



\$~35

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **W.P.(C) 8000/2024**

SUJEET KUMAR JHA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Aditya Kumar, Ms. Ila
Nath and Ms. Priyanka, Mr.
Tarun Chawla, Advs.

versus

THE SALES TAX OFFICER CLASS II AVATO

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Rajeev Aggarwal, ASC
along with Mr. Shubham Goel,
Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YASHWANT VARMA

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAVINDER DUDEJA

ORDER

% **14.10.2024**

1. The writ petitioner is aggrieved by the order dated 15 February 2023 in terms of which its registration under the **Central Goods and Services Tax Act, 2017**¹ has come to be canceled with retrospective effect from 16 July 2021.

2. The record would reflect that the aforesaid order was preceded by a **Show Cause Notice**² dated 28 October 2022 and where the following allegations were leveled: -

“Whereas on the basis of information which has come to my notice, it appears that your registration is liable to be cancelled for the following reasons:

1. MISMATCH IN GSTR-1 AND GSTR-3B OF RS 38,38,453.48/-. PLEASE CLARIFY ALONGWITH RELEVANT DOCUMENTS.

You are hereby directed to furnish a reply to the notice within seven working days from the date of service of this notice.

¹ Act

² SCN



You are hereby directed to appear before the undersigned on 04/11/2022 at 11:00

If you fail to furnish a reply within the stipulated date or fail to appear for personal hearing on the appointed date and time, the case will be decided ex parte on the basis of available records and on merits .

Please note that your registration stands suspended with effect from 28/10/2022”

3. The petitioner contends that in response to the aforesaid notice, a reply dated 20 December 2022 was duly submitted for the consideration of the respondents. The final order, however, proceeds on the basis that no reply to the SCN had at all been submitted.

4. The order also appears to suffer from apparent mistakes and inherent contradictions since in the opening lines of the final order itself, the respondent authority refers to reply dated 22 November 2022 and which perhaps appears to be an inadvertent and incorrect reference to the reply which had been submitted and was dated 20 December 2022.

5. Quite apart from the aforesaid, we find merit in the challenge which stands raised to the final order with learned counsel drawing our attention to Section 29 of the Act and which encapsulates the grounds which may warrant cancellation or suspension of registration. That provision reads as follows: -

“29. Cancellation[or suspension] of registration.—(1) The proper officer may, either on his own motion or on an application filed by the registered person or by his legal heirs, in case of death of such person, cancel the registration, in such manner and within such period as may be prescribed, having regard to the circumstances where,—

(a) the business has been discontinued, transferred fully for any reason including death of the proprietor, amalgamated with other legal entity, demerged or otherwise disposed of; or



(b) there is any change in the constitution of the business; or

[(c) the taxable person is no longer liable to be registered under Section 22 or Section 24 or intends to optout of the registration voluntarily made under sub-section (3) of Section 25]:

[Provided that during pendency of the proceedings relating to cancellation of registration filed by the registered person, the registration may be suspended for such period and in such manner as may be prescribed.]

(2) The proper officer may cancel the registration of a person from such date, including any retrospective date, as he may deem fit, where,—

(a) a registered person has contravened such provisions of the Act or the rules made thereunder as may be prescribed; or

(b) a person paying tax under Section 10 has not furnished ⁸⁹[the return for a financial year beyond three months from the due date of furnishing the said return]; or

(c) any registered person, other than a person specified in clause (b), has not furnished returns for [such continuous tax period as may be prescribed]; or

(d) any person who has taken voluntary registration under sub-section (3) of Section 25 has not commenced business within six months from the date of registration; or

(e) registration has been obtained by means of fraud, wilful misstatement or suppression of facts:

Provided that the proper officer shall not cancel the registration without giving the person an opportunity of being heard.

[Provided further that during pendency of the proceedings relating to cancellation of registration, the proper officer may suspend the registration for such period and in such manner as may be prescribed.]

(3) The cancellation of registration under this section shall not affect the liability of the person to pay tax and other dues under this Act or to discharge any obligation under this Act or the rules made thereunder for any period prior to the date of cancellation whether or not such tax and other dues are determined before or after the date of cancellation.

(4) The cancellation of registration under the State Goods and Services Tax Act or the Union Territory Goods and Services Tax



Act, as the case may be, shall be deemed to be a cancellation of registration under this Act.

(5) Every registered person whose registration is cancelled shall pay an amount, by way of debit in the electronic credit ledger or electronic cash ledger, equivalent to the credit of input tax in respect of inputs held in stock and inputs contained in semi-finished or finished goods held in stock or capital goods or plant and machinery on the day immediately preceding the date of such cancellation or the output tax payable on such goods, whichever is higher, calculated in such manner as may be prescribed:

Provided that in case of capital goods or plant and machinery, the taxable person shall pay an amount equal to the input tax credit taken on the said capital goods or plant and machinery, reduced by such percentage points as may be prescribed or the tax on the transaction value of such capital goods or plant and machinery under Section 15, whichever is higher.

(6) The amount payable under sub-section (5) shall be calculated in such manner as may be prescribed.”

6. As we view the SCN, it becomes apparent that only allegation which was leveled was of a perceived mismatch in GSTR-1 and GSTR-3B of INR 38,38,453.48/-. That notice did not allude to any of the circumstances which are spoken of in Section 29 of the Act.

7. We also find merit in the submission of writ petitioner and who draws our attention to the original SCN to contend that the same had embodied no indication of the respondents proposing to cancel registration from a retrospective date.

8. We note that while dealing with an identical challenge, we had in **Riddhi Siddhi Enterprises vs. Commissioner of Goods and Services Tax (CGST), South Delhi & Anr.**³ held as follows:-

“5. As is manifest from a reading of Section 29, clauses (a) to (e) of Section 29(2) constitute independent limbs on the basis of which a registration may warrant cancellation. While the provision does enable the respondents to cancel that registration with retrospective effect, the mere existence or conferral of that power would not justify a revocation of registration. The order under Section 29(2) must itself reflect the

³ W.P.(C) 8061/2024 decided on 25 September 2024



reasons which may have weighed upon the respondents to cancel registration with retrospective effect. Given the deleterious consequences which would ensue and accompany a retroactive cancellation makes it all the more vital that the order be reasoned and demonstrative of due application of mind. It is also necessary to observe that the mere existence of such a power would not in itself be sufficient to sustain its invocation. What we seek to emphasise is that the power to cancel retrospectively can neither be robotic nor routinely applied unless circumstances so warrant. When tested on the aforesaid precepts it becomes ex facie evident that the impugned order of cancellation cannot be sustained.

6. We note that while dealing with the right of the respondents to cancel GST registration with retrospective effect and the manner in which such power should be exercised in accordance with the statutory scheme was an issue which was noticed in **Ramesh Chander vs Assistant Commissioner of Goods and Services Tax, Dwarka Division, CGST Delhi & Anr.**⁴ The Court in Ramesh Chander taking note of the contours of Section 29 had held:-

“1. The petitioner impugns order in appeal dated 29.12.2023, whereby the appeal filed by the petitioner has been dismissed solely on the ground of limitation. Petitioner had filed the appeal impugning order dated 13.07.2022 whereby the GST registration of the petitioner was cancelled retrospectively with effect from 01.07.2017. Petitioner also impugns Show Cause Notice dated 07.04.2022.

2. Vide impugned Show Cause Notice dated 07.04.2022, petitioner was called upon to show cause as to why the registration be not cancelled for the following reasons:-

“Any Taxpayer other than composition taxpayer has not filed returns for a continuous period of six months”

3. Petitioner was in the business of services involving repair, alterations, additions, replacements, renovation, maintenance or remodelling of the building covered above, General construction services of harbours, waterways, dams, water mains and lines, irrigation and other waterworks, General construction services of long-distance underground/ overland/ submarine pipelines, communication and electric power lines (cables); pumping stations and related works; transformer stations and related works, General construction services of local water & sewage pipelines, electricity and communication cables & related works, Installation, assembly and erection services of other prefabricated structures and constructions and possessed a GST registration.

4. A show cause notice was issued to the petitioner on



07.04.2022 Though the notice does not specify any cogent reason, there is an observation in the notice stating failure to furnish returns for a continuous period of six months. The show cause notice requires the petitioner to appear before the undersigned i.e. authority issuing the notice. Notice does not give the name of the officer or place or time where the petitioner has to appear.

5. Further the order dated 13.07.2022 passed on the show cause notice does not give any reasons for cancellation of the registration. It, however, states that the registration is liable to be cancelled for the following reason "whereas no reply to notice to show cause has been submitted". However, the said order in itself is contradictory, the order states "reference to your reply dated 16.04.2022 in response to the notice to show cause dated 07.04.2022" and the reason stated for cancellation is "whereas no reply to notice to show cause has been submitted". The order further states that effective date of cancellation of registration is 01.07.2017 i.e. retrospective date.

6. Neither the show cause notice, nor the order spell out the reasons for retrospective cancellation. In fact, in our view, order dated 13.07.2022 does not qualify as an order of cancellation of registration.

7. As per the petitioner, the said order reflected that the GST of the Petitioner stands cancelled from 01.07.2017 even though returns thereafter have been filed by the Petitioner.

8. We notice that the show cause notice as well as the impugned order of cancellation, are themselves vitiated on account of lack of reason and clarity. The appeal has been dismissed solely on the ground of limitation. Since the very foundation of entire proceedings i.e. show cause notice and the order of cancellation are vitiated, we are of the view that no purpose would be served in relegating the petitioner to the stage of an appeal.

9. In terms of Section 29(2) of the Central Goods and Services Tax Act, 2017, the proper officer may cancel the GST registration of a person from such date including any retrospective date, as he may deem fit if the circumstances set out in the said sub-section are satisfied. The registration cannot be cancelled with retrospective effect mechanically. It can be cancelled only if the proper officer deems it fit to do so. Such satisfaction cannot be subjective but must be based on some objective criteria. Merely, because a taxpayer has not filed the returns for some period does not mean that the taxpayer's registration is required to be cancelled with retrospective date also covering the period when the returns were filed and the



taxpayer was compliant. 10. It is important to note that, according to the respondent, one of the consequences for cancelling a tax payer's registration with retrospective effect is that the taxpayer's customers are denied the input tax credit availed in respect of the supplies made by the tax payer during such period. Although, we do not consider it apposite to examine this aspect but assuming that the respondent's contention in this regard is correct, it would follow that the proper officer is also required to consider this aspect while passing any order for cancellation of GST registration with retrospective effect. Thus, a taxpayer's registration can be cancelled with retrospective effect only where such consequences are intended and are warranted.

11. The show cause notice does not even state that the registration is liable to be cancelled from a retrospective date.

12. The petition is allowed. The impugned show cause notice dated 07.04.2022, order of cancellation dated 13.07.2022 and the order in appeal dated 29.12.2023 are accordingly set aside. GST registration of the petitioner is restored, subject to petitioner filing requisite returns upto date.

13. It is clarified that since the petitioner could not have filed the return after the GST registration was suspended, there shall be no liability to pay any penalty or fine for delayed filing. However, this would only apply in case petitioner files an affidavit of undertaking that petitioner has not carried out any business or raised invoices or taken any Input Tax Credit after the registration was suspended with effect from 07.04.2022 i.e., the date of suspension of the registration.

14. Respondent would be at liberty to initiate appropriate proceedings in accordance with law after giving a proper show cause notice containing complete details, if so advised. Further this order would not preclude the respondent from initiating any steps in accordance with law, if it is found that the petitioner had violated any provisions of the Act.

15. Petition is disposed of in the above terms."

7. We further take note of the judgment in **Delhi Polymers vs Commissioner, Trade and Taxes & Anr.**⁵ wherein the following was observed:-

"1. Petitioner has filed the appeal impugning order of cancellation of registration dated 15.12.2021 whereby the GST registration of the Petitioner has been cancelled retrospectively with effect from 01.07.2017. Petitioner also impugns Show Cause Notice dated 04.09.2021.

2. Vide Show Cause Notice dated 04.09.2021, petitioner was



called upon to show cause as to why the registration be not cancelled for the following reason:-

“Collects any amount representing the tax but fails to pay the same to the account of the Central/State Government beyond a period of three months from the date on which such payment becomes due”

3. Petitioner was engaged in the business of Sanitary ware Products & Accessories i.e., Baths, Shower, Washbasins, Seats and Cover etc. and possessed GST registration.

4. Show Cause Notice dated 04.09.2021 was issued to the Petitioner seeking to cancel its registration. However, the Show Cause Notice also does not put the petitioner to notice that the registration is liable to be cancelled retrospectively. Accordingly, the petitioner had no opportunity to even object to the retrospective cancellation of the registration.

5. Further, the impugned order dated 15.12.2021 passed on the Show Cause Notice dated 04.09.2021 does not give any reasons for cancellation. It, however, states that the registration is liable to be cancelled for the following reason “whereas no reply to the show cause notice has been submitted”. However, the said order in itself is contradictory. The order states “reference to your reply dated 15.12.2021 in response to the notice to show cause dated 04.09.2021” and the reason stated for the cancellation is “whereas no reply to notice show cause has been submitted”. The order further states that effective date of cancellation of registration is 01.07.2017 i.e., a retrospective date.

6. Neither the show cause notice, nor the order spell out the reasons for retrospective cancellation. In fact, in our view, order dated 15.12.2021 does not qualify as an order of cancellation of registration. On one hand, it states that the registration is liable to be cancelled and on the other, in the column at the bottom there are no dues stated to be due against the petitioner and the table shows nil demand.

7. Learned Counsel for the Petitioner submits that the said order reflected that the GST registration of petitioner stands cancelled from 01.07.2017 even though returns thereafter have been filed by the Petitioner.

8. He further submits that the petitioner is no longer interested in continuing the business and the business has been discontinued.

9. In terms of Section 29(2) of the Act, the proper officer may cancel the GST registration of a person from such date including any retrospective date, as he may deem fit if the circumstances set out in the said sub-section are satisfied.



Registration cannot be cancelled with retrospective effect mechanically. It can be cancelled only if the proper officer deems it fit to do so. Such satisfaction cannot be subjective but must be based on some objective criteria. Merely, because a taxpayer has not filed the returns for some period does not mean that the taxpayer's registration is required to be cancelled with retrospective date also covering the period when the returns were filed and the taxpayer was compliant.

10. It is important to note that, according to the respondent, one of the consequences for cancelling a tax payer's registration with retrospective effect is that the taxpayer's customers are denied the input tax credit availed in respect of the supplies made by the tax payer during such period. Although, we do not consider it apposite to examine this aspect but assuming that the respondent's contention is required to consider this aspect while passing any order for cancellation of GST registration with retrospective effect. Thus, a taxpayer's registration can be cancelled with retrospective effect only where such consequences are intended and are warranted.

11. It may be further noted that both the Petitioners and the department want cancellation of the GST registration of the Petitioner, though for a different reason.

12. In view of the fact that Petitioner does not seek to carry on business or continue the registration, the impugned order dated 15.12.2021 is modified to the limited extent that registration shall now be treated as cancelled with effect from 04.09.2021 i.e., the date when the Show Cause Notice was issued.

13. It is clarified that Respondents are also not precluded from taking any steps for recovery of any tax, penalty or interest that may be due in respect of the subject firm in accordance with law.

14. Petition is accordingly disposed of in the above terms."

8. In view of the aforesaid and in light of an abject failure on the part of the authority to assign even rudimentary reasons for a retroactive cancellation, we find ourselves unable to sustain the order impugned."

Accordingly, and for all the aforesaid reasons, we find ourselves unable to sustain the impugned order.

9. The writ petition is accordingly allowed. The order dated 15 February 2023 is hereby quashed.

10. We however leave it open to the respondents to draw



proceedings afresh, if circumstances so warrant and are otherwise permissible in law. All rights and contentions of respective parties, in such an eventuality, are kept open.

YASHWANT VARMA, J

RAVINDER DUDEJA, J

OCTOBER 14, 2024/neha