



WEB COPY

WP No. 11565 of 2025



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 01-04-2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE KRISHNAN RAMASAMY

WP No. 11565 of 2025

AND

WMP NO. 13060 OF 2025, WMP NO. 13056 OF 2025

M/s.Madras Fur Factory Private Limited
Represented By S. Pavan Kumar,
Director, 58/e, North Phase,
Sidco Industrial Estate,
Ambattur, Chennai

Petitioner(s)

Vs

The State Tax Officer (FAC)
Pattarakkam Assessment Circle,
Chennai

Respondent(s)

PRAYER:-Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, pleaded to issue a Writ of Certiorari, calling for the records on the files of the respondent in GSTIN 33AAKCM1658D1ZN/2018-19 dated 25.04.2024, and quash the same.



WEB COPY

WP No. 11565 of 2025



For Petitioner(s): Mr.V.Srikanth

For Respondent(s): Ms.Amirta Poonkodi Dinakaran,
Government Advocate (t)

ORDER

This Writ Petition has been filed by the petitioner seeking to call for the records on the files of the respondent in GSTIN 33AAKCM1658D1ZN/2018-19 dated 25.04.2024, and quash the same.

2.Ms.Amirta Poonkodi Dinakaran, 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.

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



28.01.2024 was uploaded in the GST Portal and the petitioner had no occasion to open the GST Portal. Even the impugned order dated 25.04.2024 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.



WEB COPY

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

7. Considering the above submissions made by the learned counsel on either side and upon perusal of the materials, it is evident that the impugned show cause notice was issued through the GST Portal Tab. According to the petitioner, the petitioner's accountant 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. When such being the case, this Court feels that when the respondent did not receive any reply/response from the petitioner for the show causes notice and when the statute provide alternative mode for sending notices, it is a bounden duty of the respondent to choose an other effective mode of service instead of uploading the notice on the common portal again and again. When such exercise is being carried out, the petitioner would have not come with the plea before his Court that they have not received any notices.



WEB COPY

8. Thus, in such circumstances, this Court is of the view that the impugned order came to be passed without affording opportunity of personal hearing to the petitioner to establish their case, thereby violating the principles of natural justice and that it is just and necessary to provide an opportunity to the petitioner to establish their case on merits and in accordance with law.

9. For the reasons stated above, this Court is inclined to set aside the impugned order dated 25.04.2024 passed by the respondent. Accordingly, this Court passes the following order:-

(i) The order impugned herein is set aside 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



WEB COPY

WP No. 11565 of 2025



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.

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

01-04-2025

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Internet: Yes

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

rst



WP No. 11565 of 2025



WEB COPY

To

The State Tax Officer (fac)
Pattarakkam Assessment Circle,
Chennai



WEB COPY

WP No. 11565 of 2025



KRISHNAN RAMASAMY J.

rst

WP No. 11565 of 2025

AND

WMP NO. 13060 OF 2025,

WMP NO. 13056 OF 2025

01-04-2025