



WEB COPY

WP No. 13212 of 2025



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 09-04-2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE KRISHNAN RAMASAMY

WP No. 13212 of 2025

AND

W.M.P.Nos.14758, 14759 & 14761 of 2025

V.S. Engineering And Contractors
Represented by its Managing Partner
A.Vijayabaskar,
217/2- 55, Kannagi Nagar,
Near TVS Angammal Colony,
Salem-636 009.

Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. The State Tax Officer (ST)
(also Known As The Commercial Tax
Officer)
Arisipalayam Circle,
Station Room No.418/ Fourth Floor,
Integrated Commercial Taxes Building,
Pitchards Road, Salem-636 007.

2.The Branch Manager
Canara Bank, No. 68, P. Office Main
Road
Suramangalam, Salem -636 005.

Respondent(s)



PRAYER:- Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, pleased to issue a Writ of Certiorari, calling for the records on the file of the 1st respondent herein in GSTIN/33AAHFV7408E1Z9/2019-20 in FORM GST DRC-07 in order Reference No.ZD330624055245J dated 07.06.2024 and to quash the same.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.K.Siri Chandana

For Respondent: Mr.Amirta Poonkodi Dinakaran
Government Advocate (T)
for R1

ORDER

This Writ Petition has been filed by the petitioner seeking to call for the records on the file of the 1st respondent herein in GSTIN/33AAHFV7408E1Z9/2019-20 in FORM GST DRC-07 in order Reference No.ZD330624055245J dated 07.06.2024 and to quash the same.

2.Mr.Amirta Poonkodi Dinakaran, learned Government Advocate (Taxes), takes notice on behalf of the 1st 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 02.06.2023 was uploaded in the GST Portal tab in view additional notices column and the petitioner had no occasion to open the GST Portal. Even the impugned order dated 07.06.2024 was also uploaded in the view additional notices column 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 1st 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.




WEB COPY

5.Learned Government Advocate appearing for the 1st 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 repondent 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 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.

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.

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 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 1st 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



WEB COPY

WP No. 13212 of 2025



in accordance with law, after hearing the petitioner, as expeditiously as possible.

(iv) Upon production of proof with regard to the payment of 25% of the disputed tax made by the petitioner, the 1st respondent-Department is directed to issue appropriate direction on the petitioner's banker towards de-freezure of the petitioner's bank account forthwith.

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.

09-04-2025


Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Internet: Yes

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

rst



WEB COPY

To
1.The State Tax Officer (ST)
(also Known As The Commercial Tax
Officer)
Arisipalayam Circle,
Station Room No.418/ Fourth Floor,
Integrated Commercial Taxes Building,
Pitchards Road Salem-636 007

2.The Branch Manager
Canara Bank, No. 68, P. Office Main
Road
Suramangalam, Salem -636 005.



WEB COPY

WP No. 13212 of 2025



KRISHNAN RAMASAMY J.

rst

WP No. 13212 of 2025

AND

W.M.P.Nos.14758, 14759 & 14761 of 2025

09-04-2025