IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH AT KARACHI

CONSTITUTIONAL PETITION NO. D- 8019 OF 2018 (Will)

Additional Registrat (Will)

- 1. ALL PAKISTAN SECURITY AGENCIES ASSOCIATION

 1st Floor, 8-C, 24th Commercial Street
 Phase II Extension, DHA

 KARACHI
- 2. AHL SECURITY MANAGEMENT (PVT.) LTD.
 M-1, Mezzanine Floor, Falaknaz Plaza
 Main Shahrah-e- Faisal
 KARACHI
- 3. AL-AUN GUARD'S (PVT.) LTD.
 Suite No. 410, R.S.M. Square, Plot E-1, Block 7&8
 Shaheed-e- Millat Road
 KARACHI
- 4. AQSA SECURITY GUARDS (PVT.) LTD.

 Building No. 47C, 1st Floor, 21st Commercial Street
 Phase II Ext, DHA
 KARACHI
- D-46, K.D.A. Scheme No.1
 Miran Muhammad Shah Road
 KARACHI
- 6. CROWN SECURITY SERVICES (PVT.) LTD.
 8-C, 24th Commercial Street
 Phase II Extension, DHA
 KARACHI
- 7. DEFENDER SECURITY SERVICES (PVT.) LTD.
 Plot No. 110, Mezzanine Floor
 10th Street, Phase IV, DHA
 KARACHI
- 8. DOGMA SECURITY & CONSULTANCY
 SERVICES (PVT.) LTD.
 Office No. 104, 1st Floor, Portway Trade Centre
 Plot No. 189/A, Sindhi Muslim Co-Operative Housing Society
 KARACHI

- 9. DRAGON SECURITY SERVICES (PTV.) LTD. C-5, P-52, 3rd floor, Phase II Main Korangi Road, DHA KARACHI
- 10. FALCON SECURITY (PVT.) LTD.
 101 & 306, Aiwan-e-Sanat, Plot No. ST-4/2
 Sector 23, Korangi Industrial Area
 KARACHI
- 11. FIST SECURITY (PVT.) LTD.
 42-J, Block 6...
 P.E.C.H.S
 KARACHI
- 12. FRONTLINE SECURITY SERVICES (PVT.) LTD. C 2 C, Saadi Lane 1, Khayaban-e-Ittehad Near Askri Bank, Phase VII, DHA KARACHI
- 13. GHAZI SECURITY GUARDS (PVT.) LTD.
 503, Hannan Centre, Plot No.55
 Block-7/8, D.A.C.H.S
 Shahrah-e-Faisal
 KARACHI
- 14. GHOURI SECURITY GUARDS (PVT.) LTD.
 Suite II, 2nd Floor, Al-Babar Center
 F-8 Markaz
 ISLAMABAD
- 15. G.M. SECURITY SERVICES (PVT.) LTD.

 3RD Floor, Building No.10-E/1

 Jami Commercial Street No. 1, Phase VII, DHA

 KARACHI
- 16. GRANDEUR SECURITY GUARDS (PVT.) LTD. 405, 4th Floor Marine Faisal 10- A Block 6, PECHS KARACHI
- 17. INDUS SECURITY SERVICES (PVT.) LTD.
 B-7, Block-B, Gulshan-e-Jamal
 Main Rashid Minhas Road
 KARACHI
- 18. JAGUAR SECURITY GUARDS (PVT.) LTD.
 Office No. 18, 2nd Floor
 Rehmat Centre, I-8 Markaz
 ISLAMABAD

- 19. KARACHI SECURITY SERVIES (PVT.) LTD.
 A-5, A-6, First Floor, Jumani Arcade, Block-14
 Main University Road, Gulshan-e-Iqbal
 KARACHI
- 20. MARS SECURITY GUARDS (PVT.) LTD. 18-A, Block-6, PECHS, KARACHI
- 21. MEER SECURITY SERVICES (PVT.) LTD.
 Office No. 5, 3rd Floor Plot 13-C
 37th Street, Tauheed Commercial Area
 Phase V, DHA
 KARACHI
- 22. MERNAD PROTECTION & SECURITY (PVT.) LTD. 73-E, 9th Jami Commercial Street Phase VII, DHA KARACHI
- 23. MUSTANG SERCURITY SERVICES (PVT.) LTD.
 3rd Floor, Ehtesham Center, Plot No. C-121
 Main Korangi Road, Phase-I, DHA
 KARACHI
- 24. OMAR ALI SECURITY SERVICE (PVT.) LTD.
 Room No. 305, 3rd Floor, Service Building
 K.I.C.T West Wharf
 KARACHI
- 25. OMER RAZZAQ ENTERPRISES (PVT.) LTD. (OREL)
 17-C, Sunset Lane-4
 Phase-II Extension, DHA
 KARACHI
 - OQAB SECURITY SERVICES (PVT) LTD.
 46, Al-Riaz Co-Operative Housing Society Ltd.,
 KARACHI
- 27. PACIFIC SECURITY SERVICES (PVT.) LTD. 1/3, 2nd Mezzanine Floor, West Point Tower Phase-II Extension, Main Korangi Road, DHA KARACHI
- 28. PAK SECURITY SERVICES (PVT.) LTD.

 1st Floor, 10-C, 28th Street
 Tauheed Commercial Area, Phase V, DHA
 KARACHI
- 29. PARWEST PACIFIC SECURITY (PVT.) LTD.
 176, Street No. 4, Cavalry Ground,
 Lahore Cantt
 LAHORE

30. QUICK ACTION SECURITY SERVICES (PVT.) LTD.
MA-07 & 08, Mezzanine Floor, Shalimar Pride
Near Mehran Depot, Malir Cantt. Road
Model Colony
KARACHI

31. RAPID SECURITY GUARDS (PVT.) LTD.

Suit No. 2, Al-Karam Building Main Shahrah-e-Liaquat Near Regal Chowk KARACHI

32. RESCUE SECURITY SERVICES (PVT.) LTD.

Anum Apartment, 2nd Floor, Plot No. 11-C 27th Street, Touheed Commercial Area, Ph-V, DHA KARACHI

33. SAFETY & SECURITY SERVICES (PVT.) LTD. Eamaan Tower, Commercial Market Chaklala Scheme III, Rawalpindi Cantt

RAWALPINDI

34. SAKRU SECURITY SERVICES (PVT.) LTD.

3C, 1st Jami Commercial Street, 3RD Floor Khayaban-e-Jami, Phase VII, DHA KARACHI

35. SECSOL (PVT.) LTD.

Suit No. A-2, 2nd Floor, Plot No. 2-C Stadium Lane No. 3 Khayaban-e- Shamsheer, Phase-V, DHA **KARACHI**

36. SECURITY 2000 (PTV.) LTD.

1 Anjum Plaza, Shaharh-e-Quaideen, PECHS KARACHI

37. SECURITY AND MANAGEMENT SERVICES (PVT.) LTD.

12th Floor Kawish Crown Plaza Shahrah-e-Faisal KARACHI

38. SHEZADA SECURITY SERVICES (PVT.) LTD.

41-C, 15th Commercial Street Phase-II Extension, DHA **KARACHI**

39. THE MUHAFIZ SECURITY (PVT.) LTD.

A-1/3, West Land Trade Centre 3rd Floor, Block 7 & 8, K.C.H.S, Main Shaheed-e-Millat Road KARACHI



- 40. TRI-WAH SECURITY (PVT.) LTD.
 101, 1st Floor, 53-C
 27th Street, Tauheed Commercial
 DHA, Phase V
 KARACHI
- 41. VALIANT SECURITY SERVICES (PVT.) LTD.
 Apartment No. 2, 1st Floor, Plot No. 31-C
 12 Commercial Street, Phase-II Extension, DHA
 KARACHI

VERSUS

- 1. PROVINCE OF SINDH

 Through its Chief Secretary,
 Sindh Secretariat,
 KARACHI
- 2. SINDH REVENUE BOARD

 Through its Chairman
 Government of Sindh,
 Shaheen Complex,
 I.I. Chundrigar Road
 KARACHI RESPONDENTS

PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 199 OF THE CONSTITUTION
OF ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF PAKISTAN 1973



IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, KARACHI

PRESENT:

MR. JUSTICE MUHAMMAD JUNAID GHAFFAR MR. JUSTICE AGHA FAISAL

C.P No. 8014 of 2018

All Pakistan Security Agencies Association & others.....Petitioners

V/s.

Province of Sindh & another......Respondents

PETITIONERS:

Through M/s. Khalid Mahmood Siddiqui & Ghulam Rasool Korai, Advocates.

RESPONDENTS

Through M/s. Malik Naeem Iqbal, Shamshad Ahmed Narejo along with Zamir Khalid, Commissioner (Legal) Sindh Revenue Board.

Date of Hearing:

19.01.2021.

Date of Judgment:

19.01.2021.

JUDGMENT

Muhammad Junaid Ghaffar J .- Through this petition, the Petitioners have challenged the vires of Rule 42D of the Sindh Sales Tax on Services Rules, 2011 ("2011 Rules"). Learned Counsel for the Petitioner has argued that the said Rule is ultra vires to various provisions of the Sindh Sales Tax on Services Act, 2011 ("Act") and no sales tax is payable on the salaries and allowances, which are being paid to the security guards posted or placed on disposal of the service recipient by the Petitioners

Company. He submits that this Court in respect of Labour and Manpower services falling under Rule 42E of the 2011 Rules has already decided the issue vide Judgment dated 17.11.2020¹ and has interpreted Rule 42E(3), which is *pari materia* to Rule 42D(3) and the ratio of the said judgment squarely applies to the case of the petitioner.

- 2. On the other hand, learned Counsel for Sindh Revenue Board has made an effort to distinguish the above judgment and submits that sales tax in the present facts is payable on the entire amount received by the Petitioners as it cannot be separated. He has placed reliance on certain reported cases².
- 3. We have heard both the learned Counsel and perused the record. Insofar as Rule 42D(3) and Rule 42E(3) of the 2011 Rules are concerned, they are identical in terms and reads as under:

22. Service provided or rendered by Security Agency (1)
(2)
(3) The value of taxable services for the purpose of levy of sales tax shall be the gross amount charged for the services provided or rendered.
(4)
(5)
(6)
9
42E. Procedure for cancellation and payment of sales tax on Labor and manpower Supply Services(1)
(3) The value of taxable services for the purposes of levy of sales tax shall be the gross amount charged for the services provided or rendered. [* * *]
(4)
(5)
(6)



¹ passed in C.P No.D-5220/2017 and other connected matters (Sami Pharmaceuticals (Pvt) Ltd. Vs. Province of Sindh & others),

² 2001 (77) ECC 322 (Advertising Club And Ors. Vs Central Board of Excise And), 2008 13 STJ 285 CESTAT Chennai (Sudharson Security vs Commissioner of Central Excise), (2007) 6 STT 246 (Punjab Ex-Servicemen Corpn. V. Commr. Of C.Ex. Chandigarh) and 2003 (89) ECC 381 (Gda Security Private Limited vs The Union of India).



- 4. Though in the judgment relied upon on behalf of the Petitioners, there was also an issue regarding a proviso and its deletion; however, issue has been also dilated upon even in absence of the proviso, read with Section 4(3)(a) of the Act in question and it has been held that insofar as salaries of employees engaged by the service provider is concerned, that is not liable to sales tax on services. The relevant finding in the said judgment is as under:-
 - It may also be observed that in absence of anything to the contrary, ordinarily, the quantum of service charge is a matter between the service provider and the recipient. For the present purposes no other value and taxable service in question has either been notified or otherwise fixed or determined by SRB. It is not the case of SRB that the service provider is hiding or concealing, or for that matter, is issuing an invoice of his service charges which is lesser than what the service recipient is paying to the service provider. The dispute which has now arisen is after the omission of the proviso from Rule 42(E) of the 2011 Rules as now SRB is demanding the service provider to charge sales tax on the entire gross amount of service, invoiced or billed to the service recipient. Such invoice includes the amount of expenses reimbursed by the service recipient in respect of salary and allowances of the labor and manpower supplied and the charges of services so rendered by the service provider. In fact, in our considered view, though the proviso had earlier provided certain clarification as to the levy of tax on services in question, however, to us it seems superfluous as whether the proviso remains there or not. We are fully in agreement with the contention of one of the Petitioners Counsel that even the omission of the proviso cannot have any implication so as to require the Petitioners to pay sales tax on the entire gross amount in question as it is only the quantum of service rendered and the amount thereof which could be taxed under the Act. Such contention appears to be correct and in line with the spirit and the various provisions of the Act as discussed hereinabove. It is settled law that by a rule making power no tax could be imposed or levied as it is only the charging provision of the Act which can do so. If we are to read sub-rule 3 of Rule 42(E) after omission of the proviso, even then, it appears that what SRB is explaining through the rule is that the value of taxable service for the purpose of levy of sales tax shall be the gross amount charged for the services provided or rendered and in any case, it cannot, through the rule making power, require the service provider to charge sales tax on the amount which are being reimbursed in lieu of salary and wages. The tax would still remain to be chargeable for the services provided or rendered and in no way a service provider could be asked to charge sales tax even on the amount which does not include the value or the price for the services rendered; but only pertains to the reimbursed amounts of salary and wages. It is between the service provider and the recipient to arrive at a mechanism for issuing of a sales tax invoice. At best the service provider and the service recipient can mutually agree to have two separate invoices; one for the reimbursement of expenses i.e. salary and wages, and the other for the purposes of reimbursement of the actual service provided or rendered, or even a single invoice, showing both these amounts separately; but in any case the tax is only changeable or payable on the amount of services rendered and not otherwise.
 - Insofar as the argument of learned Counsel for SRB that Rule 37 pertaining to the services rendered by Customs House Clearing Agents and Ship-Chandlers is somewhat couched in a different language and would not apply to the present case of the Petitioners appears to be misconceived inasmuch as any service provider who issues an invoice which includes both the amounts; that of his services and any other reimbursement or charges paid by or on behalf of the service recipient, would not ipso facto render the entire invoice amount to be taxed. If that be so, then it would go beyond the mandate of the Province to levy tax only on service and would transgress into the domain of the Federation. By no means this could be permitted. At times, the service provider incurs expenses or pays for such expenses on behalf



of the service recipient in different modes and manner, and if he issues an invoice to claim reimbursements along with the amount of services rendered; this would not make him liable to pay sales tax on the entire amount of invoice and as rightly contended by one the Petitioners Counsel that the levy of tax is on the service and not either on the revenue or the amount of the invoice. It may also be noted that tax can only be levied pursuant to a charging provision. In the Act such incidence has been provided in s.3 i.e. taxable services listed in the 2nd Schedule provided by a registered person in the course of an economic activity, whereas, per s.4(3)(a), economic activity explicitly excludes the activities of an employee providing services in that capacity to an employer. Now merely for the reason that the service recipient is engaging service providers and is also paying for the salaries of employees engaged by the service provider, would that render such payments liable to sales tax. The answer is a big No. What the Act by itself has excluded under s.4(3)(a), cannot then be included by way of Rules or clarification so as to create a charging provision. It is not in dispute that the amount or payment in question is in respect of salary and wages of employees; be that paid by the service provider or the recipient. Once by law i.e. s:4(3)(a) it is out of the ambit of an economic activity, then in no manner it could be brought into a taxable service; hence, any clarification or rule could not require payment of sales tax on it. The salary and wages in question is being paid by the service provider to the employee, and then is being reimbursed. And that is it. By implication that since the amount is being paid to the service provider on issuance of an invoice or for the reason that by this methodology applicability of some other laws is being avoided, does not make it a taxable service or to be included in the value of taxable service."

5. In view of hereinabove facts and circumstances of this case, since we have already decided the controversy in respect of the above Rule, which is pari materia to the Rule in question, therefore, for the reasons so assigned in the judgment passed (supra)3, this Petition is also allowed in the same terms.



Ayaz P.S

Sa Agha Faisal

³ Sami Pharmaceuticals (Pvt.) Ltd. & others

SERTIFIED TO BE TRUE COPY

Balanta setah selakasan kepada belah di perana

ASSISTANT
LES ESTIMATED ON CW

STIMATED DE S DEPOSITED -N CW

STAMP & STAMP & STAMP & CM

ASSISTANT

AS

Assistant Registrar (Copying)

Assistant Registrar (Company)