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. 43372 of 2026

and WMP Nos.48689 and 48694 of 2026

CNR: {HCMA012350692026}

M/s. Om Swaminathan Industries
Represented by its proprietor R Jothi
GSTIN 33EIBPR5799J1ZK
Office Address at
229/10 , Bharathidasan Street, Karapakkam,
Chennai-600097

..Petitioner

Vs

The Superintendent of GST and C.Ex, Range-II
Sholinganallur Division,
Chennai South, 692, MHU Complex,
Nandanam, Annasalai
Chennai-600 035.

..Respondent(s)

PRAYER: The Writ Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking the issuance of a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus calling for the records of the 1st Respondent, leading to the issuance of the Impugned Order dated 11.12.2025 bearing Order in Original No. 81/2025 for the FY 2021-2022 and quash the same as illegal, arbitrary, non-speaking and violative of principles of natural justice and statutory provisions and consequently direct the Respondent to conduct a fresh de novo adjudication in accordance with law,

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

WEB COPY

after granting the Petitioner a reasonable and effective opportunity of personal hearing to submit objections, considering all documentary evidences, reconciliation statements, and statutory compliance.

For Petitioner(s): Mr. S.Keerthivasan

For Respondent(s): Mr. Arvind Srevatsa
Senior Standing Counsel

ORDER

The present Writ Petition has been filed challenging the order dated 11.12.2025 passed by the respondent.

2. Mr. Arvind Srevatsa, learned Senior Standing Counsel takes notice on behalf of the 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 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.

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

WEB COPY

4. Further, he would submit that the petitioner is voluntarily willing to pay 25% of the disputed tax amount to the respondent. To that effect, he has also made an endorsement in the Court 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.

5. On the other hand, the learned Senior Standing Counsel 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 remit the matter back to the 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 Senior Standing Counsel for the respondent and also perused the materials available on record.

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

Order QR

WEB COPY

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 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.

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

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 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 respondent. In such view of the matter, this Court is inclined to set aside the impugned order dated 11.12.2025 passed by the respondent. Accordingly, this Court passes the following order:-

> (i) The impugned order dated 11.12.2025 is set aside and the matter is remanded to the respondent for fresh consideration on condition that the petitioner pays 25% of disputed tax amount to the 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. 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.

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

WEB COPY

(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. W.M.P.No.48689 of 2026 filed to dispense with the production of the original impugned order, is allowed. Consequently, the connected W.M.P.No.48694 of 2026 is also closed.

29-10-2026

Asi

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

WEB COPY

To

The Superintendent of GST and C.Ex, Range-II
Sholinganallur Division,
Chennai South, 692, MHU Complex,
Nandanam, Annasalai,
Chennai-600 035.

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

WEB COPY

KRISHNAN RAMASAMY, J.

Asi

WP No. 43372 of 2026

and WMP Nos.48689 and 48694 of 2026

29-10-2026

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