



WEB COPY



W.P.Nos.31478 & 31479 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Dated : 22.08.2025

CORAM

THE HON'BLE Mr. JUSTICE KRISHNAN RAMASAMY

W.P.Nos.31478 & 31479 of 2025
& W.M.P.Nos.35239, 35243, 35244 & 35241 of 2025

Sudalaimani Senthil Murugan
Proprietor of M/s. S.V FOOD MILLS,
Having its business at,
No. 1739, 18th Main Road,
Anna Nagar West, Chennai 600 040

... Petitioner in both petitions

Vs.

The State Tax Officer
Koyambedu Assessment circle,
5th Floor. No 1 Pajam Annexure Building,
Greams Road, Chennai 600 006

... Respondent in both petitions

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 dated
10.02.2025 passed by the Respondent in GSTIN/33AWVPS7196Q2Z1/
2020-2021 and quash the same

calling for the records pertaining to the impugned Recovery
Notice dated 15.04.2025 issued by the Respondent and quash the same



WEB COPY



W.P.Nos.31478 & 31479 of 2025

For Petitioner
in both petitions : Mr.Madan G


For Respondent
in both petitions : Mr.V.Prashanth Kiran, GA

COMMON ORDER

This writ petition has been filed challenging the impugned order dated 10.02.2025 and the consequential recovery notice dated 15.04.2025 by the respondent.

2. Mr.V.Prashanth Kiran, learned Government Advocate, takes notice on behalf of the 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 under the “View Additional Notice 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



W.P.Nos.31478 & 31479 of 2025

WEB COPY

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.

4. Further, he would submit that the petitioner is willing to pay 25% of the disputed tax amount, to the respondent. 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 order.

5. On the other hand, the learned Government Advocate 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.



W.P.Nos.31478 & 31479 of 2025

WEB COPY

6. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Government Advocate 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



W.P.Nos.31478 & 31479 of 2025

WEB COPY

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.



WEB COPY

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 and with regard to the same, he had also made an endorsement in the case bundle. In such view of the matter, this Court is inclined to set aside the impugned order dated 10.02.2025 passed by the respondent. Accordingly, this Court passes the following order:-

(i) The impugned order dated 10.02.2025 is set aside and the matter is remanded to the respondent for fresh consideration on condition that the petitioner shall pay 25% of the disputed tax amount to the 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



WEB COPY



W.P.Nos.31478 & 31479 of 2025

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, vide notice dated 15.04.2025, 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, this writ petition is disposed of. No costs. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petitions are also closed.

22.08.2025

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Index : Yes / No

Neutral Citation : Yes / No

nsa



W.P.Nos.31478 & 31479 of 2025

WEB COPY To

The State Tax Officer
Koyambedu Assessment circle,
5th Floor. No 1 Pajam Annexure Building,
Greens Road, Chennai 600 006



WEB COPY



W.P.Nos.31478 & 31479 of 2025

KRISHNAN RAMASAMY.J.,

nsa

W.P.Nos.31478 & 31479 of 2025
& W.M.P.Nos.35239, 35243, 35244 & 35241 of 2025

22.08.2025