



W.P.No.26846 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

WEB COPY

Dated : 25.07.2025

CORAM

THE HON'BLE Mr. JUSTICE KRISHNAN RAMASAMY

W.P.No.26846 of 2025
& W.M.P.Nos.30177 & 30180 of 2025

Tvl.Rana Stones,
Rep. by its partner, Mukana Ram Bajiya,
Sy.No.480/1, Tiruvannamalai Road,
Jittobanapalli Village, Jagadevipalayam Post,
Krishnagiri, Tamil Nadu - 635 203.

... Petitioner

Vs.

Assistant Commissioner (ST),
Krishnagiri-II Circle,
Hosur, Tamil Nadu - 635 203.

... Respondent

Prayer:

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying to issue a Writ of Certiorari calling for the records relating to the Original impugned Order dated 05.03.2024 and its consequential Demand Order dated 07.03.2024 having Reference No.ZD330324036570T issued by the respondent and quash the same.

For Petitioner : Mr.Sanskar Samdaria

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



W.P.No.26846 of 2025

WEB COPY

ORDER

This writ petition has been filed challenging the impugned order dated 05.03.2024 and the consequential demand order dated 07.03.2024 passed by the respondent.

2. Mrs.K.Vasanthamala, 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 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 dated 05.03.2024 and the consequential demand order dated 07.03.2024 came to be passed by the respondent without providing any opportunity of personal hearing to the petitioner. Therefore, this



W.P.No.26846 of 2025

petition has been filed.

WEB COPY

4. Further, he would submit that the respondent has already deducted a sum of Rs.48,016/- from the ECL of the petitioner and now, the petitioner is willing to pay 25% of the disputed tax amount after deducting the amount already recovered by 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 fairly admit 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 the matter back to the respondent, subject to the payment of 25% of the disputed tax amount by the petitioner.



W.P.No.26846 of 2025

WEB COPY

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 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 and the consequential demand 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




W.P.No.26846 of 2025

WEB COPY

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 petitioner that the respondent has already deducted a sum of Rs.48,016/-



W.P.No.26846 of 2025

WEB COPY

from the ECL of the petitioner and now, the petitioner is willing to pay

25% of the disputed tax amount after deducting the amount already

recovered by the respondent. In such view of the matter, this Court is

inclined to set aside the impugned order dated 05.03.2024 and

consequential demand order dated 07.03.2024 passed by the respondent.

Accordingly, this Court passes the following order:-

(i) The impugned order dated 05.03.2024 and consequential demand order dated 07.03.2024 are set aside and the matter is remanded to the respondent for fresh consideration on condition that the petitioner shall pay 25% of the disputed tax amount, after deducting the amount already recovered by 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 respondent shall consider the same and



WEB COPY



W.P.No.26846 of 2025

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.

25.07.2025

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

To

Assistant Commissioner (ST),
Krishnagiri-II Circle,
Hosur, Tamil Nadu - 635 203.



WEB COPY



W.P.No.26846 of 2025

KRISHNAN RAMASAMY.J.,

vm

W.P.No.26846 of 2025
and W.M.P.Nos.30177 & 30180 of 2025

25.07.2025