



WEB COPY

WP No. 29480 of 2025



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 11-08-2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE KRISHNAN RAMASAMY

WP No. 29480 of 2025

AND

WMP NO. 33041 OF 2025, WMP NO. 33042 OF 2025

Nimlesh Raj,
Sole Proprietor of RJ ENTERPRISES
197A, Asiad bazar, 100ft road,
Anna Nagar West Extension,
Thirumangalam Chennai,
Tamil Nadu 600 101.

Petitioner(s)

Vs

1.The Commercial Tax Officer,
Koyambedu Assessment Circle, Chennai.

2.The Branch Manager,
Kotak Mahindra Bank Ltd. Block Q-100,
Plot No. 3698, 3 rd Avenue, Anna Nagar
Chennai 40.

Respondent(s)

PRAYER:-Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India,
praying for an issuance of Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, calling for the



records leading to the issuance of exparte assessment order bearing reference number ZD330225137645I dated 14-02-2025 passed by the 1st Respondent herein and quash the same and consequently direct 1st Respondent to raise the attachment of the Petitioners bank account with the 2nd Respondent thereby granting an opportunity to the petitioner to submit his explanation and obtain order on merits.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.S.Jaganathan

For Respondent(s): Mrs.K.Vasanthamala
Government Advocate (taxes)

ORDER

This writ petition has been filed by the petitioner challenging the impugned assessment order dated 14.02.2025, passed by the 1st respondent.

2.Mrs.K.Vasanthamala, learned Government Advocate (Taxes), takes notice on behalf of the 1st respondent.

3.By consent of the parties, the main writ petition is taken up for disposal at the admission stage itself.



WEB COPY

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 cause notice and also personal hearing notice. The show cause notice dated 25.11.2024 and three reminders were uploaded in the GST Portal under “View Additional Notices/Orders” tab and the petitioner had no occasion to open the GST Portal. Even the impugned order dated 14.02.2025 was also uploaded in the GST Portal under “View Additional Notices/Orders”, 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 1st 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 Government Advocate 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.

6. Heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner as well as the learned Government Advocate 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 Government Advocate 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.

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

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 and the matter is remanded back to the 1st 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. 29480 of 2025



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

(iv) Upon production of proof with regard to the payment of 25% of the disputed tax made by the petitioner, the 2nd respondent is directed to de-freeze the petitioner's bank account forthwith.

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.

11-08-2025

rst

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Internet: Yes

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

To

1. The Commercial Tax Officer
Koyambedu Assessment Circle, Chennai.

2. The Branch Manager,
Kotak Mahindra Bank Ltd.
Block Q-100, Plot No. 3698, 3rd Avenue,
Anna Nagar Chennai 40.



WEB COPY

WP No. 29480 of 2025



KRISHNAN RAMASAMY J.

rst

WP No. 29480 of 2025

AND

WMP NO. 33041 OF 2025,

WMP NO. 33042 OF 2025

11-08-2025