



W.P.No.28749 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

WEB COPY

Dated : 05.08.2025

CORAM

THE HON'BLE Mr. JUSTICE KRISHNAN RAMASAMY

W.P.No.28749 of 2025
and W.M.P.Nos.32199 & 32201 of 2025

Rambal Hi-Tech Engineers,
Rep. by its Proprietor Ramadoss Balasundaram,
No.6/375, NA, MAPS Main Road,
Meyyur, Kalpakkam, Kancheepuram,
Tamil Nadu - 603 102.

... Petitioner

Vs.

- 1.The State Tax Officer,
(also known as the Commercial Tax Officer),
Thirukazhukundram Circle,
Chengalpattu, Tamil Nadu.
- 2.Union of India,
(Rep. by its Director, Dept. of Revenue Ministry of Finance),
Raj Path Marg, "E" Block,
Central Secretariat,
New Delhi - 110 011.
- 3.State of Tamil Nadu,
(Rep. by its Secretary),
Commercial Taxes Department,
Fort St.George,
Chennai - 600 009.

... Respondents



W.P.No.28749 of 2025

WEB COPY

Prayer:

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying to issue a Writ of Certiorari calling for the records on the files of the first respondent herein in GSTIN/33AIMPB9324L1Z4/2019-20 in FORM GST DRC-07 in Order reference No.ZD3308240914655 dated 12.08.2024 and quash the same.

For Petitioner : M/s.S.Vishnupriya

For Respondents 1 & 2 : Mrs.K.Vasanthamala,
Government Advocate (T)

For Respondent 3 : Mr.Rajendran Raghavan,
Senior Panel Counsel

ORDER

This writ petition has been filed challenging the impugned order dated 12.08.2024 passed by the respondent.

2. Mrs.K.Vasanthamala, learned Government Advocate, takes notice on behalf of the respondents 1 & 2 and Mr.Rajendran Raghavan, learned Senior Standing Counsel takes notice on behalf of the third respondent. By consent of the parties, the main writ petition is taken up for disposal at the admission stage itself.




W.P.No.28749 of 2025

WEB COPY

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that in this case, all notices/communications were uploaded by the first 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 first respondent without providing any opportunity of personal hearing to the petitioner. Therefore, this petition has been filed.

4. Further, she would submit that the petitioner is willing to pay 25% of the CGST portion and as far as SGST portion is concerned, they have already remitted the entire tax. Hence, she requests this Court to grant an opportunity to the petitioner to present their case before the respondent by setting aside the impugned order.

5. On the other hand, the learned Government Advocate as well as learned Senior Panel Counsel appearing for the respondents would



W.P.No.28749 of 2025

WEB COPY

submit that the respondents 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 and learned Senior Panel Counsel appearing for the respondents 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, since his auditor failed to check those notices 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




W.P.No.28749 of 2025

WEB COPY

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



W.P.No.28749 of 2025

WEB COPY

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. 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, it was submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner that they have already paid the entire tax amount in regard to SGST and now they are willing to pay 25% of the CGST portion to the respondents. In such view of the matter, this Court is inclined to set aside the impugned order dated 12.08.2024 passed by the first respondent.

Accordingly, this Court passes the following order:-

(i) The impugned order dated 12.08.2024 is set aside and the matter is remanded to the respondent for fresh consideration on condition that the petitioner shall pay 25% of CGST portion, since they have already remitted the entire tax in regard to SGST portion to the respondents within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.



WEB COPY



W.P.No.28749 of 2025

The setting aside of the impugned order will take effect from the date of payment of the said amount.

(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 payment of amount as stated above.

(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.

With the above directions, this writ petition is disposed of. No costs. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petitions are also closed.

05.08.2025

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Index : Yes / No

Neutral Citation : Yes / No

vm



W.P.No.28749 of 2025

WEB COPY

To

- 1.The State Tax Officer,
(also known as the Commercial Tax Officer),
Thirukazhukundram Circle,
Chengalpattu, Tamil Nadu.
- 2.The Director, Dept. of Revenue Ministry of Finance,
Raj Path Marg, "E" Block,
Central Secretariat,
New Delhi - 110 011.
- 3.The Secretary,
Commercial Taxes Department,
Fort St.George,
Chennai - 600 009.



WEB COPY



W.P.No.28749 of 2025

KRISHNAN RAMASAMY.J.,

vm

W.P.No.28749 of 2025
and W.M.P.Nos.32199 & 32201 of 2025

05.08.2025