

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE A.K.JAYASANKARAN NAMBIAR

TUESDAY, THE 6TH DAY OF OCTOBER 2015/14TH ASWINA, 1937

WP(C).No. 30111 of 2015 (L)

PETITIONER(S):

**M. ABDUL MAJEED,
M/S.KUNNAMPURAM JEWELLERY,
THANGALS ROAD, KONDOTTY,
MALAPPURAM.**

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

RESPONDENT(S):

- 1. THE COMMERCIAL TAX OFFICER,
MANJERI-676 121.**
- 2. THE ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER (APPEALS),
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCIAL TAXES,
PALAKKAD-678 001.**
- 3. THE INSPECTING ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER,
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCIAL TAXES,
MALAPPURAM AT MANJERI-676 121.**

BY GOVT. PLEADER SRI.LIJU V.STEPHEN.

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 06-10-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:**

rs.

APPENDIX

PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS:-

- EXT.P1 COPY OF THE ASSESSMENT ORDER PASSED BY 1ST RESPONDENT
FOR THE YEAR 2012-13 DATED 11/09/2014.
- EXT.P2 COPY OF THE APPEAL FILED BY THE PETITIONER BEFORE THE
2ND RESPONDENT DATED 12/11/2014.
- EXT.P3 COPY OF THE STAY PETITION FILED BY THE PETITIONER
BEFORE THE 2ND RESPONDENT DATED 12/11/2014.
- EXT.P4 COPY OF THE INTERIM ORDER PASSED BY THE 2ND RESPONDENT
FOR THE YEAR 2012-13 DATED 11/03/2015.
- EXT.P5 COPY OF THE DEMAND NOTICE UNDER SECTION 7 OF THE
REVENUE RECOVERY ACT ISSUED BY THE 3RD RESPONDENT
FO THE YEAR 2012-13 DATED 07/11/2014.

RESPONDENT'S EXHIBITS:- NIL.

//TRUE COPY//

P.S. TO JUDGE

rs.

A.K.JAYASANKARAN NAMBIAR, J.

W.P.(C). No. 30111 of 2015

Dated this the 6th day of October, 2015

JUDGMENT

The petitioner is an assessee under the Kerala Value Added Tax Act, 2003. Against Ext.P1 assessment order for the assessment year 2012-2013, the petitioner had preferred Ext.P2 appeal before the 2nd respondent. Along with the appeal, the petitioner had also preferred Ext.P3 stay petition. The 2nd respondent has now passed Ext.P4 order directing the petitioner to pay 30% of the amount as a condition for the grant of stay against recovery of the balance amounts confirmed against the petitioner vide the assessment order.

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

3. I have heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner as also the learned Government Pleader appearing for the respondents.

4. On a consideration of the facts and circumstances of the

case and the submissions made across the bar, I dispose the writ petition with the following directions:-

(i) In Ext.P4 order, the 2nd 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 v. Commercial 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 2nd respondent is directed to reconsider the matter and pass fresh orders in the stay petitions 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 2nd respondent, as directed above, and communicated to the petitioner.

Sd/-
A.K.JAYASANKARAN NAMBIAR
JUDGE