

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE A.K.JAYASANKARAN NAMBIAR

TUESDAY, THE 6TH DAY OF JANUARY 2015/16TH POUSHA, 19361

WP(C).No. 291 of 2015 (J)

PETITIONER :

**K.MOOSA,
PROPRIETOR,
M.M. ELECTRONICS,
KADAYIL HOUSE
VATTOMKULAM**

**BY ADVS.SRI.N.MURALEEDHARAN NAIR
SRI.V.K.SHAMUSUDHEEN**

RESPONDENT(S) :

- 1. THE COMMERCIAL TAX OFFICER,
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCIAL TAXES,
PONNANI – 679577.**
- 2. THE ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER (APPEALS),
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCIAL TAXES,
PALAKKAD - 678001**

R1 & R2 BY GOVT. PLEADER SMT. SOBHA ANNAMMA EAPPEN

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 06-01-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:**

Mn

...2/-

WP(C).No. 291 of 2015 (J)

APPENDIX

PETITIONERS' EXHIBITS :

- EXHIBIT P1 TRUE COPY OF THE ASSESSMENT ORDER PASSED BY THE 1ST
RESPONDENT FOR THE YEAR 2011-12 DATED 30-09-2014.
- EXHIBIT P2 TRUE COPY OF THE APPEAL FILED BY THE PETITIONER BEFORE THE
2ND RESPONDENT DATED 07-11-2014.
- EXHIBIT P3 TRUE COPY OF THE STAY PETITION FILED BY THE PETITIONER
BEFORE THE 2ND RESPONDENT DATED 07-11-2014.
- EXHIBIT P4 TRUE COPY OF THE INTERIM ORDER PASSED BY THE 2ND
RESPONDENT, DATED 10-12-2014.
- EXHIBIT P5 TRUE COPY OF THE DEMAND NOTICE IN FORM NO 12 ISSUED BY THE
1ST RESPONDENT FOR THE YEAR 2011-12 DATED 17-10-2014

RESPONDENT(S)' EXHIBITS : NIL

//TRUE COPY//

P.A. TO JUDGE

Mn

A.K.JAYASANKARAN NAMBIAR, J.

.....

W.P.(C) No. 291 of 2015 (J)

.....

Dated this the 6th day of January, 2015

JUDGMENT

Against Ext.P1 Assessment order, petitioner preferred Ext.P2 appeal before the second respondent. Along with the appeal, he had also preferred Ext.P3 stay petition. The second respondent has now passed Ext.P4 interim order on the stay petition directing the petitioner to pay 50% of the amount as a condition for the grant of stay against recovery of the balance amounts confirmed against the petitioner vide Ext.P1 assessment order.

2.In the writ petition, the petitioner impugns the said conditional order of stay, inter alia, on the ground that the second respondent had not exercised his discretion validly while passing the said order.

3.Heard Sri.N.Muraleedharan Nair, the learned counsel appearing for petitioner and Smt.Sobha Annamma Eappen, the learned Government Pleader appearing for respondents.

4. On a consideration of the facts and circumstances of the case and submissions made across the bar, I dispose the writ petition with the following directions:-

(i) In Ext.P4 order, the second respondent does not state reasons as to why the petitioner was required to deposit the amounts as a condition for the grant of stay.

This Court has held in **Archana Agencies vs. Commecial Tax Officer** (2014 (2) KLT 715) that an authority considering a stay petition is bound to give reasons even while granting conditional stay.

(ii) Ext.P4 order is quashed and the second respondent is directed to reconsider the matter and pass fresh orders in the stay petition filed by the petitioner, within one month from the date of receipt of a copy of this judgment after affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner.

(iii) Recovery steps, initiated against the petitioner shall be kept in abeyance till such time as fresh orders

are passed by the second respondent, as directed above, and communicated to the petitioner.

Sd/-
A.K.JAYASANKARAN NAMBIAR
JUDGE

AMV/07/01/