



W.P.No.22757 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

WEB COPY

DATED : 25.06.2025

CORAM

The HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE KRISHNAN RAMASAMY

Writ Petition No.22757 of 2025
and
WMP.Nos.25586 & 25588 of 2025

Sri Karishna Auto Mobiles,
Represented by its Proprietor,
Mr.Ashok, GSTIN - 33ARZPA6503A1Z6,
63/59, Raja Street, Walajabad,
Kancheepuram, Pin - 631605.

...Petitioner

Vs.

1. Deputy State Tax Commissioner (ST),
Maduranthakam - 603 306.
2. Deputy State Tax Officer - 2,
Kancheepuram (Rural) Assessment Circle,
C.T. Building, Collectorate Campus,
Kancheepuram 631 501.
3. Indian Overseas Bank,
Walakabad Town, Rajapakar,
Kancheepuram, Pin - 631 605.

...Respondents

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, for
issuance of Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus calling for the records on the
file of the second respondent in the demand order passed in GSTIN -



W.P.No.22757 of 2025

33ARZPA6503A1Z6/2018-19 dated 30.04.2024 and quash the same, and consequentially defreeze the petitioner's bank account in A/c.No.255502000000050 by the 2nd and 3rd respondents, and further direct the second respondent to reassess the above orders.

For Petitioner : Ms.M.Devi Rudra
For R1 & R2 : Ms.K.Vasanthamala
Government Advocate (Taxes)

ORDER

Ms.K.Vasanthamala, learned Government Advocate (Taxes), who takes notice on behalf of the respondents 1 and 3. 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 30.04.2024 passed by the 2nd respondent and to quash the same, and consequentially defreeze the petitioner's bank account in A/c.No.255502000000050 by the 2nd and 3rd respondents, and further direct the second respondent to reassess the above orders.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the



W.P.No.22757 of 2025

WEB COPY

second respondent has issued a show cause notice on 13.10.2023 by uploading the same in the GST portal without serving physical copy. That apart the petitioner's consultant also failed to inform the same to the petitioner. Therefore, the petitioner was not aware of the show cause notice and failed to reply. Since the petitioner failed to file reply to the said show cause notice, the second 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. He would further submit that there is bank attachment and the same may be lifted, subject to the payment of 25% of the disputed tax. Hence, he prayed for appropriate directions.



W.P.No.22757 of 2025

WEB COPY 4. The learned Government Advocate (Taxes) for the respondents 1 and 2 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 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



W.P.No.22757 of 2025

WEB COPY

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.

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



W.P.No.22757 of 2025

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 second respondent dated 30.04.2024 is set aside.

ii) Consequently, the matter is remanded to the second 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 first respondent is directed to consider the reply



W.P.No.22757 of 2025

WEB COPY

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.

vi) Upon production of proof with regard to the payment of 25% of the disputed tax made by the petitioner, the 3rd respondent is directed to de-freeze the petitioner's bank account forthwith.

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

25.06.2025

Index : Yes / No
Neutral Citation : Yes / No
Speaking Order : Yes / No
arr

To



W.P.No.22757 of 2025

1. Deputy State Tax Commissioner (ST),
Maduranthakam - 603 306.

WEB COPY

2. Deputy State Tax Officer - 2,
Kancheepuram (Rural) Assessment Circle,
C.T. Building, Collectorate Campus,
Kancheepuram 631 501.

3. Indian Overseas Bank,
Walakabad Town, Rajapakar,
Kancheepuram, Pin - 631 605.

KRISHNAN RAMASAMY, J.



WEB COPY



W.P.No.22757 of 2025

arr

**Writ Petition No.22757 of 2025
and
WMP.Nos.25586 & 25588 of 2025**

25.06.2025