Order QR

WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 29-10-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE KRISHNAN RAMASAMY

WP No.34187 of 2026

CNR:{HCMA011939012026}

AND

WMP NO. 37586 OF 2026 and WMP NO. 37587 OF 2026

Tvl BAJRANG BUILDERS
rep. by its Proprietor,
M.Ramkumar,
Having office at No.14, Anbu Mahal,
Amul Nagar, Indira Nagar Extension,
Selvapuram, Coimbatore 641026.

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. The Commissioner of Commercial Taxes
   Ezhilagam, Chepauk, Chennai 05.

2. The Assistant Commissioner (ST),
   Perur Assessment Circle,
   1st Floor, Commercial Taxes Building,
   Dr. Balasundaram Road, Coimbatore - 641018.

3. The State Tax Officer (FAC),
   Perur Circle, Coimbatore - 641018.

..Respondent(s)

Prayer: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for issuance of Writ of Certiorari, calling for the records on the files of the 3rd Respondent herein in FORM GST DRC - 07 with Reference No ZD331225298532C, dated 18.12.2025 along with the detailed order in GSTIN 33AIUPR5148L1ZI/2021-22 dated 18.12.2025 for the tax period APR 2021 - MAR 2022, and quash the same.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

For Petitioner(s): Mr.K.Sankaranarayanan

For Respondent(s): Ms.Amirta Poonkodi Dinakaran
Additional Government Pleader (Tax)

Order

The present Writ Petition has been filed challenging the assessment order dated 18.12.2025 along with the detailed order dated 18.12.2025, passed by the third respondent.

2. Ms.Amirta Poonkodi Dinakaran, learned Additional Government Pleader takes notice on behalf of the respondents. 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 Notices 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 impugned order came to be passed by the third 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 third respondent. To that effect, he has also made

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

an endorsement in the Court bundle. Hence, he requests this Court to grant an opportunity to the petitioner to present their case before the third respondent by setting aside the impugned order.

5. On the other hand, the learned Additional Government Pleader appearing for the respondents would submit that the third 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 third respondent, subject to the payment of 25% of the disputed tax amount by the petitioner.

6. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Additional Government Pleader for the respondents 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

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

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, despite the fact that there is 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 amount to 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 has been a lack of effort in applying the available opportunities to serve the notices/orders etc., effectively to the petitioner.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

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 third respondent. In such view of the matter, this Court is inclined to set aside the impugned order dated 18.12.2025 passed by the third respondent. Accordingly, this Court passes the following order:-

(i) The impugned order dated 18.12.2025 along with the detailed order dated 18.12.2025 is set aside and the matter is remanded to the third respondent for fresh consideration on condition that the petitioner shall pay 25% of disputed tax amount to the third respondent within a period of four (4) 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 two weeks from the date of payment of amount as stated above.

(iii) On filing of such reply/objection by the petitioner, the third 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.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

11. With the above directions, this Writ Petition is disposed of. No costs. W.M.P.No.37586 of 2026 filed to dispense with the production of the impugned order is ordered. Consequently, the connected W.M.P.No.37587 of 2026 is closed.

29-10-2026
(1/2)

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

To

1. The Commissioner of Commercial Taxes
   Ezhilagam, Chepauk, Chennai 05.

2. The Assistant Commissioner (ST),
   Perur Assessment Circle,
   1st Floor, Commercial Taxes Building,
   Dr. Balasundaram Road, Coimbatore - 641018.

3. The State Tax Officer (FAC),
   Perur Circle, Coimbatore - 641018.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

KRISHNAN RAMASAMY J.

RSI

WP No.34187 of 2026
AND
WMP NO. 37586 OF 2026 and WMP NO. 37587 OF 2026

29-10-2026
(1/2)

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis