



W.P.No.31909 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

WEB COPY

Dated : 22.08.2025

CORAM

THE HON'BLE Mr. JUSTICE KRISHNAN RAMASAMY


W.P.No.31909 of 2025
& W.M.P.Nos.35726, 35729 & 35727 of 2025

Hotel Ananda
Represented by its Partner Mr.R.Narayanan
No.5, Medavakkam High Road,
Moovarasampet, Tiruvallur,
Tamil Nadu, 600091

... Petitioner

Vs.

1. The Deputy Commercial Tax Officer
Madipakkam Assessment circle,
Station No. 571, Integrated Commercial taxes
and Registration department (south tower)
Room No. 233, 2nd Floor,
Nandanam Chennai 35
2. The Deputy Commissioner (st) (fac)
Tambaram Zone, 4th Floor,
PAPJM Building Greams Road, Chennai 600 006
3. The State Of Tamil Nadu
Rep. by its Secretary to Government,
Commercial Taxes Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai 600 009
4. Union Of India
Rep. by its Secretary, Ministry of Finance,



W.P.No.31909 of 2025

Department of Revenue, North Block,
New Delhi 110 001

WEB COPY

... Respondents

Prayer:

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying to issue a Writ of Certiorari, call for records from the file of first respondent in impugned order of the first respondent in GSTIN/33AAKFH1748L1Z6 /2019-20 dated 20.08.2024 and Reference No. ZD330824205592I in GSTIN/ID 33AAKFH1748L1Z6 dated 23.08.2024 and quash the same as illegal, without jurisdiction and violative of principles of natural justice, and consequently direct the first respondent to re-do the assessment afresh granting an effective opportunity of personal hearing


For Petitioner : Mr.K.Sankaranarayanan

For Respondent : Ms.P.Selvi, GA for R1 to R3
Mr.Sai Srujan Tayi, SPC,
& Ms.Pooja Jain, JPC, for R4

ORDER

This writ petition has been filed challenging the impugned order dated 20.08.2024 passed by the respondent.

2. Ms.P.Selvi, learned Government Advocate, takes notice on behalf of the respondents 1 to 3 and Mr.Sai Srujan Tayi, learned Senior



W.P.No.31909 of 2025

WEB COPY

Panel counsel, takes notice on behalf of the 4th 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 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.

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.



W.P.No.31909 of 2025

WEB COPY

5. On the other hand, the learned Government Advocate appearing for the respondents 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 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 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



W.P.No.31909 of 2025

WEB COPY

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.



W.P.No.31909 of 2025

WEB COPY

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 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 20.08.2024 passed by the respondent. Accordingly, this Court passes the following order:-

(i) The impugned order dated 20.08.2024 is set aside and the matter is remanded to the respondent for fresh consideration on condition that the petitioner shall pay 25% of the disputed tax amount to the respondent within a period of four weeks from the date



WEB COPY



W.P.No.31909 of 2025

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.

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.No.31909 of 2025

To

WEB COPY

1. The Deputy Commercial Tax Officer
Madipakkam Assessment circle,
Station No. 571, Integrated Commercial taxes
and Registration department (south tower)
Room No. 233, 2nd Floor,
Nandanam Chennai 35

2. The Deputy Commissioner (st) (fac)
Tambaram Zone, 4th Floor,
PAPJM Building Greaves Road,
Chennai 600 006

3. The State Of Tamil Nadu
Rep. by its Secretary to Government,
Commercial Taxes Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai 600 009

4. Union Of India
Rep. by its Secretary, Ministry of Finance,
Department of Revenue, North Block,
New Delhi 110 001



WEB COPY



W.P.No.31909 of 2025

KRISHNAN RAMASAMY.J.,

nsa

W.P.No.31909 of 2025
& W.M.P.Nos.35726, 35729 & 35727 of 2025

22.08.2025