



W.P.(MD)No.36154 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED : 17.12.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE KRISHNAN RAMASAMY

W.P.(MD)No.36154 of 2025
& W.M.P.(MD)No.28764 & 28768 of 2025

Tvl Madhu Shree Granites
Rep by its proprietor Ramavtar Singh
15/1, 14/2, 6/12, Sivagangai Main road
Aathikulam Village, Madurai - 625020

... Petitioner

Vs.

The Assistant Commissioner (ST)
Madurai Rural East Assessment Circle
Madurai - 625020

... Respondents

Prayer:

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, calling for the records of the respondent in GSTIN 33ADJPC0177G1ZZ dated 29.04.2024 relating to the Tax Period 2018-19 and the Form GST DRC-07 issued in Reference No ZD3304242394994 dated 29/04/2024 and uploaded in the portal, 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.



W.P.(MD)No.36154 of 2025

For Petitioner : Mr.A.Chandra Sekaran

For Respondent : Mr.R.Suresh Kumar, AGP

ORDER

This writ petition has been filed challenging the impugned order dated 29.04.2024 passed by the respondent.

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

3. 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, viz., show cause notice and the subsequent 2 reminders, 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



W.P.(MD)No.36154 of 2025

providing any opportunity of personal hearing to the petitioner.

Therefore, this petition has been filed.

4. Further, he would submit that the respondent had initiated action against the petitioner on the ground that he had dealing with one of the bill traders. That apart, he would submit that a sum of Rs.2,86,166/- was demanded by the respondent towards reversing the ITC, out of which, a sum of Rs.2,11,007/- was already recovered. Now, the petitioner is willing to pay a sum of Rs.75,000/-, to the respondent. 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 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



W.P.(MD)No.36154 of 2025

remit the matter back to the respondent, subject to the payment of Rs.75,000/- 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 and the subsequent 2 reminder notices were uploaded on the GST Portal Tab. According to the petitioner, he was not aware of the issuance of the said show cause notice and the subsequent 2 reminder notices issued through the GST Portal and the original of the said show cause notice and the subsequent reminders were 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



W.P.(MD)No.36154 of 2025

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.



W.P.(MD)No.36154 of 2025

10. Further, it was submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is willing to pay a sum of Rs.75,000/- to the respondent. In such view of the matter, this Court is inclined to set aside the impugned order dated 29.04.2024 passed by the respondent. Accordingly, this Court passes the following order:-

(i) The impugned order dated 29.04.2024 is set aside and the matter is remanded to the respondent for fresh consideration on condition that the petitioner shall pay 25% of 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 appropriate orders on merits and in accordance with



W.P.(MD)No.36154 of 2025

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.

17.12.2025

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

To

The Assistant Commissioner (ST)
Madurai Rural East Assessment Circle
Madurai - 625020



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD)No.36154 of 2025

KRISHNAN RAMASAMY.J.,

nsa

W.P.(MD)No.36154 of 2025
& W.M.P.(MD)No.28764 & 28768 of 2025

17.12.2025