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. 44310 of 2026
and W.M.P.Nos.49674 & 49675 of 2026

CNR: {HCMA012574792026}

Winmeen Engineers Private Limited,
Represented by its Director
Mrs.Uma 1st Floor,
Winmeen Tower,
KNG Pudur Road,
Thudiyalur,
Coimbatore,
Tamil Nadu - 641034.

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

The Commercial Tax officer
Thudiyalur Circle, Coimbatore-II
Tamil Nadu.

..Respondent(s)

Prayer: This writ petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying to issue a Writ of Certiorari calling for the records of the Respondent in the impugned suo motu rectification order DRC-08 in Reference No.ZD330326020868C dated 03.03.2026 in GSTIN No.33AAACX1005B1Z9 merged with the DRC-07 Order in Reference No.ZD330326020778D dated 03.03.2026 and to quash the same as the same has been passed in violation of principles of natural justice

For Petitioner(s): Ms.J.Vamini
for Mr.K.Vaitheeswaran

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

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

WEB COPY

ORDER

This writ petition has been filed challenging the impugned order dated 03.03.2026 passed by the respondent.

2. Mr.I.Dinesh, learned Additional Government Pleader, 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 a "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.

4. Further, she would submit that the petitioner undertakes to pay 25% of the disputed tax amount to the respondent and also made an endorsement to that effect in the case 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.

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

WEB COPY

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 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 on either side and 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 of the fact that there is no response from the petitioner to the show cause notices etc., the

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

WEB COPY

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 on 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 03.03.2026 passed by the respondent. Accordingly, this

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

WEB COPY

Court passes the following order:-

(i) The impugned order dated 03.03.2026 is set aside and the matter is remanded to the respondent for fresh consideration on condition that the petitioner shall pay 25% of 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 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.49674 of 2026 filed to dispense the production of original impugned order, is allowed. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

29-10-2026

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

VM

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

WEB COPY

KRISHNAN RAMASAMY, J.

VM

To:

The Commercial Tax officer
Thudiyalur Circle, Coimbatore-II
Tamil Nadu.

WP No. 44310 of 2026

29-10-2026

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