

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 21.03.2017

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.RAVICHANDRABAABU

W.P.No.6818 of 2017

And

W.M.P.No.7387 of 2017

Tvl.Manohar & Co.,
Represented by its Manager
Girdhari Singh ... Petitioner

Vs.

The Assistant Commissioner (CT) (FAC),
R.G.Street Assessment Circle,
Coimbatore - 641 018. ... Respondent

Prayer:

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Certiorari calling for the records on the files of the respondent in TIN.33541760878/2012-13 dated 30.11.2016 and quash the same as being without jurisdiction and authority of law and contrary to the principles of natural justice.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Senniappan

For Respondent : Mr.S.Kanmani Annamalai
Additional Government Pleader (Taxes)

सत्यमेव जयते
O R D E R

Mr.S.Kanmani Annamalai, learned Additional Government Pleader (Taxes) takes notice for the respondent. By consent of parties, the main writ petition itself, is taken up for final disposal at the admission stage, since it is represented by both sides that the issue involved in this case is squarely covered by the decision made by this Court in W.P.No.105 of 2016 etc. batch dated 01.03.2017 arising out of the assessments made based on the web report.

2.Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Additional Government Pleader (Taxes) appearing for the respondent.

3.It is seen that the impugned order of assessment was passed on the basis of web report alleging there is some mismatch. It is the contention of the petitioner that the respondent has passed the order of assessment without even furnishing copy of the details of such web report and without even granting an opportunity of personal hearing to the petitioner. Therefore, the learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the order passed by this Court in the batch of cases dated 01.03.2017 in W.P.No.105 of 2016 etc. is squarely applicable to the facts of the present case as well.

4.The learned Additional Government Pleader appearing for the respondent is not disputing the above said fact.

5.This Court while considering the assessments made based on web report, has passed a detailed order in W.P.No.105 of 2016 etc. batch, dated 01.03.2017, wherein at paragraph Nos.56 to 58, it has been observed as follows:

"56.The procedure adopted under the Maharashtra VAT Act appears to be a more reasonable procedure, the Rules have been so designed to constitute independent authorities, who will in exercise jurisdiction to dispose of the objections etc. However, this Court cannot legislate nor direct the State to legislate in a particular fashion and it is for the state to bring about and appropriate rules and set procedures so that when discrepancy is noted while comparing the return with that of the figures available with the Department in their web portal, there should be an exercise carried out by the department within its level before calling upon the dealer to show cause. This can be achieved only if there is a centralised mechanism and if the present practice is allowed to prevail, it would only result in multiplicity of proceedings with more number of cases pending before the Courts and Appellate forums, thus jeopardizing the interest of revenue. Therefore, it is high time the Principal Secretary and Commissioner of Commercial Taxes in consultation with him officers lays out a detailed procedure as to how to take forward cases of mismatch, evolve a central mechanism, which can go into these aspect and furnish details in full form to the respective Assessing Officers, who can decide

for themselves as to whether there is a case made out to call upon their dealer to explain. If this centralized mechanism is not put in place exclusively for such purpose, it would result in notices and orders being issued by the respective Assessing Officers without even the knowledge of the Assessing Officer of the other end dealer resultantly no action being taken against other end dealer, assuming, he is at fault. Therefore, it is high time the Department wakes up and stops the one way approach and examine the matter in a holistic manner so that the defaulting dealer is brought to books.

57. Hence, for all the above reasons, all the Writ Petitions are allowed and the notices/orders either original or appellate or revisional are set aside and the matters are remanded to the respective Assessing Officers, to undertake a fresh exercise by conducting a thorough enquiry in consultation with the Assessing Officers of the other end dealer for which purpose the Commissioner of Commercial Taxes shall empower the Assessing Officers to seek information from other circles as well and in the mean time to evolve a centralized mechanism to exclusively deal with the cases of mismatch and while doing so, the Principal Commissioner shall take note of the procedures adopted by the other States, more particularly, in Maharastra, Gujarat and Delhi and if any statutory amendments have to be made, make appropriate recommendations to the State Government, and till then to devise a procedure which is fair and reasonable and afford an opportunity to the dealer to putforth his case and establish that he is entitled to the concession/set-off availed.

58. Since these Writ Petitions have been allowed and the impugned orders have been set aside and the matters have been remanded for fresh consideration the petitioners/dealers are not entitled to raise the plea of limitation, when fresh show cause notices are issued and they are directed to submit their explanation to enable the Assessing Officers to adjudicate their case. The Court places on record the valuable assistance of Ms.R.Charulatha Advocate of M/s.Lakshmikumaran and Sridharan Attorneys.

Consequently, connected Miscellaneous
Petitions are closed. No costs."

6. Therefore, it is clear that the respondent has to redo the assessment after following the procedure/ guidelines made in the above said batch of cases.

7. Accordingly, the writ petition is allowed and the impugned order of assessment is set aside and the matter is remitted back to the respondent for passing fresh order of assessment after following the procedure/ guidelines issued in the above said batch of cases, also by affording opportunity of personal hearing to the petitioner. Such exercise shall be done by the respondent within a period of eight weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

8. The writ petition is allowed as indicated above. No costs. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (CS IX)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

pri

To
The Assistant Commissioner (CT) (FAC),
R.G. Street Assessment Circle,
Coimbatore - 641 018.

+1cc to Mr. R. Senniappan, Advocate, S.R.No.17825

+1cc to the Special Government Pleader (T), S.R.No.17615

WEB COPY

W.P.No.6818 of 2017

And

W.M.P.No.7387 of 2017

rv (co0
rmp (23/03/17)