



WEB COPY

WP No. 13498 of 2025



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 17-04-2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE KRISHNAN RAMASAMY

WP No. 13498 of 2025

and

W.M.P.Nos.15142 & 15143 of 2025

Tvl.Lakshminarayana Agencies
Represented by its Proprietor
J.Dinesh,
1/276, Visahar Complex,
Sattayappar Nagar,
Sattanathapuram,
Sirkali 609 111.

Petitioner(s)

Vs

The Deputy State Tax Officer-2
Sirkali Assessment Circle,
Mayiladuthurai.

Respondent(s)

Prayer : Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India
praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, calling for the



records of the respondent in GSTIN:33BKEPD2090J1ZG/2018-19 dated 26/04/2024 and quash the same and consequently direct the respondent to given an opportunity of personal hearing.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.P.R Kumar

For Respondent(s): Mr.C.Harsha Raj,
Special Government Pleader
(Tax)

ORDER

The present Writ Petition is filed challenging the order dated 26.04.2024 passed by the respondent, relating to the assessment year 2018-19.

2. Mr.C.Harsha Raj, learned Special Government Pleader (Tax) takes notice on behalf of the respondent. By consent of the parties, the main Writ Petition is taken up for disposal for final disposal at the stage of admission.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is engaged in the business of trading beverages and is registered under the Goods and Service Tax Act, 2017. During the relevant period viz. 2018-19, the petitioner had filed its return and paid the appropriate taxes. However, on



WEB COPY

scrutiny of the returns under Section 61 of the Act, it was noticed that there was mismatch between GSTR-3B and GSTR-1. Pursuant thereto, a notice in Form ASMT 10 dated 20.05.2022 was issued to the petitioner, followed by which, an intimation notice in Form DRC-01A and a show cause notice in Form DRC-01 were issued to the petitioner on 19.11.2022 and 17.11.2023 respectively through GST common portal. Thereafter, three reminder notices were issued and personal hearing opportunities were also granted to the petitioner on 30.01.2024, 07.02.2024 and 14.02.2024 respectively. However, the petitioner had neither filed its reply nor availed the opportunities of personal hearing. Hence, the impugned order came to be passed by the respondent, confirming the proposals.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the impugned order is challenged on the premise that neither the show cause notices nor the impugned order of assessment has been served by tendering to the petitioner or by registered post, instead it was uploaded in the common portal, thereby, the petitioner was unaware of the initiated proceedings and thus unable to




participate in the adjudication proceedings.

WEB COPY


5. It was further submitted that the petitioner is ready and willing to pay 25% of the disputed tax and that he may be granted one final opportunity before the adjudicating authority to put forth their objections to the proposal, to which the learned Special Government Pleader appearing for the respondent does not have any serious objection.

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 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

7. 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

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

- i) The impugned order dated 26.04.2024 passed by the respondent 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 had voluntarily come forward to make such payment, within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.
- iv) Thereafter, the petitioner is directed to file a reply along with supportive documents within a period of two weeks.
- v) Thereupon, the respondent is directed to consider the reply and shall issue a clear 14 days notice affording an opportunity of personal hearing to the



petitioner and shall decide the matter in accordance with law.

WEB COPY

9. With the above observations & directions, this Writ Petition is disposed of. No costs. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petitions are closed.

17-04-2025

jd

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Internet: Yes

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

To

The Deputy State Tax Officer-2
Sirkali Assessment Circle, Mayiladuthurai.



WEB COPY

WP No. 13498 of 2025



KRISHNAN RAMASAMY J.

jd

WP No. 13498 of 2025

17-04-2025