



WEB COPY



W.P.No.28185 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 29.07.2025

Coram

The Honourable **Mr.Justice Krishnan Ramasamy**

W.P.No.28185 of 2025
and
W.M.P.Nos. 31616 & 31617 of 2025

M/s.Shiva Traders,
Rep. By its Proprietor,
Mr.Murugesan Ayyadurai,
No.8, Pathrakaliamman Nagar,
Chennai – 600057.

...Petitioner

Vs.

The Assistant Commissioner (ST),
Manali Assessment Circle,
Integrated Commercial Taxes Building,
Chennai – 600038.

...Respondent

Prayer : Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus to call for the records relating to the impugned proceedings of the Respondent in GSTIN:33AKWPM9910B1Z0/2020-2021 dated 19.02.2025, including the order passed under Section 73 of the CGST Act, dated 19.02.2025, the summary of the order in Form GST DRC-07, dated 19.02.2025 issued in



W.P.No.28185 of 2025

Reference No.ZD330225188919W and to quash the same as being contrary to the provisions of the Central Goods and Services Tax Act, 2017 r/w. The provisions of the Tamil Nadu Goods and Services Tax Act, 2017, and also in violation of the principles of natural justice.

For Petitioner : Mr.Samuel Rupesh Rajkumar


For Respondent : Mr.V.Prashanth Kiran
Government Advocate (Tax)

Order

Mr.V.Prashanth Kiran, learned Government Advocate (Tax), who takes notice on behalf of the respondent. With consent, the main Writ Petition is taken up for final disposal at the stage of admission itself.

2. The challenge in this Writ Petition is to the order dated 19.02.2025 passed by the respondent for the AY 2020-21 and to quash the same and also consequential direction to the first respondent to remove the recovery notice dated 19.02.2025 and remand back the matter to the first respondent.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the respondent has issued a show cause notice in Form DRC 01 on 26.11.2024,



W.P.No.28185 of 2025

WEB COPY

unfortunately, the Consultant, who was engaged by the petitioner for filing returns, on account of his ill-health, he failed to note those notices/reminders and intimate the petitioner. The petitioner was not aware of those notices and file reply to those notices. Since the petitioner failed to file reply to the said show cause notice, the respondent has confirmed the proposals contained in the show cause notice and passed the present impugned order. Therefore, the learned counsel would submit that the impugned order suffers from violation of principles of natural justice and is liable to be aside, as the petitioner has not been heard before passing the impugned order.

3.1. It is also submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is ready and willing to deposit 25% of the disputed tax, in the event, this Court is inclined to set aside the impugned order and remand the matter back to the Authority for fresh consideration. He would further submit that there is bank attachment and the same may be lifted, subject to the payment of 25% of the disputed tax. Hence, he prayed for appropriate directions.




W.P.No.28185 of 2025

4. The learned Government Advocate (T) for the respondent fairly

submitted that since the petitioner has voluntarily come forward to deposit 25% of the disputed tax, the prayer sought for by the petitioner may be considered.

5. Considering the above submissions made by the learned counsel on either side 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.

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



W.P.No.28185 of 2025

WEB COPY

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.

7. Therefore, this Court finds that there is a lack of opportunities being provided to serve the notices/orders etc., effectively to the petitioner. 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. Hence, this Court is inclined to set-aside the impugned order with terms, by issuing the following directions:-



W.P.No.28185 of 2025

i) The impugned order passed by the respondent dated 19.02.2025 is set aside.

ii) Consequently, the matter is remanded to the first respondent for fresh consideration.

iii) The petitioner is granted liberty to deposit 25% of the disputed tax, which the petitioner themselves had voluntarily come forward to make such payment, within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

iv) Thereafter, the petitioner is directed to file a reply along with supportive documents within a period of two weeks.

v) Thereupon, the respondent is directed to consider the reply and shall issue a clear 14 days notice affording an opportunity of personal hearing to the petitioner and shall decide the matter in accordance with law.

vi) Upon production of proof with regard to the payment of 25% of the disputed tax made by the petitioner, the respondent-Department is directed to issue appropriate direction on the petitioner's banker towards de-freezure of the petitioner's bank account forthwith.



W.P.No.28185 of 2025

8. With the above observations & directions, this Writ Petition is

disposed of. No costs. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petitions are closed.

29.07.2025

kkn

Index : yes/no

Neutral Citation : yes/no

To

The Assistant Commissioner (ST),
Manali Assessment Circle,
Integrated Commercial Taxes Building,
Chennai – 600038.



WEB COPY



W.P.No.28185 of 2025

Krishnan Ramasamy,J.,

KKN

W.P.No. 28185 of 2025

29.07.2025