



WEB COPY

WP No. 16819 of 2025



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

**DATED: 03-06-2025**

CORAM

**THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE KRISHNAN RAMASAMY**

**WP No. 16819 of 2025  
AND WMP NO. 19065 OF 2025**

M/s.Kamini Opticals,  
Represented by its Proprietor,  
Rajendra Singh,  
No 7 Francis Joseph Street,  
Broadway, Chennai-108.

Petitioner(s)

Vs

1.The Union of India,  
Represented by its Chairman,  
Central Board of Indirect Taxes and Customs,  
New Delhi - 110 001.

2.The State of Tamil Nadu,  
Represented by its Principal Secretary,  
Finance Department,  
Fort St.George, Chennai – 600 009.

3.The Deputy State Tax Officer – I,  
Loansquare Assessment Circle,  
No.32, Integrated Commercial Taxes Office Complex,  
Elephant Gate Bridge Road,  
Chennai – 600 003.

Respondent(s)



**PRAYER:-** Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for an issuance of Writ of Certiorari, calling for entire record in pursuant to the order dated 17.10.2024 passed by the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent vide Ref No.ZD3310241101648 and quash the same.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.B. Karthik

For Respondent(s): Mr.S.M.Deendayalan,  
Senior Standing Counsel For R1  
Mrs.K.Vasanthamala, Government  
Advocate For Rr2 And 3

### **ORDER**

This Writ Petition has been filed by the petitioner challenging the impugned order dated 17.10.2024 passed by the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent vide Ref No.ZD3310241101648 and to quash the same.


2.Mr.S.M.Deendayalan, learned Senior Standing Counsel takes notice on behalf of the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent and Mrs.L.Vasanthamala, learned Government Advocate (Taxes), takes notice on behalf of the respondents 2 and 3.



WEB COPY

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 06.05.2024 was uploaded in the GST Portal tab and the petitioner had no occasion to open the GST Portal. Even the impugned order dated 17.10.2024 was also uploaded in the GST Portal, 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 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 respondents 2 and 3 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 respondents 2 and 3 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 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. 16819 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 3<sup>rd</sup> 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 petition is closed.

**03-06-2025**


rst

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Internet: Yes

Neutral Citation: Yes/No



WEB TO  
1. Union of India

Represented by its Chairman,  
Central Board of Indirect Taxes and Customs,  
New Delhi - 110 001.

2. The State of Tamil Nadu,  
Represented by its Principal Secretary,  
Finance Department,  
Fort St. George, Chennai – 600 009.

3. The Deputy State Tax Officer – I,  
Loansquare Assessment Circle,  
No.32, Integrated Commercial Taxes Office Complex,  
Elephant Gate Bridge Road,  
Chennai – 600 003.



WEB COPY

WP No. 16819 of 2025



**KRISHNAN RAMASAMY J.**

rst

WP No. 16819 of 2025  
AND WMP NO. 19065 OF 2025

03-06-2025