



WEB COPY

WP No. 6874 of 2025



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 18-07-2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE KRISHNAN RAMASAMY

**WP No. 6874 of 2025
AND WMP NO. 7572 OF 2025**

Tvl.Sencon Builders and Infrastructure Pvt Ltd.,
Represented by its Director,
Shri.Sathies Lakshmi Gowdu Senthil Kumar,
D.No.43C, Pasheer Mohameed Layout,
INDIAN GAS Agencies, Gandhi Nagar,
Krishnagiri, Tamil Nadu.

Petitioner(s)

Vs

State Tax Officer,
Krishnagiri – I Circle,
Hosur, Tamil Nadu
SF.No. 559/5 ground floor,
Kallukurukki Village, Saamanthamalai Post,
Ramapuram (SO), Collector office back side,
Krishnagiri - 635 115.

Respondent(s)

PRAYER:-Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India,
praying for an issuance of Writ of Certiorari, calling for the records relating to
the impugned order bearing GSTIN 33ABICS4986R1ZB/ 2023-2024 dated



29.07.2024 along with the summary order Form GST DRC-07 bearing Reference No. ZD330724332671I dated 29-07-2024 passed by the Respondent and quash the same as the same being arbitrary, passed in violation of the principles of natural justice and also in violation of Articles 14, 19 (1) (g) and 265 of the Constitution.

For Petitioner(s): Ms.N.Asmitha

For Respondent(s): Ms.P.Selvi,
Government Advocate (t)

ORDER

This writ petition has been filed by the petitioner challenging the impugned assessment order dated 29.07.2025, passed by the respondent.

2.Ms.P.Selvi, learned Government Advocate (Taxes), takes notice on behalf of the respondent.

3.By consent of the parties, the main writ petition is taken up for disposal at the admission stage itself.



WEB COPY

4.Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that, in the present case, the petitioner have not received any physical copy of the show cause notice and also personal hearing notice. The show cause notice dated 17.04.2024, reminder notice dated 06.06.2024 and three personal hearing notices were uploaded in the GST Portal tab and the petitioner had no occasion to open the GST Portal. Even the impugned order dated 29.07.2025 was also uploaded in the GST Portal, which is violation of principle of natural justice. He would further submit that the petitioner is ready and willing to pay 25% of the disputed tax demand in respect of the impugned assessment period and prayed to set aside the impugned order directing the respondent to permit the petitioner to file their reply and provide an opportunity of personal hearing so that the petitioner would be able to substantiate their case.


5.Learned Government Advocate appearing for the respondent would submit that as per the voluntary submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, subject to the deposit of 25% of the disputed tax demand by the petitioner in respect of the impugned assessment period, if the Court feels it



appropriate and it is a fit case for re-consideration, this Court may consider and pass orders.


6. Heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner as well as the learned Government Advocate appearing for the respondent and perused the materials available on record.

7. Considering the above submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner as well as the learned Government Advocate appearing for the respondent and upon perusal of the materials, it is evident that the impugned show cause notice was uploaded on the GST Portal Tab. According to the petitioner, the petitioner was not aware of the issuance of the show cause notice issued through the GST Portal and the original of the said show cause notice was not furnished to them. In such circumstances, this Court is of the view that the impugned assessment order came to be passed without affording any opportunity of personal hearing to the petitioner, confirming the proposals contained in the show cause notice.



WEB COPY

8.No doubt sending notice by uploading in portal is a sufficient service, but, the Officer who is sending the repeated reminders, inspite of the fact that no response from the petitioner to the show cause notices etc., the Officer should have applied his/her mind and explored the possibility of sending notices by way of other modes prescribed in Section 169 of the GST Act, which are also the valid mode of service under the Act, otherwise it will not be an effective service, rather, it would only fulfilling the empty formalities. Merely passing an *ex parte* order by fulfilling the empty formalities will not serve any useful purpose and the same will only pave way for multiplicity of litigations, not only wasting the time of the Officer concerned, but also the precious time of the Appellate Authority/Tribunal and this Court as well. Thus, when there is no response from the tax payer to the notice sent through a particular mode, the Officer who is issuing notices should strictly explore the possibilities of sending notices through some other mode as prescribed in Section 169(1) of the Act, preferably by way of RPAD, which would ultimately achieve the object of the GST Act.



WEB COPY

9. Therefore, this Court finds that there is a lack of opportunities being provided to the petitioner. Hence, this Court is inclined to set-aside the impugned order with terms, by issuing the following directions:-

(i) The order impugned herein is set aside and the matter is remanded back to the respondent for fresh consideration on condition that the petitioner deposits 25% of the disputed tax amount in respect of the impugned assessment period, as agreed by the petitioner, within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

(ii) The petitioner shall file their reply/objection along with the required documents, if any, within a period of two weeks thereafter.

(iii) On filing of such reply/objection by the petitioner, the respondent shall consider the same and issue a 14 days clear notice by fixing the date of personal hearing to the petitioner and thereafter, pass appropriate orders on merits and in accordance with law, after hearing the petitioner, as expeditiously as possible.



WEB COPY

WP No. 6874 of 2025



(iv) Considering the fact that the impugned order itself has been set aside, this Court is of the opinion that, if any attachment has been made on the Bank account of the petitioner, the same cannot survive any longer and hence, it is lifted. The respondent is directed to instruct the Bank to unfreeze the Bank account of the petitioner immediately upon the production of proof with regard to the payment of 25% of the disputed tax made by the petitioner.

10. With the above directions, the writ petition is disposed of. There is no order as to costs. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

18-07-2025


rst

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Internet: Yes

Neutral Citation: Yes/No



WP No. 6874 of 2025



WEB COPY

To
State Tax Officer,
Krishnagiri – I Circle,
Hosur, Tamil Nadu
SF.No. 559/5 ground floor,
Kallukurukki Village, Saamanthamalai Post,
Ramapuram (SO), Collector office back side,
Krishnagiri - 635 115.



WEB COPY

WP No. 6874 of 2025



KRISHNAN RAMASAMY J.

rst

WP No. 6874 of 2025
AND WMP NO. 7572 OF 2025

18-07-2025