



W.P.No.27626 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

WEB COPY

Dated : 29.07.2025

CORAM
THE HON'BLE Mr. JUSTICE KRISHNAN RAMASAMY

W.P.No.27626 of 2025
& W.M.P.Nos.30950 and 30951 of 2025

Sansaj Home Care Products Private Limited,
Rep by its Director
Sajith Balakrishnan Menon,
56, Anugraha Garden,
Central Studio Road,
Dhanalakshmipuram,
Coimbatore 641 005.

... Petitioner

Vs.

The Assistant Commissioner (ST),
Singanallur North Circle,
Commercial Taxes Building,
Dr Balasundaram Road,
Coimbatore 641 018.

... Respondent

Prayer:

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying to issue a Writ of Certiorari, calling for Respondent Order dated 15.02.2025 passed in GSTIN:33ABCCS2579L1Z0/2020-21 and quash the same.

For Petitioner : M/s Disha Jain

For Respondent : Mrs.K.Vasanthamala,
Government Advocate



W.P.No.27626 of 2025

ORDER

WEB COPY This writ petition has been filed challenging the impugned order dated 15.02.2025 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 came to be passed by the respondent without providing any opportunity of personal hearing to the petitioner. Therefore, this petition has been filed.

4. Further, she would submit that since the disputed amount is very meagre, she requests this Court to grant an opportunity to the petitioner to present their case



W.P.No.27626 of 2025

before the respondent by setting aside the impugned order.

WEB COPY

5. On the other hand, the learned Government Advocate appearing for the respondent would submit that the 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 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.

6. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Government Advocate appearing 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 issued through the GST Portal and the original of the said show cause notice was not furnished to them. In such



W.P.No.27626 of 2025

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.

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



W.P.No.27626 of 2025

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, on perusal of the records, it is evident that the disputed amount is very meagre. In such view of the matter, this Court is inclined to set aside the impugned order dated 15.02.2025 passed by the respondent. Accordingly, this Court passes the following order:-

(i) The impugned order dated 15.02.2025 is set aside and the matter is remanded to the respondent for fresh consideration.

(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 receipt of a copy of this order.

(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.



W.P.No.27626 of 2025

WEB COPY With the above directions, this writ petition is disposed of. No costs.

Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petitions are also closed.

29.07.2025

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Index : Yes / No

Neutral Citation : Yes / No

vm



W.P.No.27626 of 2025

WEB COPY

To

The Assistant Commissioner (ST),
Singanallur North Circle,
Commercial Taxes Building,
Dr Balasundaram Road,
Coimbatore 641 018.



WEB COPY



W.P.No.27626 of 2025

KRISHNAN RAMASAMY.J.,

vm

W.P.No.27626 of 2025
and W.M.P.Nos.30950 and 30951 of 2025

29.07.2025