



WP No. 26828 of 2025

WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 31-07-2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE KRISHNAN RAMASAMY

WP No. 26828 of 2025

AND

WMP NO. 30153 OF 2025, WMP NO. 30152 OF 2025, WMP NO. 30154 OF 2025

M/s.L.Sasi Kumar
Proprietor of M.s Srisa Impex,
143-5, Alagapuri Nagar,
Attayampalayam, Avinashi,
Tiruppur 641 654

also at 3/1274 Vijay Nivas,
Aarnesh Dream City,
Velayuthampalayam, Tiruppur 641 654.

Petitioner(s)

Vs

1.The Assistant Commissioner (ST),
Avinashi Assessment Circle, Avinashi, Tiruppur.

2.HLL Lifecare Limited,
HLL Bhavan, Mahilamandiram Road,
Poojappura, Tiruvananthapuram, Kerala 695 012.

Respondent(s)



WP No. 26828 of 2025

WEB COPY

PRAYER:-Writ Petition filed under article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for an issuance of Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, calling for records of the 1st respondent in Reference No ZD33022511870P dated 13.02.2025 passed by the 1st respondent and quash the same as it is illegal and passed in gross violation of principles of natural justice and consequently direct the petitioner to not proceed ahead with recovery in prusuanace of order under Reference No ZD330225118704P dated 13.02.2025 passed by the 1st respondent.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.K.Sakthivel

For Respondent(s): Mr.C.Harsha Raj
Spl. Govt. Pleader (taxes)

ORDER

This writ petition has been filed by the petitioner challenging the impugned assessment order dated 13.02.2025, passed by the respondent relating to the Tax Period 2020-21 and to quash the same.

2.Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that, in the present case, the petitioner have not received any physical copy of the show



WP No. 26828 of 2025

WEB COPY

cause notice and also personal hearing notice. The show cause notice dated 31.07.2024 was uploaded in the GST Portal tab and the petitioner had no occasion to open the GST Portal. Even the impugned order dated 13.02.2025 was also uploaded in the GST Portal, 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.

3.Learned Special Government Pleader appearing for the 1st 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.




WP No. 26828 of 2025

WEB COPY

4. Heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner as well as the learned Special Government Pleader appearing for the 1st respondent and perused the materials available on record.

5. Considering the above submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner as well as the learned Special Government Pleader appearing for the 1st 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.



WP No. 26828 of 2025

WEB COPY

6.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.



WP No. 26828 of 2025

WEB COPY

7. 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 the matter is remanded back to the respondent for fresh consideration 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 two weeks thereafter.

(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



WEB COPY



WP No. 26828 of 2025

in accordance with law, after hearing the petitioner, as expeditiously as possible.

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

31-07-2025

rst

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Internet: Yes

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

To:

The Assistant Commissioner (ST),
Avinashi Assessment Circle, Avinashi,
Tiruppur.



WEB COPY



WP No. 26828 of 2025

KRISHNAN RAMASAMY J.

rst

WP No. 26828 of 2025

AND

WMP NO. 30153 OF 2025,

WMP NO. 30152 OF 2025,

WMP NO. 30154 OF 2025

31-07-2025