IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Dated : 21.08.2025

CORAM

THE HON'BLE Mr. JUSTICE KRISHNAN RAMASAMY

W.P.Nos.30783 & 30788 of 2025
& W.M.P.Nos.34491, 34492, 34493 & 34495 of 2025

M/s Heamcure Healthcare
Represented by its Proprietor T.Vignesh
No.1, Bajanai Koil Street,
North Malayambakkam,
Nazarathpet, Tiruvallur District

... Petitioner in both petitions

Vs.

1. The Assistant Commissioner (ST)
Sriperumbudur Assessment Circle,
No.4/109, Bangalore - Chennai Highway,
Varadarajapuram, Nazaratpet, chennai- 123.

2. The Deputy Commissioner (ST)
Kancheepuram Zone ,1st Floor,
Commercial Taxes Building,
Collectorate Campus,
Kancheepuram -631 501.

... Respondents in W.P.No.30783 of 2025

1. The Deputy Commercial Tax Officer,
Sriperumbudur Assessment Circle,
Bangalore - Chennai Highway,
Varadarajapuram, Nazaratpet, chennai- 123.

2. The Deputy Commissioner (ST)
Kancheepuram Zone ,1st Floor,
Commercial Taxes Building,
Collectorate Campus,
Kancheepuram -631 501.

... Respondents in W.P.No.30788 of 2025

Common Prayer:

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying to issue a Writ of Certiorari,

calling for the records pertaining to the Impugned order passed by the 1st Respondent in order Ref.No.ZD330824145483C dated 19.08.2024 against the petitioners firm vide GSTIN-33AUFPV9818G1Z7, for the Assessment Year 2019-2020 and Quash the same as illegal, arbitrary and against the principles of natural justice

calling for the records pertaining to the Impugned order dated 19.02.2025 in Reference No.ZD3302251935486 passed by the 1st respondent herein against the petitioners firm vide GSTIN-33AUFPV9818G1Z7 for the Assessment Year 2020-2021 and Quash the same as illegal, arbitrary and against the principles of natural justice

For Petitioner
in both petitions : Mr.K M Malarmannan

For Respondent
in both petitions : Mr.T.N.C. Kaushik, AGP

COMMON ORDER

These writ petitions have been filed challenging the impugned orders dated 19.08.2024 & 19.02.2025 passed by the respondent.

2. Mr.T.N.C.Kaushik, learned Additional Government Pleader, takes notice on behalf of the respondent. By consent of the parties, the main writ petitions are taken up for disposal at the admission stage itself.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that in these cases, all notices/communications were uploaded by the respondent 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 orders came to be passed by the respondent without providing any opportunity of personal hearing to the petitioner. Therefore, these petitions have been filed.

4. Further, he would submit that the petitioner is willing to pay

25% of the disputed tax amount, to the respondent in each case. In this regard, he had also made an endorsement in the case bundle. Hence, he requests this Court to grant an opportunity to the petitioner to present their case before the respondent by setting aside the impugned orders.

5. On the other hand, the learned Additional Government Pleader 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, he has fairly admitted that no opportunity of personal hearing was provided to the petitioner prior to the passing of impugned order. Therefore, he requested this Court to remit the matter back to the 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 Additional Government Pleader 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 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 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 respondent, in each case, and with regard to the same, he had also made an endorsement in the case bundles. In such view of the matter, this Court is inclined to set aside the impugned orders dated 19.08.2024 & 19.02.2025 passed by the 1st respondent. Accordingly, this

Court passes the following order:-

(i) The impugned orders dated 19.08.2024 & 19.02.2025 is set aside and the matter is remanded to the 1st respondent for fresh consideration on condition that the petitioner shall pay 25% of the disputed tax amount to the respondent, in each case, 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 respondent is directed to instruct the concerned Bank 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.

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

21.08.2025

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

To

1. The Assistant Commissioner (ST)
Sriperumbudur Assessment Circle,
No.4/109, Bangalore - Chennai Highway,
Varadarajapuram, Nazaratpet, chennai- 123.

2. The Deputy Commissioner (ST)
Kancheepuram Zone ,1st Floor,
Commercial Taxes Building,
Collectorate Campus,
Kancheepuram -631 501.

KRISHNAN RAMASAMY.J.,

nsa

W.P.Nos.30783 & 30788 of 2025
& W.M.P.Nos.34491, 34492, 34493 & 34495 of 2025

21.08.2025