



WEB COPY



W.P.No.20693 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 13.06.2025

Coram

The Honourable **Mr.Justice Krishnan Ramasamy**

W.P.No.20693 of 2025

and

W.M.P.Nos.23336 and 23337 of 2025

ZAINA INTERNATIONAL,
Represented by its Proprietor
Mr.ODIANDIRAM ABDUL MOHAMMED TANVEER
SUHAIB
No.1283/C, Kattumani Street,
Vaniyambadi,
Tirupathur, Tamilnadu-635 751.

...Petitioner

Vs.

The State Tax Officer,
(Formerly known as Commercial
Tax Officer),
VEPERY:NORTH:III:CHENNAINORTH,
Station No.110, First Floor,
Grems Road,
Chennai 600 006.

...Respondent

Prayer : Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India
praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorari to call for the records of the



W.P.No.20693 of 2025

respondent in Reference No:ZD330824087677S/2019-20 dated 12.08.2024
and quash the same as arbitrary, illegal.

For Petitioner : Ms.V.Vijayalakshmi
For Respondents : Mrs.K.Vasanthamala
Government Advocate (Taxes)

ORDER

Mrs.K.Vasanthamala, learned Government Advocate (Taxes), takes notice on behalf of the respondents. With consent, the main Writ Petition is taken up for final disposal at the stage of admission itself.

2. The challenge in this Writ Petition is to the order dated 12.08.2024 passed by the respondent for the AY 2019-20 and to quash the same.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the 2nd respondent has issued a show cause notice on 29.05.2024 followed by reminders dated 03.07.2024, 20.07.2024 and 06.08.2024 to the petitioner by uploading the same in the GST portal without serving physical copy of the same to the petitioner. Hence, the petitioner was not aware of the show cause notice and failed to file reply to the same. Since the petitioner failed to



W.P.No.20693 of 2025

file reply to the said show cause notice, the 2nd respondent has confirmed the proposals contained in the show cause notice and passed the present impugned order. Therefore, the learned counsel would submit that the impugned order suffers from violation of principles of natural justice and is liable to be aside, as the petitioner has not been heard before passing the impugned order.

3.1. It is also submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is ready and willing to deposit 25% of the disputed tax, in the event, this Court is inclined to set aside the impugned order and remand the matter back to the Authority for fresh consideration.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Taxes) for the respondent fairly submitted that since the petitioner has voluntarily come forward to deposit 25% of the disputed tax, the prayer sought for by the petitioner may be considered.

5. Considering the above submissions made by the learned counsel



W.P.No.20693 of 2025

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.

6. 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



W.P.No.20693 of 2025

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.

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

i) The impugned order passed by the respondent dated 12.08.2024 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



W.P.No.20693 of 2025

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.

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

13.06.2025

arr

Index : yes/no

Neutral Citation : yes/no



W.P.No.20693 of 2025

To
WEB COPY

The State Tax Officer,
(Formerly known as Commercial
Tax Officer),
VEPERY:NORTH:III:CHENNAINORTH,
Station No.110, First Floor,
Greens Road,
Chennai 600 006.



WEB COPY



W.P.No.20693 of 2025

Krishnan Ramasamy,J.,

arr

W.P.No.20693 of 2025

13.06.2025