

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT HYDERABAD
FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA AND THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH

THE HON' BLE SRI JUSTICE V. RAMASUBRAMANIAN
AND
THE HON' BLE MS.JUSTICE J. UMA DEVI

WRIT PETITION No.13796 OF 2018

Date:20.04.2018

Between:

M s.Sri Venkata Lakshmi Trading Company,
West Fly.Gate, Dumpagadapa Road,
Akividu, West Godavari District
Rep. by its Managing Director.

...Petitioner

Vs.

The State of Andhra Pradesh,
Rep.by its Principal Secretary,
Revenue (CT-II) Dept., Secretariat,
Velagapudi, Guntur District
and others

.. Respondents

For Petitioner : M s.P.Balaji Varma

For Respondents : Mr.Shaik Jeelani Basha

Gist :

Head Note : सत्यमेव जयते

Cases Referred : Nil

THE HON' BLE SRI JUSTICE V. RAMASUBRAMANIAN

AND

THE HON' BLE MS. JUSTICE J. UMA DEVI

WRIT PETITION No.13796 of 2018

ORDER: (Per V.Ramasubramanian,J)

Aggrieved by the revision of assessment passed under Section 32(2) of the Andhra Pradesh Value Added Tax Act, 2005, the assessee has come up with the above writ petition.

2. Heard Mr.P.Balaji Varma, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr. Shaik jeelani Basha, learned special standing counsel for Commercial Taxes appearing for the respondents.

3. The contention of the petitioner is that the issue raised in this writ petition is squarely covered by the decision of this Court in K.G.F. Cottons (P) Ltd., Assistant Commissioner (CT)¹. According to the learned counsel for the petitioner, the dealer referred to the decision of this Court dated 04.03.2015 in W.P.No.17972 of 2008, but the 2nd respondent failed to consider the same.

4. It is seen from the impugned order that there is a reference to W.P.No.17972 of 2008. The issue as to whether tax can be levied under Section 4(4) of the Act on husk to the extent it related to the purchase of paddy, is covered by the decision in K.G.F. Cottons (P) Ltd. But, the 2nd respondent has not taken note of the law laid down in the said decision. Therefore, we are of the considered view that the matter has to be remanded back.

5. Hence, the Writ Petition is allowed, the impugned order is set aside, and the matter remanded back to the 2nd respondent for consideration of the issue, in the light of the decision of this Court in

¹ (2015) 81 VST 1

K.G.F. Cottons (P) Ltd. The 2nd respondent may pass fresh orders, after taking note of the facts, with reference to the case law indicated above.

6. Consequently, miscellaneous petitions if any pending in the writ petition shall stand dismissed. No order as to costs.

V. RAMASUBRAMANIAN, J

J. UMA DEVI, J

April 20, 2018
KTL

