



WEB COPY



W.P.No.22656 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Dated : 24.06.2025

CORAM

THE HON'BLE Mr. JUSTICE KRISHNAN RAMASAMY

W.P.No.22656 of 2025
& W.M.P.Nos.25503 & 25506 of 2025

Tvl.BIONICS ENVIRO TECH
Rep. by its Proprietor Mr .KALIAPPAN SASI
KUMAR 2/180, Pallar Street, N.Kosavampatti,
Namakkal Town, Tamilnadu 637002

... Petitioner

Vs.

1. Union Of India
Rep. By The Secretary Of Government Of India,
Ministry Of Finance, New Delhi-110 001.

2. The Director
Central Board of Indirect Taxes and Customs
1st Floor Tower NBCC Plaza-1 Sector 5,
Pushp Vihar New Delhi 110017

3. The Assistant Commissioner (st)
NAMAKKAL(TOWN) ASSESSMENT CIRCLE
Namakkal

... Respondents

Prayer:

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India
praying to issue a Writ of Certiorari, call for the records of Notification



W.P.No.22656 of 2025

No.56/2023-Central Tax dt.28.12.2023 issued by the 2nd respondent and its consequential culminating the Impugned Assessment Order dated 23.08.2024 issued by the 3rd respondent in GSTIN. No. 33BKEPS2994G1ZV/ 2019-20 and quash the same as arbitrary and ultra-virus and consequently raise the petitioners Bank attachment dated 29.05.2025 having reference No. ROC.33BKEPS2994G1ZV/ 2025/BI/ Dated 29.05.2025

For Petitioner : Mr.Abdul Rahman

For Respondent : Mr.M.Santhanaraman, Sr.St.counsel
for R1 & R2
Ms.P.Selvi, GA for R3

ORDER

This writ petition has been filed challenging the impugned order dated 23.08.2024 and the attachment order dated 29.05.2025 passed by the respondents.

2. Mr.M.Santhanaraman, learned Senior Standing counsel and Ms.P.Selvi, learned Government Advocate, takes notice on behalf of the respondents. By consent of the parties, the main writ petition is taken up



W.P.No.22656 of 2025

for disposal at the admission stage itself.

WEB COPY

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 to file their reply within the time. Under these circumstances, the impugned order came to be passed by the 3rd respondent without providing any opportunity of personal hearing to the petitioner. Therefore, this petition has been filed.

4. Further, he would submit that the petitioner is willing to pay 25% of the disputed tax amount, to the 3rd 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.




W.P.No.22656 of 2025

WEB COPY

5. On the other hand, the learned Senior Standing counsel and the learned Government Advocate appearing for the respondents would submit that the respondents had uploaded the notices in the GST Online Portal. But the petitioner failed to avail the said opportunity. Further, they had fairly admitted that no opportunity of personal hearing was provided to the petitioner prior to the passing of impugned order. Therefore, they requested this Court to remit the matter back to the 3rd respondent, subject to the payment of 25% of the disputed tax amount by the petitioner.

6. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Senior Standing counsel & the learned Government Advocate for the respondents 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



W.P.No.22656 of 2025

WEB COPY

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.

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



W.P.No.22656 of 2025

WEB COPY

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 to the respondent. In such view of the matter, this Court is inclined to set aside the impugned order dated 23.08.2024 passed by the 1st respondent. Accordingly, this Court passes the following order:-

(i) The impugned order dated 23.08.2024 is set aside and the matter is remanded to the 3rd respondent for fresh consideration on condition that the petitioner shall pay 25% of the disputed tax amount to the respondent 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



WEB COPY



W.P.No.22656 of 2025

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 3rd 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.

(iv) The petitioner is permitted to operate his bank account, which was freezed by the respondent vide attachment order dated 29.05.2025, for the payment of 25% of the disputed tax amount to the respondent.

(v) Thereafter, the 3rd respondent is directed instruct the concerned Bank 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.



W.P.No.22656 of 2025

WEB COPY

24.06.2025

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

To

1. Union Of India
Rep. By The Secretary Of Government Of India,
Ministry Of Finance, New Delhi-110 001.
2. The Director
Central Board of Indirect Taxes and Customs
1st Floor Tower NBCC Plaza-1 Sector 5,
Pushp Vihar New Delhi 110017
3. The Assistant Commissioner (st)
NAMAKKAL(TOWN) ASSESSMENT CIRCLE
Namakkal



WEB COPY



W.P.No.22656 of 2025

KRISHNAN RAMASAMY.J.,

nsa

W.P.No.22656 of 2025
and W.M.P.Nos.25503 & 25506 of 2025

24.06.2025