



WEB COPY



W.P.No.11918 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED :04.04.2025

Coram

The Honourable **Mr.Justice Krishnan Ramasamy**

W.P.No.11918 of 2025

and

W.M.P.No.13486 & 13487 of 2025

Tvl R Jayaramakrishnan
rep by its Proprietor
R Jayaramakrishnan No.11/21
Nyneeappan Street, Pattalam Chennai 600012.

...Petitioner

Vs

The Deputy State Tax Officer -I
Perambur Assessment Circle Nos. 15 and 16
Malliga Avenue, Kolathur chennai 600 099.

...Respondent

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus to call for records of the respondent in GSTIN 33AMQPJ7931H1ZS/2017-2018 dated 15.12.2023 and quash the same and consequently direct the respondent to grant an opportunity of personal hearing.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Desingu
For Respondent : Mrs.K.Vasanthamala
Government Advocate (T)



W.P.No.11918 of 2025

Order

Heard Mr.M.Desingu, learned counsel appearing for the

petitioner and Mrs.K.Vasanthamala, learned Government Advocate (T) who takes notice on behalf of the respondent. With consent, the main Writ Petition is taken up for final disposal at the stage of admission itself.

2. The challenge in this Writ Petition is to the order passed by the respondent dated 15.12.2023 and to quash the same.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that a show cause notice in Form GST DRC-01 along with subsequent notice were uploaded on the GST on-line portal, but the petitioner was unaware of the said notices, and hence, failed to file reply to such show cause notice, however, the respondent, without even affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner, passed the impugned order confirming the proposals contained in the show cause notice and uploaded the said order on the Gst On-line Portal.




W.P.No.11918 of 2025

4. Therefore, the learned counsel would submit that the impugned order suffers from violation of principles of natural justice and is liable to be aside. However, it is stated that the petitioner is also ready and willing to deposit 25% of the disputed tax, in the event, this Court is inclined to set aside the impugned order and remands the matter back to the Authority for fresh consideration, and thus, prays for appropriate orders.

5. The learned Government Advocate (T) for the respondent fairly submitted that since the petitioner has voluntarily come forward to deposit 25% of the disputed tax, the prayer sought for by the petitioner may be considered.

6. 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 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. Further, the original of the said show cause notice was not furnished to the petitioner. In such



W.P.No.11918 of 2025

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.

6.1 No doubt, sending notice by uploading in portal is a sufficient service, but, the Officer who finds no response from the petitioner to the show cause notices, instead of sending repeated reminders, 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, the service of notice will not be deemed to 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 would 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



W.P.No.11918 of 2025

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.

6.2 Therefore, this Court is inclined to set aside the impugned order, as the same suffers from the violation of principles of natural justice. Thus, once the order is passed in violation of principles of natural justice, this Court cannot impose any condition requiring the petitioner to make any deposit, however, considering the fact that the petitioner has come forward to deposit 25% of the disputed tax in the event the impugned order is set aside, this Court is inclined to pass/issue the following orders/directions:-

i) The impugned order passed by the respondent dated 15.12.2023 is set aside.

ii) Consequently, the matter is remanded to the respondent for fresh consideration.

iii) The petitioner is granted liberty to deposit 25% of the disputed tax, which the petitioner themselves have voluntarily come forward to make such payment within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.



W.P.No.11918 of 2025

iv) Thereafter, the petitioner is directed to file a reply along with supportive documents within a period of two weeks.

and

v) Thereupon, the respondent is directed to consider the reply and shall issue a 14 clear days notice affording an opportunity of personal hearing to the petitioner and shall decide the matter in accordance with law.

7. In the result, the Writ Petition is allowed on the aforesaid terms.

No costs. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petitions are closed.

04.04.2025

sd

Index : yes/no

Neutral Citation : yes/no

To
The Deputy State Tax Officer -I
Perambur Assessment Circle Nos. 15 and 16
Malliga Avenue, Kolathur chennai 600 099.



WEB COPY



W.P.No.11918 of 2025

Krishnan Ramasamy,J.,

sd

W.P.No.11918 of 2025

04.04.2025