



WEB COPY

WP No. 26488 of 2025



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 24-07-2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE KRISHNAN RAMASAMY

WP No. 26488 of 2025

AND

WMP NO. 29792 OF 2025, WMP NO. 29793 OF 2025

Kapil Ajayraj,
Proprietor of Fones and Tones,
No.116/154, Kutchery Road,
Mylapore, Chennai 600 004.

Petitioner(s)

Vs

The State Tax Officer/
The Commercial Tax Officer,
Mandaveli Assessment Circle,
4th Floor, Hall No.421, CT And R Department,
Fanepet, Nandanam, Chennai-600 035.

Respondent(s)

PRAYER:-Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for an issuance of Writ of Certiorari, to call for the records on the files of the respondent relating to the impugned order bearing Reference No.ZD3302250111429 dated 03.02.2025 passed in respect of GSTIN/ID



33DAQPA3193B1Z1 for the F.Y.2020-21, and quash the same as illegal, arbitrary, and violative of the principles of natural justice.

WEB COPY

For Petitioner(s): Mr.R.Ananth

For Respondent(s): Mr.T.N.C.Kaushik,
Additional Government Pleader (t)

ORDER

This writ petition has been filed by the petitioner challenging the impugned assessment order dated 03.02.2025, passed by the respondent relating to the Assessment Year 2020-21 and to quash the same.

2.Mr.T.N.C.Kaushik, learned Additional 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.

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



WEB COPY

cause notice and also personal hearing notice. The show cause notice dated 23.06.2023 was uploaded in the GST Portal under “Additional Notices and Orders” tab and the petitioner had no occasion to open the GST Portal. Even the impugned order dated 03.02.2025 was also uploaded in the GST Portal under “Additional Notices and Orders” tab, which is violation of principle of natural justice. He would further submit that the petitioner is ready and willing to pay 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 Additional Government Pleader appearing for the respondent would submit that as per the voluntary submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, subject to the deposit of 25% of the disputed tax demand by the petitioner in respect of the impugned assessment period, if the Court feels it appropriate and it is a fit case for re-consideration, this Court may consider and pass orders.



WEB COPY

6. Heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner as well as the learned Additional 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 Additional 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 on condition that the petitioner deposits 25% of the disputed tax amount in respect of the impugned assessment period, as agreed by the petitioner, within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

(ii) The petitioner shall file their reply/objection along with the required documents, if any, within a period of four weeks from the date the GST portal made available for filing reply or from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, whichever is later.

(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

WP No. 26488 of 2025



(iv) Considering the fact that the impugned order itself has been set aside, this Court is of the opinion that the if any attachment has been made on the Bank account of the petitioner, the same cannot survive any longer and hence, it is lifted. The respondent is directed to instruct the Bank to unfreeze the Bank account of the petitioner immediately upon the production of proof with regard to the payment of 25% of the disputed tax made by the petitioner.

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.

24-07-2025

rst

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Internet: Yes


Neutral Citation: Yes/No



WEB COPY

WP No. 26488 of 2025





WP No. 26488 of 2025



WEB COPY
To
The State Tax Officer/
The Commercial Tax Officer,
Mandaveli Assessment Circle,
4th Floor, Hall No.421, CT And R Department,
Fanepet, Nandanam,
Chennai – 600 035.



WEB COPY

WP No. 26488 of 2025



KRISHNAN RAMASAMY J.

rst

WP No. 26488 of 2025

AND

WMP NO. 29792 OF 2025,

WMP NO. 29793 OF 2025

24-07-2025