

THE BALOCHISTAN SALES TAX ON SERVICES
APPELLATE TRIBUNAL QUETTA.

Sales Tax Appeal No.87 of 2026
M/s CG Consultants Pvt Ltd, Karachi.
Versus
Commissioner-I Balochistan Revenue Authority, Quetta.

Appellants by: Mr. Baloch Khan Adv

Respondents by: Mr. Amin Ullah Adv

Date of hearing: 20/04/2026

Date of Order 29.4.2026

ORDER

SAIF ULLAH KHAN, MEMBER. The above-titled Sales Tax Appeal has been filed by the appellant calling into question the Order-in-Original No. 01/2026 dated 18-Feb-2026, passed by the learned Commissioner Operation-I of the Balochistan Revenue Authority ('BRA'), Quetta. In the impugned order, the appellant has been treated as a defaulter for failing to pay remaining tax liabilities for the tax period July 2024 to June 2025. The learned Commissioner has determined an amount of Rs. 15,129,755 as short-paid sales tax and imposed a penalty of Rs. 756,488 under section 48 of the Balochistan Sales Tax on Services Act, 2015 ('Act'), making a total recoverable amount of Rs. 15,886,243.

2. The relevant facts for the disposal of the instant appeal are that the appellant, having BNTN: B8173330, is registered with the BRA with the principal activity of "ARCHITECTS OR TOWN PLANNERS" under tariff heading 9814.1000. Perusal of the records by the learned Commissioner revealed that the appellant provided services to the Secretary Board of Revenue Balochistan and the Gwadar Port

Authority during the tax period July 2024 to June 2025 but allegedly failed to pay 80% of the tax liability. Show-cause notices were issued, and the appellant submitted replies contending that taxes had been withheld/paid at source by the service recipients. However, the learned Commissioner found the submissions incomplete, noting that the invoices produced did not specify mandatory particulars required under Section 30 of the Act and that the services had not been declared in the appellant's monthly sales tax returns. Consequently, the impugned order was passed under section 52(3) of the Act.

3. The appellant, being aggrieved with the impugned order, has come before this forum in terms of section 60 of the Act on the grounds set forth in the memo of appeal.

4. On behalf of the appellant, arguments were provided by the learned counsel who contended that the Commissioner failed to properly reconcile the documentary evidence provided. The counsel pointed out that the appellant had submitted multiple Challans and Computerized Payment Receipts (CPRs) proving that significant amounts—such as Rs. 2,590,500 and Rs. 155,084 for Gwadar Port Authority, and Rs. 2,501,713 for the Board of Revenue—had indeed been deposited into the government exchequer. It was argued that the learned Commissioner summarily rejected these evidences on technical grounds regarding invoice formatting without verifying the actual payment of tax. The learned counsel suggested that if the matter is remanded, the appellant will provide further reconciliation to satisfy the Authority.

5. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent supported the order, stating that the appellant's failure to fulfill mandatory invoicing requirements under Section 30 and the non-declaration of services in monthly

returns justified the assessment. However, the respondent did not strongly object to the suggestion of remanding the matter for a more detailed factual verification.

6. We have gone through the impugned order, examined the relevant provisions of law, and considered the arguments of both counsels.

7. Perusal of the records shows that while the learned Commissioner acknowledged some payments (e.g., Rs. 2,590,500), the impugned order lacks a detailed reconciliation of all the PSIDs and CPRs provided by the appellant against the total determined liability. The rejection of evidence primarily based on the technical "conformity" of invoices, without a thorough audit of the actual tax flow and credit for taxes already deposited by withholding agents, appears to be a decision that requires deeper factual scrutiny.

8. In view of the above, the impugned order cannot be allowed to sustain in its current form. Therefore, with the consent of both counsels, it is set aside, and the matter is remanded back to the learned Commissioner with the following directions:

- o Provide a sufficient opportunity of being heard to the appellant.
- o Conduct a thorough reconciliation of the taxes withheld and deposited by the Secretary Board of Revenue and Gwadar Port Authority as evidenced by the CPRs and Challans provided.
- o Examine the applicability of the 80% liability claim in light of the actual withholding performed by government entities.
- o Issue a well-reasoned, speaking decision within 30 days of this order.

9. The appellant is also directed to cooperate fully in the proceedings and provide all necessary documentary evidence including copies of contracts and work orders to assist the Commissioner in reaching a judicious decision.

10. The appeal stands disposed of as above.

Announced
Dated, the 29/4/ 2026.

SD
CHAIRPERSON

SD
MEMBER

SD
MEMBER