



WEB COPY

WP No. 24441 of 2025



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 07-07-2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE KRISHNAN RAMASAMY

WP No. 24441 of 2025

AND

WMP NO. 27528 OF 2025, WMP NO. 27529 OF 2025

M/s.Ramakrishna Reddy Suresh Kumar,
Represented by its Proprietor
Mr.R.Suresh Kumar
No.29, W Block, 13th Street, Annanagar
Extension, Chennai 600 101.

Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. The Assistant Commissioner (ST)
Koyambedu Assessment Circle,
No.1, Papjm Annex Building,
Greams Road, Chennai-600 006.

2.The Deputy Commissioner ST
Chennai Central -I Circle, No.1,
PAPJM Annex Building,
Greams Road, Chennai 600 006.

Respondent(s)



PRAYER:- Writ Petition filed under article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for an issuance of Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, to call for the records of the first respondent in GSTIN 33AAFPS6341B1Z1 2020-21 dated 22.02.2025 and quash the same and further direct the 2nd respondent to refund the amount of Rs.3,00,732 and Rs.17,98,068 recovered from the bankers on 23.06.2025 and 24.06.2025 respectively and thereafter direct the respondents to take action afresh in accordance with the provisions of Goods and Service Tax Act, 2017.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.J.Sunil Kumar

For Respondent(s): Mr.C.Harsha Raj,
Special Government Pleader (t)

ORDER

This writ petition has been filed by the petitioner challenging the impugned assessment order dated 22.02.2025, passed by the 1st respondent.

2.Mr.Harsha Raj, learned Special Government Pleader (Taxes), takes notice on behalf of the respondent.

3.By consent of the parties, the main writ petition is taken up for disposal at the admission stage itself.



WEB COPY

4.Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that, in the present case, the petitioner have not received any physical copy of the show cause notice and also personal hearing notice. The show cause notice dated 25.11.2024 and three reminders were uploaded in the GST Portal tab and the petitioner had no occasion to open the GST Portal. Even the impugned order dated 22.02.2025 was also uploaded in the GST Portal, which is violation of principle of natural justice. He would further submit that the respondent had recovered more than 25% of the disputed tax demand in respect of the impugned assessment period and prayed to set aside the impugned order directing the respondent to permit the petitioner to file their reply and provide an opportunity of personal hearing so that the petitioner would be able to substantiate their case.


5.Learned Special Government Pleader appearing for the respondent would submit that he has to verify whether the respondent had recovered 25% of the disputed tax demand from the petitioner in respect of the impugned assessment period and he would further submit that if the Court feels it



appropriate and it is a fit case for re-consideration, this Court may consider and pass orders.


6. Heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner as well as the learned Special Government Pleader appearing for the respondent and perused the materials available on record.

7. Considering the above submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner as well as the learned Special Government Pleader appearing for the respondent 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. 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.



WEB COPY

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. 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.




WEB COPY

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

(i) The order impugned herein is set aside and remanded back to the respondent for fresh consideration subject to the verification whether 25% of the disputed tax amount has been recovered by the respondent in respect of the impugned assessment period, as stated by the petitioner.

(ii) The petitioner shall file their reply/objection along with the required documents, if any, within a period of two weeks from the date the portal is made ready to the petitioner to file their reply.

(iii) 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.



WEB COPY

10. With the above directions, the writ petition is disposed of. There is no order as to costs. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

07-07-2025

rst

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Internet: Yes

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

To:-

1. The Assistant Commissioner (ST)
Koyambedu Assessment Circle,
No.1, Papjm Annex Building,
Greens Road, Chennai-600 006.

2. The Deputy Commissioner ST
Chennai Central -I Circle, No.1,
PAPJM Annex Building,
Greens Road, Chennai 600 006.



WEB COPY

WP No. 24441 of 2025



KRISHNAN RAMASAMY J.

rst

WP No. 24441 of 2025

AND

WMP NO. 27528 OF 2025,

WMP NO. 27529 OF 2025

07-07-2025