the Directorate General I&I-IR of FBR. The "Red Alerts" were issued to the field formations concerned but neither any action was initiated against fake claimants nor their connivers within the Deptt, who were involved in bogus registration, processing and sanctioning of fraudulent refunds and issuance of refund cheques, nor was any action proposed against the related officers/officials of the Bank's Branches, Pakistan Revenue Automation (Pvt.) Ltd (PRAL) Management.

3. In the case of M/s Winner Safety Glass, STRN 1700245256618, a Registered Person (RP) engaged in exporting loather footwear, the investigation conducted by I&I-IR FBR, revealed that:

- i. the RP was sanctioned bogus refund of Rs.22.005 million for tax periods from November 2011 to February 2012 on the basis of invoices for plastic goods and food items.
- ii. the RP claimed refunds on the basis of fake input.

4. Thus, Red Alert was accordingly issued by the Directorate of I&I-IR, Karachi vide letter dated 02.05.2012 for keeping the refund claims pending, till receipt of comments of the field formation on the observations of the Directorate.

5. The Deptt remained unconcerned over such an important anti-Tax evasion exercise carried out by the Directorate I&I-IR which led to serious instances of maladministration on account of certain acts of omission and commission, reflecting improper motives, jeopardizing good governance and transparency in Tax Administration.

6. Comments of the Secretary, Revenue Division, Islamabad were requisitioned. In response thereto, the Commissioner-IR, Zone-IV, RTO-II, Karachi furnished para-wise comments on 16.12.2019. It was averred that case of the RP was transferred from defunct RTO Karachi to RTO-II, Karachi vide FBR's Jurisdiction order dated 21.07.2016. However, while transferring the RP's case record, the defunct RTO Karachi did not send copy of the Red Alert. It was contented that from perusal of electronic data, it revealed that refund claims mentioned in the Red Alert were not processed and RP was blacklisted on 26.04.2013 but restored on 07.06.2013, by the Chief-IR (Automation), FBR, Islamabad.

7. After considering the Department's contention and perusing the record, it was observed by the learned FTO that a country wide investigation against issuance of huge bogus refunds was carried out by the Directorate General of I&I-IR FBR. After painstaking exercise, the Directorate of I&I-IR unearthed number of cases, where fake RPs were registered with the connivance of the staff. The fake RPs claimed on the basis of fake and flying vouchers, bogus refund and in most of the cases got away with fraudulent refund, causing colossal loss to already cash starved exchequer.

8. In the case of RP on the basis of investigation, Red Alert was issued by the Director I&I-IR Karachi vide letter dated 20.05.2012 pointing out certain discrepancies and inconsistencies requiring the Deptt for further investigation and retrieval and initiation of criminal proceedings against the RP for claiming bogus refund of Rs.22.005 million. The Deptt did not grasp gravity of the state of affairs, and kept the RP blacklisted from 26.04.2013 to 07.06.2013 (less than two months and restored on 07.06.2013). No serious effort appeared to have been made for retrieving loss of revenue incurred on account of claim of refund/adjustment of Rs.25.123 million as per refund profile of the RP. Obviously, the registration of unit, processing, sanctioning and issuance of refund was not a simple task but required a team work, involving not only the main beneficiaries of fraudulent refund but also having connivers in the Deptt and Bank Officials who facilitated in opening the fake Bank accounts through which refund cheques were drawn.

SS (70-II)
07-12

Pop
ms
2/12

✓ Dex # 222509-R
07/12/2020

9. On consideration of the matter, the learned FTO issued aforementioned recommendations on 27.02.2020. Hence, the present Representation by the FBR.

10. The hearing of the case has been held on 10.11.2020. Abdul Hameed Anjum, Commissioner-IR, RTO-I and Mr. M. Aslam Sheikh, Additional Commissioner-IR, RTO-I, Karachi have represented the FBR.

11. A thorough perusal and examination of documents on record shows that the concerned officials remained indolent regarding failure to retrieve huge loss of revenue by not initiating action against the culprits. This is evidently a case of gross maladministration where, except suspending the RP, the Deptt had failed to initiate any proceedings for retrieval of bogus refund/input adjustment of Rs.25.132 million pertaining to various tax periods July 2011 to February 2012. It was also strange that the Directorate General of I&I-IR FBR and its filed offices, after conducting such laudable effort of detecting fraudulent activities whereby national exchequer was made to suffer colossal loss of revenue, and issued letters of Red Alerts to the filed formation but did not pursue the matter to its fruition.

12. The objection as to the jurisdiction of the FTO is untenable in as much as a very restricted and narrow interpretation is being put as to the purposes, objects and real scope of the Ordinance XXXV/2000. Section 9(1) empowers the FTO to "investigate any allegation of maladministration on the part of the Revenue Division" of his Own Motion. Section 14 of the Ordinance vests in the FTO further powers to order criminal /disciplinary proceedings against a Tax employee. Therefore, the learned FTO has acted in accordance with Law in order to protect the interest of the exchequer and has done nothing wrong.

13. A strange stance of the Deptt is that red alert letters were interdepartmental correspondence to which the FTO could not have any access nor he could rely upon the same. But in raising such an objection it is being overlooked that the learned FTO is empowered under S.9 of the Ordinance (XXXV/2000) to investigate any allegation of maladministration and can lay hand on any document/ call for the production of any record/ correspondence in the process. The contention that in Suo moto action red alert letters could not be taken into consideration amounts to whittling down the authority of the learned FTO conferred by the law.

14. From the perusal of the representation signed by the Commissioner (Inland Revenue), Zone-IV, Regional Tax Office-II, Karachi filed with the approval or blessing of the Federal Board of Revenue, it is evident that utmost effort has been made to object to the jurisdiction of the learned FTO despite quoting the preamble of FTO Ordinance, 2000 and S.9(1) which empowers him to diagnose and investigate the allegations of mal-administration of the functionaries administering the tax laws. In taking notice of tax evasions and pointing out the bogus refunds/ claims on motion investigations the learned FTO has acted within the domain of the law empowering him to perform such functions. He had indeed on taking notice of such alleged mal-administration directed the departmental authority to further proceed in the matter and to investigate and identify the officials involved. He has not taken any disciplinary or departmental action by himself. By no stretch of imagination such an action by him can be termed as an act in excess of jurisdiction. In **Capital Development Authority Vs Zahid Iqbal and another (PLD 2004 SC 99)** it was emphasized by the Honorable Supreme Court of Pakistan that "*According to Article 9 of the Establishment of the Office of the Wafaqi Mohtasib (Ombudsman) Order being President's Order No.1 of 1983 it is an obligation of the Mohtasib to undertake an investigation into an allegation of maladministration on the part of any Agency or any of its officers or employees*". Indeed, the learned FTO has acted in aid of the revenue collection body in pointing out such alleged mal-administration.

15. The recommendations of the learned FTO are merely to the extent to "(i) direct the Chief Commissioner-IR, RTO-II, Karachi to identify the officials/officers who failed to thoroughly scrutinize the claims of the RP and to recover the inadmissible input tax claimed/adjusted and take disciplinary action against them; (ii) initiate appropriate action including criminal proceedings leading to prosecution of RP and recovery of amount swindled from public exchequer through claiming inadmissible input tax; as per law; within 45 days". It is merely an awakening call reminder of the duty of the Departmental authority to proceed in the matter as per law. There is thus no valid justification to assail the Order of the learned FTO. The Representation is therefore liable to be rejected.

16. As no order adversely affecting the rights of petitioner/ department has been made by which it would be legitimately aggrieved. Accordingly, the Hon'ble President has been pleased to reject the instant Representation of the Agency-FBR.

(Muhammad Saleem)
Director General(Legal)

The Chairman,
Federal Board of Revenue,
Islamabad.

No.46/FTO/2020, dated 01.12.2020

Copy for information to:

1. The Registrar, Federal Tax Ombudsman, Islamabad.
2. The Commissioner, Inland Revenue, RTO-II, Karachi.
3. ✓ The Chief (Legal-I), Federal Board of Revenue, Islamabad
4. Master file.

M. Saleem
(Muhammad Saleem)
Director General(Legal)