



WEB COPY



W.P.No.22276 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Dated : 23.06.2025

CORAM

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

**W.P.No.22276 of 2025**  
**& W.M.P.Nos.25058 & 25060 of 2025**

M/s.Evershine Services  
Represented By Its Partner Ahamed Elyas, 1st  
Floor, No.2/2, Selvanathan Street, Chetput,  
Chennai-600 031

... Petitioner


**Vs.**

1. The Deputy Commissioner (st)  
North-iii Zone, 5th Floor Room No.518,  
Integrated Commercial Taxes Buildings,  
No.322, Elephant Gate Road,  
Chennai-600 003.

2. The Assistant Commissioner (st)  
Egmore Assessment Circle,  
No.88, Mayor Ramanathan Salai,  
Taluk Office Building, 2nd Floor,  
Spurtank Road, Chetpet, Chennai-600 031

3. The Branch Manager  
Hdfc Bank, No.808,  
Poonamalee High Road,  
Kilpauk, Chennai-600 010

... Respondents



W.P.No.22276 of 2025

**Prayer:**

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying to issue a Writ of Certiorari, calling for the records of the second respondent in his proceedings in GSTIN 33AAEFE7586M1ZX/ 2018-19, quash the order dated 23.04.2024 passed therein

For Petitioner : Mr.P.V.Sudakar


For Respondent : Mr.C.Harsha Raj, SGP

**ORDER**

This writ petition has been filed challenging the impugned order dated 23.04.2024 passed by the respondent.

2. Mr.C.Harsha Raj, learned Special Government Pleader, takes notice on behalf of the respondents 1 & 2. 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 notices/communications were uploaded by the respondent under the “View Additional Notices and Orders” column in the GST common portal. Since the petitioner was not aware of the said notices, they failed



W.P.No.22276 of 2025

WEB COPY

to file their reply within the time. Under these circumstances, the impugned order came to be passed by the respondent without providing any opportunity of personal hearing to the petitioner. Therefore, this petition has been filed.

4. Further, he would submit that now, the petitioner is willing to pay 25% of the disputed tax amount after deducting the amount already recovered by the respondent. Hence, he requests this Court to grant an opportunity to the petitioner to present their case before the respondent by setting aside the impugned order.

5. On the other hand, the learned Special Government Pleader appearing for the respondents 1 & 2 would submit that the respondent had uploaded the notices in the GST Online Portal. But the petitioner failed to avail the said opportunity. Further, she has fairly admitted that no opportunity of personal hearing was provided to the petitioner prior to the passing of impugned order. Therefore, she requested this Court to remit the matter back to the respondent, subject to the payment of 25% of the disputed tax amount by the petitioner.



W.P.No.22276 of 2025

WEB COPY

6. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and and the learned Special Government Pleader for the respondents 1 & 2 and also perused the materials available on record.

7. In the case on hand, it is evident that the show cause notice was uploaded on the GST Portal Tab. According to the petitioner, he was not aware of the issuance of the said 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




W.P.No.22276 of 2025

WEB COPY

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.

9. 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. Therefore, this Court finds that there is a lack of opportunities being provided to serve the notices/orders etc., effectively to the petitioner.

10. Further, it was submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is willing to pay 25% of the disputed tax amount after deducting the amount already recovered by the respondent.



W.P.No.22276 of 2025

WEB COPY

In such view of the matter, this Court is inclined to set aside the impugned order dated 23.04.2024 passed by the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent.

Accordingly, this Court passes the following order:-

(i) The impugned order dated 23.04.2024 is set aside and the matter is remanded to the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent for fresh consideration on condition that the petitioner shall pay 25% of the disputed tax amount, after deducting the amount already recovered by the respondent, if any, within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. The setting aside of the impugned order will take effect from the date of payment of the said amount.

(ii) The petitioner shall file their reply/objection along with the required documents, if any, within a period of three weeks from the date of payment of amount as stated above.

(iii) On filing of such reply/objection by the petitioner, the 2<sup>nd</sup> 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 in accordance with law, after hearing the petitioner, as expeditiously as possible.



WEB COPY



W.P.No.22276 of 2025

(iv) Considering the fact that the impugned order itself has been set aside, this Court is of the opinion that the attachment made on the bank account of the petitioner cannot survive any longer and hence, it is to be lifted. As a sequel, the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent is directed to release the attachment, and de-freeze the bank account of the petitioner, immediately upon the production of proof with regard to the payment as stated above.

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

**23.06.2025**

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Index : Yes / No


Neutral Citation : Yes / No

nsa

To

1. The Deputy Commissioner (st)  
North-iii Zone, 5th Floor Room No.518,  
Integrated Commercial Taxes Buildings,  
No.322, Elephant Gate Road,  
Chennai-600 003.

7/9



W.P.No.22276 of 2025

WEB COPY

2. The Assistant Commissioner (st)  
Egmore Assessment Circle,  
No.88, Mayor Ramanathan Salai,  
Taluk Office Building, 2nd Floor,  
Spurtank Road, Chetpet, Chennai-600 031

3. The Branch Manager  
Hdfc Bank, No.808,  
Poonamalee High Road,  
Kilpauk, Chennai-600 010



WEB COPY



W.P.No.22276 of 2025

**KRISHNAN RAMASAMY.J.,**

nsa

**W.P.No.22276 of 2025**  
**and W.M.P.Nos.25058 & 25060 of 2025**

**23.06.2025**