



WEB COPY



W.P.No.26052 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Dated : 18.07.2025

CORAM

THE HON'BLE Mr. JUSTICE KRISHNAN RAMASAMY

W.P.No.26052 of 2025
& W.M.P.No.29313 of 2025

Tvl S Ayyavoo Construction
Rep By Its Subramani Ayyavoo
14 A, Fudupalayam, M.G.R. Street,
Bhavani, Erode -638315

... Petitioner

Vs.

1. The State Tax Officer
Roving Squad-iii, Erode

2. The Deputy Commissioner CT
GST Appeals, Erode and Salem

...Respondents

Prayer:

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India
praying to issue a Writ of Certiorari, calling for Respondent No.2s Form
GST APL - 02 dated 17.06.2025 with Ref. No. ZD33 0625171441K and
quash the same



WEB COPY



W.P.No.26052 of 2025

For Petitioner : Ms.Disha Jain

For Respondent : Mr.V.Prasanth Kiran, GA

ORDER

This writ petition has been filed challenging the impugned rejection order dated 17.06.2025 passed by the 2nd respondent.

2. Mr.V.Prashanth Kiran, learned Government Advocate, takes notice on behalf of the respondents. 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, initially, the show cause notice was issued by the respondent on 06.08.2024 for which a detailed reply was filed by the petitioner on 05.09.2024. However, without considering the said reply, the assessment order dated 26.11.2024 came to be passed by the respondent. Aggrieved over the said assessment order, the rectification application came to be filed by the petitioner, however, the same was dismissed vide order dated 14.05.2025. Thereafter, the appeal against the aforesaid assessment order




W.P.No.26052 of 2025

was preferred by the petitioner. However, due to the pendency of the aforesaid rectification application, there was a delay in filing the appeal.

Since the said delay is beyond the condonable period, the appeal was rejected by the respondent, vide impugned rejection order dated 17.06.2025, on the aspect of limitation. Hence, this writ petition has been filed.

4. Further, he would submit that the petitioner had already paid 10% towards statutory pre-deposit while filing the appeal and now, he is willing to pay additional pre-deposit of 10% of disputed tax amount. Therefore, he requests this Court to condone the delay in filing the appeal.

5. On the other hand, the learned Government Advocate appearing for the respondents would submit that in this case, after the passing of impugned assessment order, a rectification application was filed by the petitioner and the same was rejected by the respondent vide order dated 14.05.2025. Thereafter, the appeal, which was belatedly filed by the petitioner, was also rejected on the aspect of limitation vide order




W.P.No.26052 of 2025

dated 17.06.2025. Hence, he would contend that the said delay has occurred only due to the fault on the part of the petitioner and requests this Court to pass appropriate orders.

6. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Government Advocate for the respondents and also perused the materials available on record.

7. In the case on hand, the assessment order came to be passed on 26.11.2024. Aggrieved over the same, the appeal was belatedly preferred by the petitioner. Since the delay was beyond the condonable period, the said appeal was rejected by the respondent vide impugned order dated 17.06.2025. According to the petitioner, they had filed the rectification application against the assessment order and the same was dismissed vide order dated 14.05.2025. Hence, due to the pendency of rectification application, they were unable to file the appeal within time.

8. The above reason assigned by the petitioner, for the delay in filing the appeal against the assessment order, appears to be genuine. In



W.P.No.26052 of 2025

WEB COPY

such view of the matter, this Court is inclined to condone the delay, in filing the appeal against the impugned assessment order, on terms.

9. Therefore, though the petitioner had already paid 10% of the disputed tax amount as statutory pre-deposit while filing the appeal, considering the delay, this Court directs the petitioner to pay additional 10% of the disputed tax amount to the respondents, as agreed by the petitioner. Accordingly, this Court passes the following order:-

(i) Accordingly, the appeal rejection order dated 17.06.2025 passed by the 2nd respondent is set aside and the delay in filing the appeal before the 2nd respondent is hereby condoned, subject to the payment of additional 10% of the disputed tax amount by the petitioner to the respondents.

(ii) Upon payment of the said amount, the 2nd respondent is directed to take the appeal on record and pass appropriate orders on merits and in accordance with law, after providing sufficient opportunity to the petitioner, as expeditiously as possible.

10. With the above directions, this writ petition is disposed of. No



W.P.No.26052 of 2025

costs. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petitions are also

closed.

WEB COPY

18.07.2025

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Index : Yes / No

Neutral Citation : Yes / No

nsa

To

1. The State Tax Officer
Roving Squad-iii, Erode

2. The Deputy Commissioner CT
GST Appeals, Erode and Salem



WEB COPY



W.P.No.26052 of 2025

KRISHNAN RAMASAMY.J.,

nsa

W.P.No.26052 of 2025
& W.M.P.No.29313 of 2025

18.07.2025