

ORDER SHEET
IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH AT KARACHI

SCRA 47 of 2026
SCRA 48 of 2026

DATE	ORDER WITH SIGNATURE OF JUDGE(S)
------	----------------------------------

1. For orders on office objection.
2. For hearing of CMA No.681/2026.
3. For hearing of main case.
4. For hearing of CMA No.682/2026.

09.04.2026

Mr. Shahzeb Shaikh, advocate and Mr. Haris Ahmed, advocate for the applicant.

Sardar Zafar Hussain, advocate files Vakalatnama on behalf of respondent, same are taken on record. It is jointly submitted that the question before the court is squarely covered by order dated 27.10.2025 passed in SCRA 115 of 2020 which is reproduced herein below:

"27.10.2025

Sardar Zafar Hussain, advocate for the applicant alongwith Mr. Tariq Aziz, A.C. Customs.

The following question had been proposed for determination:-

Whether in the presence of "Classification Committee" decision on the same issue, the Honourable Customs Appellate Tribunal has not erred in law to set aside the Classification Committee Decision under Section 194- B of the Customs Act, 1969 on the unsubstantiated plea that the Classification Committee has not disclosed some vital points?

Notice was issued and courier tracking report has been placed on record, demonstrates that the service has been effected.

In the present facts and circumstances, the Classification Committee had already rendered its decision, as discernible from paragraphs-5 and 9 of the impugned judgment. Learned counsel states that once the Classification Committee had rendered its findings, no case arose for the learned Tribunal to warrant any interference therein. Learned counsel states that this is not case of first impression and matter has already been conclusively decided by the Supreme Court in the case of K.S. Sulemanji Esmailji reported as 2025 PTD 260, paragraph-5 thereof reads as follows:-

"5. The Classification Committee had sent samples to the Customs House Laboratory for analysis and after subjecting them to tests a report was accordingly submitted. The Committee, in the light of the test analysis report and the physical attributes of the samples, had concluded that 'Biaxially Oriented Polypropylene film (BOPP)' falls under one of the four PCT Headings i.e. 3920.2010, 3920.2020, 3920.2030 and 2920.2040. The Committee further concluded that the composition of the imported goods described in the test report rendered all the aforementioned headings to merit equal

consideration. The Committee considered the three sub-rules of Rule 3 of the Rules of Interpretation in order to make a determination and the reasoning was recorded in the classification ruling. Rule 3(a) was excluded because none of the headings was most specific. Rule 3(b) was not attracted because all the headings merited equal consideration. As a consequence the determination was made by applying Rule 3(c) and on that basis PCT Heading 3920.2040 was determined since it was the heading which was last in numerical order among those which equally merited consideration. The respondent company had taken the plea that the correct classification in that case should have been 3920- 2090 i.e under the heading 'Others'. The Committee on the basis of the Explanatory Notes had concluded that the headings that merit equal consideration in this case for the purposes of Rule 3(c) were those which were specific to BOPP i.e 3920-2010, 3920.2020, 3920.2030 and 3920.2040. The heading 3920.2090 was for 'Others' i.e films, sheets of propylene other than BOPP. The said heading was not relevant for consideration under Rule 3(c) in the case before us and, therefore, the Committee had correctly determined PCT Heading 3920- 2040 because it occurred last in the numerical order among those headings which merited equal consideration. The determination made by Committee was in accordance with the correct appreciation of the Rules of Interpretation and it did not suffer from any infirmity. The Tribunal had made its own determination and that too without considering the test report nor the classification ruling of the Committee. The Tribunal had also not sought any technical assistance from the Committee nor the Board. The opinion of the Committee was substituted without appreciating it after careful consideration. On the basis of samples produced by the respondent-company the Tribunal classified the imported goods under PCT Heading 3920.2030. This determination was made in an arbitrary manner and in violation of the Rules of Interpretation. The High Court also did not appreciate that the Committee had interpreted the Rules of Interpretation in accordance with the Explanatory Notes. The heading "Others" i.e. 3920.2090 was considered and reasons were recorded why it was not applicable. The reasons were in conformity with the Explanatory Notes and, therefore, the Committee had correctly concluded that the heading 'Others' i.e. 3920.2090 was not applicable. The Explanatory Notes for Chapter 39 describe the rules in relation to a sub-heading 'Others'. It explicitly mentions that goods are classifiable under the sub heading 'Others' provided they are not covered more specifically under another sub-heading. Moreover, only four headings covered BOPP and, therefore, they were relevant for applying Rule 3(c) of the Rules of Interpretation. The Tribunal had taken upon itself the role of the Classification Committee rather than examining the classification ruling issued by the latter and the reasoning recorded therein. The High Court also did not consider the reasoning in the light of the Rules of Interpretation, the Explanatory Notes and other documents. The Rules of Interpretation, particularly Rule 3(c), have not been properly appreciated and thus misinterpreted. The determination made by the Classification Committee did not suffer from any legal infirmity nor has been found to be in violation of the Rules of Interpretation read with the Explanatory Notes.

The Act of 1969 is a comprehensive statute dealing with matters relating to the levy and collection of customs duties etc. The charging section, i.e section 18, expressly provides that customs duties shall be levied at such rates as are, inter alia, prescribed in the First Schedule. The First Schedule contains the general rules for interpretation of the schedule. Moreover, it provides that for the purposes of interpretation 'Explanatory Notes' to the Harmonised Commodity Description and Coding System published by the World Customs Organisation, Brussels, as amended from time to time, shall be considered the authentic source of interpretation. It further provides that for the purposes of classification the Board shall be the final authority to determine the classification of any item meant to be imported or exported. The First Schedule is divided into ninety nine chapters and twenty one sections in accordance with the Harmonised Commodity Description and Coding System ('Harmonised System') developed by the World Customs Organisation. It is a

multipurpose international product nomenclature and governed under the 'International Convention on the Harmonised Commodity Description and Coding System'. It is the most effective and widely used classification system. More than 180 countries have ratified the Convention and Pakistan is one of them. In order to fulfil the commitments under the Convention, the Board has established the Classification Centre which is run and managed by the Classification Committee. Through Customs General Order No. 10/2001, dated 04- 09-2001, the Board has established the Classification Committee and has prescribed a procedure in order to streamline the issuance of classification rulings, implement the recommendations of the World Customs Organisation etc. The latter has issued five volumes of Explanatory Notes which are the official interpretation of the Harmonised System. The World Customs Organisation takes measures to secure uniform interpretation of the Harmonised System and it is periodically updated in the light of developments which take place from time to time. The World Customs Organisation has constituted various committees to manage this process. It also issues guidelines to the contracting States to the Convention regarding the tariff classification and related infrastructure. It is noted that classification of goods is one of the most basic functions of the procedure in the context of import or export of goods. It is a specialised job and technical in nature. It essentially requires expertise and taking of multiple factors into consideration e.g. examining the goods, all the relevant documents, understanding the classification aids and technical literature etc. The Classification Committee includes experts who possess the skills, knowledge and experience in respect of classification of goods in conformity with the Harmonised System. The Classification Committee has been established by the Board pursuant to the guidelines of the World Customs Organisation and the commitments under the Convention. The Rules of Interpretation have statutory backing because they form part of the First Schedule to the Act of 1969. Likewise, the Explanatory Notes issued by the World Customs Organisation are declared in the First Schedule to be the most authentic interpretation of its chapters and sections based on the Harmonised System. The Classification Committee and its classification rulings, therefore, have crucial importance. There is a presumption of regularity attached to its proceedings and findings regarding classification of goods. This presumption, however, is rebuttable if it can be demonstrably shown that the findings are arbitrary, fanciful and in violation of the Rules of Interpretation, the Explanatory Notes and other relevant guidelines or principles relating to classification of goods under the Harmonised System. The First Schedule also declares that the determination of classification by the Board shall be final. This finality is also in the light of the scheme of the Harmonised System which has been adopted and followed by Pakistan pursuant to its commitments under the Convention. The Tribunal nor the High Court can substitute the findings of the Classification Committee unless they can be shown to be arbitrary, fanciful or in violation to the applicable rules and principles of interpretation. In the case before us, the Tribunal fell in error by disregarding the classification ruling issued by the Classification Committee and proceeding to determine the classification on its own. The Tribunal could not bypass the competent forum i.e the Classification Committee nor give a different finding unless it could be clearly shown that the determination was arbitrary, fanciful and in violation of the rules and principles relating to classification of goods under the Harmonised System. The High Court had also misinterpreted the Rules of Interpretation without adverting itself to the reasons recorded in the classification ruling issued by the Classification Committee.”

Needless to state that the judgment relied upon by the learned counsel is squarely binding upon this Court, therefore, in *mutatis mutandis* application thereof, the question framed for determination is decided in favour of the applicant department and against the respondent. As a consequence hereof, the reference application is allowed and the impugned judgment is set-aside.

A copy of this order may be sent under the seal of this Court and the signature of the Registrar to the learned Customs Appellate Tribunal, as required per section 196(5) of the Customs Act, 1969.”

Counsel seek that these reference applications may be disposed of for the same reasons and upon same terms. Order accordingly.

A copy of this decision may be sent under the seal of this Court and the signature of the Registrar to the learned Customs Appellate Tribunal, as required per section 196(5) of the Customs Act, 1969. Office is instructed to place copy hereof in the connected file.

Judge

Judge

Khuro/PS