

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.17076 of 2015

=====

1. Arsh Eit Udyog a proprietorship concern having its office at Nimrauli, P.O. - Alimabad Nimrauli, P.S. - Kamtaul, District - Darbhanga through its proprietor, Md. Khurshid Alam, Son of Late Abdul Rahman, Resident of Nimrauli, P.O. - Alimabad Nimrauli, P.S. - Kamtaul, District - Darbhanga.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Commissioner of Commercial Taxes, Bihar, Patna having its office at Vikash Bhawan, Bailey Road, Patna.
2. Dy. Commissioner of Commercial Taxes, West Circle, Darbhanga.
3. Commercial Taxes Officer, Darbhanga Circle, Darbhanga.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. D.V.Pathy

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Purnendu Singh- Gp27

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESH KUMAR DATTA

and

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR SINGH

ORAL ORDER

(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESH KUMAR DATTA)

4 22-01-2016

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and

learned counsel for the State.

The petitioner seeks quashing of the order dated 29.7.2015 for the period 2014-15 passed by the Respondent-authorities of the Commercial Taxes Department by which entry tax as also penalty under Section 28 of the Bihar VAT Act have been levied.

The stand of the petitioner is that the Respondent-authority has passed the order of assessment without service of notice and grant of proper opportunity of

being heard to the petitioner.

Despite several adjournments having been granted in the batch of cases from time to time from the month of August, 2015 onwards including this case when added to the said analogous list of cases, no counter affidavit has been filed assailing the said fact and bringing on record any document to show actual service of notice. In this case also a cyclostyled order passed in hundreds of cases, imposing exactly the same amount of tax and penalty, has been passed in the same manner but while there may be some justification because barring a few of these brick kilns, they have gone for compounding to the same extent, but there cannot be any justification for passing order in each case that the notices were issued and after service they are on the record. It is completely unacceptable to make any such statement with regard to the notice as each notice will have its own course and while some may be served at the first instance, others may not have been served at the proper place to the proper person under the provisions of the Act and the Rules. Thus, putting the same in cyclostyled manner shows non-application of mind and no reliance can be placed on any such statement made on such cyclostyled order-sheet.

In the aforesaid circumstances, in the absence

of any reply to the said allegations by filing counter affidavit, it has to be held that the order has been passed in violation of the principles of natural justice.

The writ application is, accordingly, allowed. The impugned order dated 29.7.2015 and the consequential demand notice are both quashed and the matter is remanded to the assessing authority to proceed afresh in accordance with law.

It is, however, made clear that no fresh notice shall be required to be issued to the petitioner and the petitioner shall appear before the assessing authority on 4th March, 2016 at 11.00 A.M. along with his show cause, who shall thereafter proceed to pass orders expeditiously in the matter in accordance with law.

(Ramesh Kumar Datta, J)

S.Pandey/-

(Sudhir Singh, J)

U			
---	--	--	--