



WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 04.07.2023

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE S.SRIMATHY

W.P.(MD)Nos.15989 to 15991 of 2023

and

W.M.P(MD)Nos.13406, 13403 & 13410 of 2023

Hotel Jeeva,

Represented by its Proprietor D.Rajaguruvan

...

Petitioner in all Writ
Petitions

Vs.

The Assistant Commissioner (ST),

Office of the Assistant Commissioner (ST),

Virudhunagar -II

...

Respondent in all Writ
Petitions.

COMMON PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of *Writ of Certiorari*, calling for the records relating pertaining to the impugned order passed by the respondent in Asst.No. 33965741624/2018-2019, 2019-2020 and 2020-2021, respectively; dated 12.09.2022 and quash the same.



WEB COPY

In both Writ Petitions

For Petitioner : M/s.T.Bashyam

For Respondent : Mr.A.K.Manikkam
Additional Government Pleader

COMMON ORDER

These writ petitions are filed to quash the impugned order, dated 03.06.2022, passed by the Respondent in Asst.No.33965741624/2018-2019, 2019-2020 and 2020-2021, respectively; on the limited ground that the Petitioner has submitted their objection that, it was stated that the Tamil Nadu Government had introduced G.O.Ms.No.47/27.03.2012 with effect from 01.04.2012, whereby, an amendment was made to Entries 1 and 2 of Second Schedule to the Tamil Nadu Value Added Tax Act, 2006 (hereinafter referred as -the Act-). Subsequent to the said notification, the Entries 1 and 2 have been amended. The said amendment was challenged and the challenge was rejected upholding the vires of the said amendment by the Hon-ble Division Bench of this Court. Thereafter, it was carried by way of appeal and pending consideration before the Hon-ble Supreme Court. The outcome of the Appeals which are pending consideration before the Hon-ble Supreme Court, in view of the Petitioner, would have direct



WEB COPY

and material bearing on the present assessment.

2. Heard M/s.T.Bashyam, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and Mr.A.K.Manikkam, learned Additional Government Pleader, appearing for the respondent. Perused the material documents placed before this Court.

3. Since the issue involved in these Writ Petitions are similar in nature both the writ petitions are taken up together and disposed of by a common order.

4. The learned Counsel for the Petitioner submitted that no personal hearing was afforded to the Petitioner before passing the impugned assessment order. The learned Counsel brought to the notice of this Court that in view of the pendency of the Special Leave Petitions challenging the validity of the amendment made by the Government of Tamil Nadu, the Respondent ought not to have proceed further until the matter gets resolved by the Hon-ble Supreme Court. In any view, the Petitioner was not granted any opportunity to put forth



WEB COPY

their submission on merits. It was submitted that under similar circumstances, this Court was pleased to direct the Assessing Officer to revoke the assessment after granting an opportunity to the Petitioner to put forth their submission on merits. In this regard, he relied on the order, dated 26.03.2019 passed by this Court in W.P.(MD)No.22429 of 2016 and the relevant portion is extracted hereunder:

.....

“6. According to the learned counsel for the petitioner, no personal hearing was afforded to the petitioner before passing the impugned assessment order. Further, it is his case that no adequate explanation was submitted by the petitioner in his reply dated 06.5.2015 to the pre revision notice dated 22.04.2015 on merits, but he just informed the respondent that in view of the pendency of the Special Leave Petitions challenging the validity of the amendment made by the Government of Tamil Nadu, the respondent should not proceed with the revision of assessment proceedings. Therefore, according to the learned counsel for the petitioner, the respondent has violated the principles of natural justice by not affording adequate opportunity to the petitioner available to him under law.

7. Per contra, the learned Government Advocate would submit that there is an alternate efficacious remedy available to the petitioner under Section 51 of TN VAT Act and without exercising the same, the petitioner has directly approached this



WEB COPY

Court , which is not maintainable.

8. As seen from the impugned assessment order, the petitioner has not been afforded the right of personal hearing by the respondent. Further, on merits no explanation was given by the petitioner in his reply dated 06.05.2015 to the pre revision notice dated 22.04.2015, but he has simply stated that in view of the pendency of Special Leave Petitions before the Supreme Court challenging the amendment made by the Government of Tamil Nadu, based on which the proposal for revision of assessment has been made, he has not given any explanation on merits. Therefore, as rightly contended by the learned counsel for the petitioner the respondent has violated the principles of natural justice by not affording adequate opportunity to the petitioner and by granting him the right of personal hearing as well as permitting him to raise all his objections available to him under law for the proposed revision of assessment.

.....

11. In the result, the impugned assessment order dated. 09.11.2016 passed by respondent against the petitioner is hereby quashed and matter is remanded back to the respondent for fresh consideration and the respondent shall pass final orders in accordance with law after giving adequate opportunity to the petitioner, to raise all objections available to him under law and the respondent shall pass final orders within a period of eight weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order”.



WEB COPY

5. Following the above order of this Court which applies to the facts of the case, the impugned assessment order, dated 12.09.2022 passed by the Respondent are hereby quashed and the matters are remanded back to the Respondent for fresh consideration. The Respondent shall pass final orders in accordance with law after granting reasonable opportunity of personal hearing to the Petitioner. It is also open to the Petitioner to raise all objections available to him under law and the Respondent shall pass final order, within a period of three weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

6. With the above direction, these Writ Petitions are disposed of. No costs. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petitions are closed.

Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes
ksa

04.07.2023



WEB COPY

To

The Assistant Commissioner (ST),
Office of the Assistant Commissioner (ST),
Virudhunagar -II



WEB COPY



S.SRIMATHY, J

ksa

**Common Order made in
W.P.(MD)Nos.15989 to 15991 of 2023**

04.07.2023