

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE A.K.JAYASANKARAN NAMBIAR

SATURDAY, THE 21ST DAY OF NOVEMBER 2015/30TH KARTHIKA, 1937

WP(C).No. 35184 of 2015 (W)

PETITIONER:

**SHAJI K.A, PROPRIETOR,
SURYA ENTERPRISES,
PMC XVIII/1201, 1202, PERUMBAVOOR.**

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

RESPONDENT:

**THE COMMERCIAL TAX INSPECTOR,
COMMERCIAL TAX CHECKPOST, WALAYAR-678624.**

BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SMT.LILLY.K.T

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 21-11-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:**

mbr/

WP(C).No. 35184 of 2015 (W)

APPENDIX

PETITIONER(S)' EXHIBITS:

- EXT.P1 :** TRUE COPY OF THE INVOICE NO.181 DATED 26.10.2015.
- EXT.P2 :** TRUE COPY OF THE NOTICE NO.OR/3245/9A/15-16 DATED 06.11.2015
UNDER SECITON 47(2)OF THE KERALA VALUE ADDED TAX ACT
ISSUED BY RESPONDENT`.
- EXT. P3 :** TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER ISSUED BY THE SUPPLIER
DATED 12.11.2015.

RESPONDENT(S)' EXHIBITS:

NIL

//TRUE COPY//

P.S. TO JUDGE

mbr/

A.K.JAYASANKARAN NAMBIAR, J.

W.P.(C).NO.35184 OF 2015 (W)

Dated this the 21st day of November, 2015

J U D G M E N T

The petitioner, who is a registered dealer under the KVAT Act, is aggrieved by Ext.P2 notice issued to him, detaining a consignment of veneer tapes, that was being transported at the instance of the petitioner. In the writ petition, the petitioner is aggrieved by the insistence of the respondent that the petitioner must pay the security deposit demanded in the detention notice as a condition for release of the goods and vehicle.

2. I have heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and also the learned Government Pleader appearing for the respondents.

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) On a perusal of Ext.P2 notice, it is seen that the objection of the respondent is essentially with regard to the classification of the goods under transportation. There is nothing in the notice however to indicate as to why the goods would merit classification in the manner suggested by the respondent. Counsel for the petitioner would point out that the petitioner is a registered dealer and that the transportation of the goods was accompanied by the documents mandated under the KVAT Act. Taking note of the said submission, I direct the respondent to release the goods and the vehicle subject to the petitioner furnishing a simple bond without sureties for the security deposit demanded in Ext.P2 notice, before the respondent.

(ii) The respondent shall thereafter transmit the files to the adjudicating authority who shall adjudicate the matter and pass orders, after hearing the petitioner, within two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this judgment, untrammelled by the observations in this judgment.

(iii) The petitioner shall produce a copy of this judgment and a copy of the writ petition before the respondent.

A.K.JAYASANKARAN NAMBIAR
JUDGE