WEB COPY

Order QR

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 05-11-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE KRISHNAN RAMASAMY

WP No. 44270 of 2026

Case QR

and WMP Nos.49623 and 49625 of 2026

CNR: {HCMA012207552026}

Tvl Royal Engineering Corporation,
Rep by its Sole Proprietor Mr CU Mathews
Formerly at, Town Club Road, Block 17,
Neyveli Township, Cuddalore,
Tamil Nadu 607 801.
Presently at residing at Chirappurathu House,
Opposite to Mangalam School, Manganam,
Kottayam, Kerala 686 018.

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. The Deputy State Tax officer 1
   Panruti Rural
   Office of the State Tax Officer, Panruti Rural,
   Old Kumbakonam Road,
   Commercial Tax Building 1st floor,
   Near Taluk office, Panruti 607 106

2. State Bank Of India
   P.B No. 19, Thirunakkara S Road, Thirunakara
   Maidanam, Kottayam, Kerala 686 001.

..Respondent(s)

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

WEB COPY

PRAYER: The Writ Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking the issuance of a Writ of Certiorari calling for the records on the file of the 1st respondent pertaining to the impugned order bearing Reference No. GSTIN / 33AIPPM4721M1ZX / 2019-20 dated 05.07.2024 passed by the 1st Respondent under the provisions of the CGST Act, 2017, and quash the same, and pass a DE NOVO order,

For Petitioner(s): Ms. Shalini E

For Respondent(s): Mr. I. Dinesh
Additional Government Pleader (Taxes)

ORDER

The present Writ Petition has been filed challenging the assessment order dated 05.07.2024 passed by the first respondent.

2. Mr. I. Dinesh, learned Additional Government Pleader (Taxes) takes notice on behalf of the first 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 under the "View Additional Notices and Orders" column in the GST common portal. Since the

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

WEB COPY

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, she would submit that the petitioner is voluntarily willing to pay 25% of the disputed tax amount to the first respondent. To that effect, she has also made an endorsement in the Court bundle. Hence, she 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 first 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 first respondent, subject to the payment of 25% of the disputed tax amount by the petitioner.

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

WEB COPY

6. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the 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 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, despite the fact that there is no response from the petitioner to the show cause notices etc., 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

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

WEB COPY

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.

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 first respondent. In such view of the matter, this Court is inclined to set aside the impugned order dated 05.07.2024 passed by the first respondent. Accordingly, this Court passes the following order:-

> (i) The impugned order dated 05.07.2024 is set aside and the matter is remanded to the first respondent for fresh consideration on condition that the petitioner pays 25% of disputed tax amount to the respondent within a period of four

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

WEB COPY

(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. In the event, any amount is already recovered or deposited, the petitioner is granted liberty to adjust the said amount while making payment of 25% of the disputed tax 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 first 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 be lifted. As a sequel, the second respondent Bank is directed to de-freeze the bank account of the petitioner, immediately upon proof of payment of the said amount and permit them to operate the account normally. The Bank shall intimate the same to the first respondent authority.

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

WEB COPY

11. With the above directions, this Writ Petition is disposed of. There shall be no order as to costs. W.M.P.No.49623 of 2026 filed to dispense with the production of the impugned order, is allowed. Consequently, the connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

05-11-2026

(1/2)

Asi

To

1. The Deputy State Tax officer 1,
   Panruti Rural,
   Office of the State Tax Officer, Panruti Rural,
   Old Kumbakonam Road,
   Commercial Tax Building 1st floor,
   Near Taluk office, Panruti 607 106

2. The State Bank Of India
   P.B No. 19, Thirunakkara S Road, Thirunakara
   Maidanam, Kottayam, Kerala 686 001.

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

WEB COPY

KRISHNAN RAMASAMY, J.

Asi

WP No. 44270 of 2026

and WMP Nos.49623 and 49625 of 2026

05-11-2026

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