



W.P.(MD) No.35227 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 09.12.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE KRISHNAN RAMASAMY

W.P.(MD)No.35227 of 2025
and W.M.P(MD).No.27929 and 27931 of 2025

Tvl.Aruna Maligai

Proprietor S.Saravanan

... Petitioner

Vs

The Deputy State Tax Officer-I (ST),
Palakarai Assessment Circle,
Tiruchirappalli 620 001

... Respondent

Prayer: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus to call for the records relating to an impugned order dated 30.08.2024 in Form GST DRC -07 vide Ref No.ZD330824299032C bearing GSTIN: 33ABDPS3446E1ZV, pertaining to FY 2019-20 issued by the respondent as arbitrary and illegal and quash the same, and further direct the respondent to redo the adjudication in accordance with law, after granting opportunity of personal hearing to the petitioner.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Ilayaraja

For Respondent : Mr.R.Sureshkumar
Additional Government Pleader



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD) No.35227 of 2025


ORDER

This writ petition has been filed challenging the impugned order dated 30.08.2024.

2. Mr.R.Suresh Kumar, learned Additional Government Pleader, takes notice on behalf of the respondents.

3. By consent of the parties, the main writ petition is taken up for disposal at the admission stage itself.

4. 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, these petitions have been filed.



5. Further, he would submit that now, the petitioner is willing to

6. On the other hand, the learned Additional Government Pleader

7. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and and the learned



W.P.(MD) No.35227 of 2025

8. 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.

9. 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.(MD) No.35227 of 2025

WEB COPY

10. 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.

11. Further, it was submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner that now, 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 30.08.2024 passed by the respondent. Accordingly, this Court passes the following order:-

(i) The impugned order dated 30.08.2024 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, as agreed, 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.



W.P.(MD) No.35227 of 2025

(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.

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

**09.12.2025
(2/2)**

Index : Yes/No
Internet: Yes/No
Neutral Citation: Yes/No
Rmk



W.P.(MD) No.35227 of 2025

To

WEB COPY

The Deputy State Tax Officer-I (ST),
Palakarai Assessment Circle,
Tiruchirappalli 620 001



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD) No.35227 of 2025

KRISHNAN RAMASAMY, J.

Rmk

W.P.(MD)No.35227 of 2025

**09.12.2025
(2/2)**