



WEB COPY



W.P.No.31824 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Dated : 21.08.2025

CORAM

THE HON'BLE Mr. JUSTICE KRISHNAN RAMASAMY

W.P.No.31824 of 2025
and W.M.P.Nos.35636 & 35637 of 2025

Tvl.Raja Timber Plywoods,
Rep. by its Proprietor: A.Sridhar,
No.1E/13, GST Road, Chengalpattu,
Kanchipuram.

... Petitioner

Vs.

The State Tax Officer,
Chengalpattu Assessment Circle,
Chengalpattu.

... Respondent

Prayer:

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus calling for the records on the file of the respondent in GSTIN: 33BCBPS2167L1ZF/2018-19 dated 24.04.2024 uploaded in the portal in Form GST DRC-07 reference number ZD3304241868750, dated 24.04.2024 quash the same and further direct the respondent to pass order afresh after affording an opportunity to the petitioner to file their objections with supporting documents.



WEB COPY



W.P.No.31824 of 2025

For Petitioner : Mr.A.Chandrasekaran


For Respondent : Mr.C.Harsha Raj,
Special Government Pleader

ORDER

This writ petition has been filed challenging the impugned order dated 24.04.2024 passed by the respondent.

2. Mr.C.Harsha Raj, learned Special Government Pleader, 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, at the request of the petitioner, their GST Registration was cancelled with effect from 07.12.2023. This being the case, the respondent uploaded the show cause notice in the GST Common portal, since there was a mismatch between petitioner's GSTR-2A and GSTR-3B returns for the financial year 2018-19. Since the petitioner's registration was cancelled, the petitioner was not aware of the same and failed to file a reply within the time. Under these circumstances, the impugned order



W.P.No.31824 of 2025

WEB COPY

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 and he has also made an endorsement to that effect 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 Special 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 as agreed by the petitioner.




W.P.No.31824 of 2025

WEB COPY

6. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Special Government Pleader appearing 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



W.P.No.31824 of 2025

WEB COPY

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 such view of the matter, this Court is inclined to set aside the impugned order dated 24.04.2024 passed by the



W.P.No.31824 of 2025

respondent. Accordingly, this Court passes the following order:-

WEB COPY

(i) The impugned order dated 24.04.2024 is set aside and the matter is remanded to the respondent for fresh consideration on condition that the petitioner shall pay 25% of disputed tax amount to the respondent within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, as agreed by the petitioner. 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



WEB COPY



W.P.No.31824 of 2025

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.

With the above directions, this writ petition is 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

vm

KRISHNAN RAMASAMY.J.,

vm

To

The State Tax Officer,
Chengalpattu Assessment Circle,
Chengalpattu.

7/8



WEB COPY



W.P.No.31824 of 2025

W.P.No.31824 of 2025
and W.M.P.Nos.35636 & 35637 of 2025

21.08.2025