



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 22ND DAY OF APRIL, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S SUNIL DUTT YADAV

WRIT PETITION NO. 10583 OF 2026 (T-RES)

BETWEEN:

M/S RENTEASE INTERNATIONAL LLP,
SURVEY NO. 71, DASANAPURA HOBLI,
HMT MAIN ROAD, BENGALURU RURAL,
KARNATAKA- 562162
(REPRESENTED BY MEGHRAJ SINGH,
PARTNER OF M/S RENTEASE
INTERNATIONAL LLP,
PARTNERSHIP FIRM REGISTERED UNDER
LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP ACT, 2008)

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. RAGHURAMAN V., SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SRI. RAGHAVENDRA C R., ADVOCATE)

AND:

THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER OF COMMERCIAL
TAXES, (AUDIT), DGSTO-6, BENGALURU,
VANIYA THERIGE SANKIRNA,
SIDDARAMESHWARA EXTENSION,
JAYANAGAR EAST, TUMKUR - 572103.

...RESPONDENT

(BY SRI. K. HEMA KUMAR, AGA)

THIS WP IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF
THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO QUASHING THE
IMPUGNED ORDER ISSUED UNDER SECTION 73 BEARING
REFERENCE NO.ZD290225006121Z ALONG WITH THE

Digitally
signed by
VIJAYA P
Location:
HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA



SUMMARY OF THE ORDER IN FORM GST DRC-07 DATED 03.02.2025, FOR THE PERIOD APRIL 2020 - MARCH 2021 PASSED BY THE RESPONDENT HEREIN ENCLOSED AS ANNEXURE-A AND ETC.,

THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR PRELIMINARY HEARING, THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S SUNIL DUTT YADAV

ORAL ORDER

Learned Additional Government Advocate accepts notice for the respondent.

2. The petitioner has assailed the validity of the order of adjudication at Annexure-A as well as the order at Annexure-A1. The petitioner has sought for allied reliefs as well regarding the recovery proceedings. It is the case of the petitioner that the authority has completed the adjudication proceedings and passed order at Annexure-A1 without benefit of any reply of the petitioner to the show-cause notice.

3. It is further submitted that the petitioner was unable to make out reply to the show-cause notice as they



were not aware and due to bonafide lapse they were not in a position to make out a reply. It is submitted that if an opportunity is granted by condoning the lapse, petitioner would be in a position to demonstrate that the discrepancies as made out do not exist.

4. It is further submitted that insofar as parallel proceedings were initiated by the Central Government and petitioner has met the tax liability insofar as the proceedings initiated by the Central Authority. It is further submitted that such proceedings initiated by the Central Authority, though were subsequent to the proceedings by the State Authority, petitioner having met such liability, petitioner would take appropriate stand regarding the proceedings initiated by the State Authority by making out a detailed reply to the show cause.

5. Having perused the order and noticing that the order is an exparte order without the benefit of reply to the show-cause notice and taking note of the contention



raised and asserted including that the petitioner would make out a case by reply to the show-cause notice and meet grounds raised therein, it would be appropriate to afford an opportunity to the petitioner noticing that the adjudication relates to a factual aspect which requires material to be placed by the petitioner before the authority. It is noticed from perusal of the impugned order that matter relates to reconciliation between GSTR-3B and GSTR-2A which would require factual appreciation which is also a reason for remitting the matter for reconsideration.

6. Accordingly, the orders at Annexures-A and A1 are set aside and the consequential proceedings of recovery at Annexure-B is set aside. Matter is remitted to the stage of reply to the show-cause notice. All contentions are kept open.

7. Though in due course, the Court insists on deposit of 10% of the tax demand, however in the present



case taking note of the peculiar facts of the case, no such condition is imposed. Petitioner to appear before the respondent without further notice on 18.05.2026.

Accordingly, petition is ***disposed of***.

Sd/-
(S SUNIL DUTT YADAV)
JUDGE

MCR