



W.P.No.16028 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

WEB COPY

Dated : 02.06.2025

CORAM

**THE HON'BLE Mr. JUSTICE KRISHNAN RAMASAMY**

**W.P.No.16028 of 2025**  
**& W.M.P.Nos.18131 & 18132 of 2025**

Tvl.Sankavi Red Rose Garments Private Limited,  
Rep by its Director,  
No.61, ERP Nagar, Cross Street,  
Thiruneelakandapuram,  
Kongu Main Road, Tiruppur 641 607

... Petitioner

**Vs.**

- 1.Deputy Commissioner (CT),  
Erode
- 2.Assistant Commissioner (ST),  
Kongunagar Circle, Tirupur II

... Respondents

**Prayer:**

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, to call for the records relating to the rejection of appeal in FORM GST APL - 02 bearing Reference No. ZD331224249033V dated 27.12.2024 issued by the 1<sup>st</sup> Respondent and quash the same and thereby direct the 1st



W.P.No.16028 of 2025

Respondent to take the appeal filed by the Petitioner against order in Reference No. ZD330823129011X dated 23.08.2023 passed by the 2nd Respondent on record and dispose the appeal on merits

For Petitioner : Ms.R.Sri Visvapriya

For Respondent : Ms.K.Vasanthamala,  
Government Advocate

### **ORDER**

This writ petition has been filed challenging the impugned rejection order dated 27.12.2024 passed by the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent.

2. Ms.K.Vasanthamala, learned Government Advocate, takes notice on behalf of the respondents. By consent of the parties, the main writ petition is taken up for disposal at the admission stage itself.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that in this case, all the notices were uploaded by the respondent in the GST common portal and the same remained unnoticed by the petitioner, due to which, they were unable to file their reply. Under these circumstances,




W.P.No.16028 of 2025

WEB COPY

the *ex parte* assessment order came to be passed and uploaded in the same portal. Being unaware of the said order, the petitioner was not in a position to file the appeal in time. Thereafter, the appeal against the aforesaid assessment order was preferred by the petitioner with a delay of 73 days. Since the said delay is beyond the condonable period, the appeal was rejected by the respondent, vide impugned rejection order dated 27.12.2024, on the aspect of limitation. Hence, this writ petition has been filed.

4. Further, he would submit that the petitioner had already paid 10% towards statutory pre-deposit while filing the appeal and now, he is willing to pay additional pre-deposit of 15% of disputed tax amount. Therefore, he requests this Court to condone the delay in filing the appeal.

5. On the other hand, the learned Government Advocate appearing for the respondents would submit that though all the notices and orders were duly uploaded by the respondents, the petitioner had



W.P.No.16028 of 2025

WEB COPY

failed to file the appeal in time. Hence, she would contend that the said delay has occurred only due to the fault on the part of the petitioner and requests this Court to pass appropriate orders.

6. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Government Advocate for the respondents and also perused the materials available on record.

7. In the case on hand, the *ex parte* assessment order came to be passed on 23.08.2023. Aggrieved over the same, an appeal was belatedly preferred by the petitioner on 02.02.2024, i.e., with a delay of 73 days. Since the delay was beyond the condonable period, the said appeal was rejected by the respondent vide impugned order dated 27.12.2024. According to the petitioner, since the assessment order was passed in *ex parte*, they remained unaware of the said order and hence, they were unable to file the appeal within time.



W.P.No.16028 of 2025

WEB COPY

7. The above reason assigned by the petitioner, for the delay in filing the appeal against the assessment order, appears to be genuine. In such view of the matter, this Court is inclined to condone the delay, in filing the appeal against the impugned assessment order, on terms.

8. Therefore, though the petitioner had already paid 10% of the disputed tax amount as statutory pre-deposit while filing the appeal, considering the delay of 73 days, this Court directs the petitioner to pay additional 15% of the disputed tax amount to the respondents, as agreed by the petitioner. Accordingly, this Court passes the following order:-

(i) Accordingly, the rejection order dated 27.12.2024 passed by the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent is set aside and the delay of 73 days in filing the appeal before the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent is hereby condoned, subject to the payment of additional 15% of the disputed tax amount by the petitioner to the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent.

(ii) Upon payment of the said amount, the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent is directed to take the appeal on record and pass appropriate orders on merits and in accordance



WEB COPY



W.P.No.16028 of 2025

with law, after providing sufficient opportunity to the petitioner, as expeditiously as possible.

9. With the above directions, this writ petition is disposed of. No costs. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petitions are also closed.

**02.06.2025**

Speaking/Non-speaking order  
Index : Yes / No  
Neutral Citation : Yes / No  
nsa

To

1. Deputy Commissioner (CT),  
Erode
2. Assistant Commissioner (ST),  
Kongunagar Circle, Tirupur II



WEB COPY



W.P.No.16028 of 2025

**KRISHNAN RAMASAMY.J.,**

nsa

**W.P.No.16028 of 2025**  
**and W.M.P.Nos.18131 & 18132 of 2025**

**02.06.2025**