



W.P.No.24617 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

WEB COPY

Dated : 08.07.2025

CORAM

THE HON'BLE Mr. JUSTICE KRISHNAN RAMASAMY

W.P.No.24617 of 2025
& W.M.P.Nos.27750 & 27753 of 2025

Shanti Motors
Rep by its Proprietor Mr.Kamal Bohra,
No.30, Shanti Motors, Mylai Balaji Nagar,
Pallikaranai, Chennai, Tamil Nadu, 600100

... Petitioner

Vs.

1. The Deputy Commissioner (st)
GST Appeal, Chennai - II, Main Building,
2nd Floor, Greams Road, Chennai-600 006.

2. The Assistant Commissioner
Madippakkam Assessment Circle
Room No.229, 2nd Floor,
Integrated Commercial Taxes offices
Building, Govt Farm Village,
Nandanam, Chennai-600035

... Respondents

Prayer:

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying to issue a Writ of Certiorari, dated 14.12.2023 passed by the 2nd Respondent and Memorandum vide Rc.No. /2025/A1 dated 10.01.2025 passed by the 1st Respondent and to quash the same and to direct the 1st



W.P.No.24617 of 2025

Respondent to accept the statutory appeal dated 03.05.2024 filed under Tamil Nadu GST Act, 2017 against recovery order of the 2nd Respondent in Reference No. ZD3312230988059 dated 14.12.2023 without reference to limitation

For Petitioner : Mr.V.Hariharan

For Respondent : Ms.Amirta Poonkodi Dinakaran, GA

ORDER

This writ petition has been filed challenging the impugned order dated 14.12.2023 passed by the respondent.

2. Ms.Amirta Poonkodi Dinakaran, learned Government Advocate, takes notice on behalf of the respondent. 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 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 respondent



W.P.No.24617 of 2025


without providing any opportunity of personal hearing to the petitioner.

WEB COPY

Being aggrieved over the said assessment order, an appeal was also preferred by the petitioner. However, the said appeal was rejected by the Appellate Authority on the aspect of limitation. Therefore, this petition has been filed.

4. Further, he would submit that the petitioner had already paid 10% of the disputed tax amount at the time of filing the appeal and now, he is willing to pay additional 15% of the disputed tax amount, to 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 Government Advocate appearing for the respondent 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




W.P.No.24617 of 2025

the matter back to the respondent, subject to the payment of 15% of the disputed tax amount as agreed by the petitioner.

6. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and and the learned Government Advocate for the respondent 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



W.P.No.24617 of 2025

WEB COPY

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 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



W.P.No.24617 of 2025

WEB COPY

petitioner that the petitioner has already paid 10% of disputed tax amount at the time of filing the appeal and now, he is willing to pay additional 15% 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 14.12.2023 passed by the respondent. Accordingly, this Court passes the following order:-

(i) The impugned order dated 14.12.2023 is set aside and the matter is remanded to the respondent for fresh consideration on condition that the petitioner shall pay 15% 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.

(ii) Further, considering the delay in approaching this Court, the petitioner shall pay a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand Only) to The Principal Government Naturopathy Medical College and Hospital, Account No.7883022723, IFSC Code: IDIB000M157, 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.



WEB COPY



W.P.No.24617 of 2025

(iii) 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.

(iv) 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 in accordance with law, after hearing the petitioner, as expeditiously as possible.

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

08.07.2025

Speaking/Non-speaking order
Index : Yes / No



W.P.No.24617 of 2025

Neutral Citation : Yes / No

nsa

WEB COPY

To

1. The Deputy Commissioner (st)
GST Appeal, Chennai - II, Main Building,
2nd Floor, Greaves Road, Chennai-600 006.

2. The Assistant Commissioner
Madippakkam Assessment Circle
Room No.229, 2nd Floor,
Integrated Commercial Taxes offices
Building, Govt Farm Village,
Nandanam, Chennai-600035



WEB COPY



W.P.No.24617 of 2025

KRISHNAN RAMASAMY.J.,

nsa

W.P.No.24617 of 2025
& W.M.P.Nos.27750 & 27753 of 2025

08.07.2025