WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 03-11-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE KRISHNAN RAMASAMY

WP No. 43952 of 2026

CNR:{HCMA012536642026}

AND

WMP NO. 49317 OF 2026

Case QR

Kaveri Bangles,
represented by its Proprietor K. Nenaram,
No.47,/4 Aiyar Madam Street,
Junction Road,
Virudhachalam 606 001.

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

The Deputy State Tax Officer – 1,
Virudhaqhalam Assessment Circle,
Commercial Taxes Building, Vayalur,
Ulundurpet Main Road, Near Railway Bridge,
Vtudhachalam -606 001.

..Respondent(s)

PRAYER:- Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for an issuance of Writ of Certiorari, calling for the records of the respondent in his proceedings in Order No 33ARUPN6023F1ZP/2O21-22, quash the order dated 22.11-2025.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.P.V.Sudakar

For Respondent(s): Ms.G.Dhana Madhri
Special Government Pleader (T)

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

WEB COPY

Order

This writ petition has been filed challenging the impugned order dated 22.11.2025 passed by the respondent.

2.Ms.G.Dhana Madhri, learned Special 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.

4.Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that, in the present case, the petitioner had not received physical copies of either the show cause notice or the notice of personal hearing. The show cause notice dated 17.09.2025 was merely uploaded on the GST Portal, which the petitioner had no occasion to access. Even the impugned order dated 22.11.2025 was uploaded on the GST Portal, without furnishing a physical copy to the petitioner. Hence he would submit that the impugned order has been passed in violation of principle of natural justice. He would further submit that the petitioner is ready and willing to pay 25% of the disputed tax demand in respect of the impugned assessment period and prayed to set aside the impugned order directing the

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

WEB COPY

respondent to permit the petitioner to file their reply and provide an opportunity of personal hearing so that the petitioner would be able to substantiate their case.

5.Learned Special Government Pleader appearing for the respondent would submit that if this Court feels that the matter warrants reconsideration, in terms of the voluntary submission made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, upon the petitioner depositing 25% of the disputed tax demand for the impugned assessment period, the impugned order may be set aside and the matter may be remanded for reconsideration.

6.Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner as well as the learned Special Government Pleader appearing for the respondent and perused the materials available on record.

7.Considering the above submissions made by the learned counsel on either side and upon perusal of the materials, it is evident that the impugned show cause notice was uploaded on the GST Portal. According to the petitioner, the petitioner was not aware of the issuance of the show cause notice through the GST Portal and a physical copy of the said show cause notice was not served on the petitioner. In such circumstances, when the respondent did not

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

WEB COPY

receive any reply/response from the petitioner to the show causes notice and when the statute provides for alternative modes of service of notice, it is incumbent upon the respondent to adopt an effective mode of service instead of repeatedly uploading the notices and reminders on the common portal. If such an effective mode of service has been adopted, the petitioner would have not been in a position to contend before this Court that the notices were not received.

8.Thus, this Court is of the view that the impugned order came to be passed without affording an opportunity of personal hearing to the petitioner to establish their case, thereby violating the principles of natural justice and that it is just and necessary to provide an opportunity to the petitioner to establish their case on merits and in accordance with law.

9.For the reasons stated above, this Court is inclined to set aside the impugned order dated 22.11.2025 passed by the respondent. Accordingly, this Court pass the following orders:-

(i) The order impugned herein is set aside on condition that the petitioner deposits 25% of the disputed tax amount in respect of the impugned assessment period, as agreed by the petitioner, within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

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

WEB COPY

(ii) The petitioner is at liberty to make the aforesaid 25% deposit after deducting the amount, if any paid subsequent to the issuance of the impugned assessment order.

(iii) The petitioner shall file their reply/objection along with the required documents, if any, within a period of two weeks thereafter.

(iv) 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.

10.With the above directions, the writ petition is disposed of. There is no order as to costs. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

03-11-2026

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

rst

To

The Deputy State Tax Officer – 1,
Virudhaqhalam Assessment Circle,
Commercial Taxes Building, Vayalur,
Ulundurpet Main Road, Near Railway Bridge,
Vtudhachalam -606 001.

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

WEB COPY

KRISHNAN RAMASAMY J.

rst

WP No. 43952 of 2026
AND
WMP NO. 49317 OF 2026

03-11-2026

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