

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.12762 of 2024

=====

M/S Sanjeev Kumar Sharma through its proprietor Sanjeev Kumar Sharma @ Sanjeev Kumar Singh, Male, aged about 21 years, Son of Ganesh Prasad Sharma, resident of ward no.- 15, Bajitpur Maiyari, P.O. and P.S.- Bazitpur Maiyari, Samastipur, Bihar.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Commissioner of State Taxes, New Secretariat, Patna.
2. The Joint Commissioner, State Taxes, Samastipur, Darbhanga, Bihar.
3. The Additional Commissioner (Appeal), State Taxes, Darbhanga Commissioner, Darbhanga, Bihar.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mrs. Archana Sinha, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Vivek Kumar, Government Pleader 7

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

and

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PARTHA SARTHY

ORAL JUDGMENT

(Per: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE)

Date : 28-08-2024

The petitioner is aggrieved with the cancellation of registration by Annexure P-2 order passed on 09.02.2023. against which an appeal was filed which was rejected as delayed, on 14.03.2024 at Annexure P-3.

2. Section 107 of the Bihar Goods and Services Tax Act, 2017 ("BGST Act" hereafter) permits an appeal to be filed within three months and also apply for delay condonation with satisfactory reasons within a further period of one month. Here, the order impugned in the appeal was dated 09.02.2023.



An appeal was to be filed on or before 10.05.2023 and if necessary with a delay condonation application within one month thereafter, i.e. on or before 09.06.2023. The appeal is said to have been filed only on 31.01.2024, after the limitation period expired.

3. Further, the Government had come out with an Amnesty Scheme by Circular No. 3 of 2023, by which the registered dealers, whose registrations were cancelled were permitted to restore their registration on payment of all dues between 31.03.2023 to 31.08.2023. The petitioner did not avail of such remedy also.

4. The petitioner does not have any case that the show-cause notice was not received by him. Further, it is also pertinent that the reason stated in the show-cause notice for cancellation of registration is that the petitioner has not filed returns for a continuous period of six months. The petitioner does not have a case that he had in fact filed a return in the continuous period of six months.

5. In the above circumstances, we find no reason to invoke the extraordinary jurisdiction under Article 226, especially since it is not a measure to be employed where there are alternate remedies available and the assessee has not been



diligent in availing such alternate remedies within the stipulated time. The law favors the diligent and not the indolent.

6. The writ petition would stand dismissed.

(K. Vinod Chandran, CJ)

(Partha Sarthy, J)

aditya/-

AFR/NAFR	
CAV DATE	
Uploading Date	29.08.2024.
Transmission Date	

