



WEB COPY

WP No. 13487 of 2025



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 17-04-2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE KRISHNAN RAMASAMY

WP No. 13487 of 2025

AND

WMP NO. 15130 OF 2025 & WMP NO. 15131 OF 2025

Tvl. RJ Industries
Rep. by its Proprietor -
Sankaranarayanan Ganesan
Seetharaman,
94, Vignesh Fab, Valluvar Nagar,
Peelamedu, Coimbatore – 641 004.


Petitioner(s)

Vs

The Deputy State Tax Officer-II (FAC)
Office of the Deputy Commercial Tax
Officer,
Peelamedu South Circle, Coimbatore.

Respondent(s)

Prayer : Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India
praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorari, calling for the records on the



files of Respondent in Impugned Order vide GSTIN:

33AUXPS1144A1ZP/2019-20 dated 23.08.2024 along with Consequential

Order vide Form GST DRC-07 with Reference No.ZD330824212793D dated

23.08.2024 for the tax period April, 2019 to March 2020 and quash the same as

arbitrary, against the principles of natural justice.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.K.Vignesh Kumar

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

ORDER

The present Writ Petition is filed challenging the orders dated 23.08.2024 passed by the respondent, relating to the assessment year 2019-20.

2. Ms.P.Selvi, learned Government Advocate (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



WEB COPY

engaged in the business of manufacturing Mono Black Pumps and is registered under the Goods and Service Tax Act, 2017. During the relevant period viz.

2019-20, the petitioner had filed its return and paid the appropriate taxes.

However, on scrutiny of returns under Section 73 of the Act, it was found that there was mismatch between GSTR 2A and GSTR 3B.

4. Pursuant thereto, a notice in ASMT-10 dated 16.08.2022 was issued to the petitioner through GST common portal, followed by three reminder notices were issued mentioning the date of personal hearing. However, the petitioner had neither filed its reply nor availed the opportunities of personal hearing. Hence, the impugned orders came to be passed by the respondent, confirming the proposals.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the impugned orders are 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.

6. 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 Government Advocate appearing for the respondent does not have any serious objection.

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.

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



WEB COPY

9. 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 orders with terms, by issuing the following directions:-

i) The impugned orders dated 23.08.2024 passed by the respondent are 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

10. 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-II (FAC)
Office of the Deputy Commercial Tax Officer,
Peelamedu South Circle, Coimbatore.



WEB COPY

WP No. 13487 of 2025



KRISHNAN RAMASAMY J.

jd

WP No. 13487 of 2025

17-04-2025