



W.P.No.30977 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

WEB COPY

Dated : 19.08.2025

CORAM

THE HON'BLE Mr. JUSTICE KRISHNAN RAMASAMY

W.P.No.30977 of 2025
& W.M.P.Nos.34703, 34705 & 34707 of 2025

S Saravanan Enterprises
Represented by its Proprietor
S Saravanan,
No 47 Bajanai Koil Street
Paruthipattu chennai-600 071

... Petitioner

Vs.

1. Assistant Commissioner (st)
Avadi Assessment Circle,
No.124, Elephant Gate Bridge Road,
Chennai-600 003

2. The Branch Head / Manager
ICICI Bank Limited
No. 3 Main Road Kamraj Nagar
Avadi

... Respondents

Prayer:

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying to issue a Writ of Certiorari, to call for the impugned order of the respondent passed in GSTIN 33EHBPS683J1Z0/2018-19 dated 20.12.2023 and quash the same



WEB COPY



W.P.No.30977 of 2025

For Petitioner : Ms.Divya.A

For Respondent : Ms.Amirtapoonkodidinakaran,
Government Advocate (t) For R1

ORDER

This writ petition has been filed challenging the impugned order dated 20.12.2023 passed by the respondent.

2. Ms.Amirta Poonkodi Dinakaran, learned Government Advocate, takes notice on behalf of the 1st 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 in the GST common portal. Since the petitioner's Accountant 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.



W.P.No.30977 of 2025

WEB COPY

4. Further, he would submit that the petitioner is willing to pay 25% of the disputed tax amount, to the 1st respondent. Hence, he requests this Court to grant an opportunity to the petitioner to present their case before the 1st respondent by setting aside the impugned order.

5. On the other hand, the learned Government Advocate appearing for the 1st 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 1st respondent, subject to the payment of 25% of the disputed tax amount as agreed by the petitioner.

6. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and and the learned Government Advocate for the 1st respondent and also perused the materials available on record.



W.P.No.30977 of 2025

WEB COPY

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 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



W.P.No.30977 of 2025

WEB COPY

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 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 the petitioner is willing to pay 25% of the disputed tax amount to the 1st respondent. In such view of the matter, this Court is inclined to set aside the impugned order dated 20.12.2023 passed by the 1st respondent. Accordingly, this Court passes the following order:-

- (i) The impugned order dated 20.12.2023 is set aside and the matter is remanded to the 1st respondent for fresh consideration on condition that the petitioner



WEB COPY



W.P.No.30977 of 2025

shall pay 25% of the disputed tax amount to the 1st respondent within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. 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.

(iv) Considering the fact that the impugned order itself has been set aside, this Court is of the opinion that the attachment made on the bank account of the petitioner cannot survive any longer and hence, it is to be lifted. As a sequel, the 2nd respondent is directed to release the attachment, and de-freeze the bank account of the petitioner, immediately upon the production of a copy of this order along with the proof of payment as stated above.



W.P.No.30977 of 2025

WEB COPY

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

19.08.2025

Speaking/Non-speaking order
Index : Yes / No
Neutral Citation : Yes / No
nsa



WEB COPY



W.P.No.30977 of 2025

KRISHNAN RAMASAMY.J.,

nsa

To

1. Assistant Commissioner (st)
Avadi Assessment Circle,
No.124, Elephant Gate Bridge Road,
Chennai-600 003

2. The Branch Head / Manager
ICICI Bank Limited
No. 3 Main Road Kamraj Nagar
Avadi

W.P.No.30977 of 2025
& W.M.P.Nos.34703, 34705 & 34707 of 2025

19.08.2025