



WEB COPY



W.P.No.25806 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Dated : 16.07.2025

CORAM

THE HON'BLE Mr. JUSTICE KRISHNAN RAMASAMY

W.P.No.25806 of 2025
and W.M.P.Nos.29006 & 29008 of 2025

Tvl.Coniray Technology,
Rep. by its Partner,
Thiru C.Rajan Babu,
No.138, 139 9th Link Street,
Nehru Nagar, Kottivakkam,
Chennai - 600 041.

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Assistant Commissioner (ST),
Sholinganallur Assessment Circle,
Integrated Building for Commercial Taxes
And Registration Department,
(South Tower), Nandanam,
Chennai - 600 035.

2.The Branch Manager,
City Union Bank Limited,
No.61A, Ground Floor,
3rd Cross Main Road,
Sadasiva Nagar, Puzhuthivakkam,
Chennai - 600 091.

... Respondents



W.P.No.25806 of 2025

Prayer:

WEB COPY

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus calling for the impugned order on the file of the first respondent in DRC-07 Ref.No.ZD330225114608N dated 12.02.2025 passed under Section 73 of the Tamil Nadu Goods and Service Tax Act, 2017 read with Central Goods and Service Tax, 2017 herein after referred to as GST Act, 2017 and quash the same as well as revocation of the blocking of access to funds from the petitioner's Bank Account Number 510909010122698 with the second respondent.

For Petitioner : Mr.Suresh.T

For Respondent 1 : Mrs.K.Vasanthamala,
Government Advocate (T)

ORDER

This writ petition has been filed challenging the impugned order dated 12.02.2025 passed by the first respondent.

2. Mrs.K.Vasanthamala, learned Government Advocate, takes notice on behalf of the first respondent. By consent of the parties, the main writ petition is taken up for disposal at the admission stage itself.



W.P.No.25806 of 2025

WEB COPY

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that in this case, all notices/communications were uploaded by the first 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 first 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 first 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 first respondent would submit that the first 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



W.P.No.25806 of 2025

WEB COPY

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 first 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 Government Advocate for the first 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.



W.P.No.25806 of 2025

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.

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.



W.P.No.25806 of 2025

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 first respondent. In such view of the matter, this Court is inclined to set aside the impugned order dated 12.02.2025 passed by the first respondent. Accordingly, this Court passes the following order:-

(i) The impugned order dated 12.02.2025 is set aside and the matter is remanded to the first respondent for fresh consideration on condition that the petitioner shall pay 25% of 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 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 first respondent shall consider the same



WEB COPY



W.P.No.25806 of 2025

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) 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 first respondent is directed to instruct the concerned Bank to release the attachment, and de-freeze the bank account of the petitioner, immediately upon the production of a copy of this order.

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

16.07.2025

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



WEB COPY



W.P.No.25806 of 2025

KRISHNAN RAMASAMY.J.,

vm

To

1.The Assistant Commissioner (ST),
Sholinganallur Assessment Circle,
Integrated Building for Commercial Taxes
And Registration Department,
(South Tower), Nandanam,
Chennai - 600 035.

2.The Branch Manager,
City Union Bank Limited,
No.61A, Ground Floor,
3rd Cross Main Road,
Sadasiva Nagar, Puzhuthivakkam,
Chennai - 600 091.

W.P.No.25806 of 2025
and W.M.P.Nos.29006 & 29008 of 2025

16.07.2025