APHC010150482026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
AT AMARAVATI **[3529]**
(Special Original Jurisdiction)

WEDNESDAY,THE SIXTH DAY OF MAY
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE R RAGHUNANDAN RAO

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE T.C.D.SEKHAR

WRIT PETITION NO: 9032/2026

Between:

1. M/S.SREE SAI CHAITANYA AGRO SOLUTIONS,, PLOT NO.E/17, INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, NEAR MAHINDRA TRACTOR SHOW ROOM, MADANAPALLE. STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH. REP. BY ITS PROPRIETOR MR.VALLUR PEERAIAH

...PETITIONER

AND

1. THE DEPUTY ASSISTANT COMMISSIONERI ST, MADANAPALLE.
2. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY, REVENUE (CT) DEPARTMENT, A.P. SECRETARIAT, AMARAVATI

...RESPONDENT(S):

Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed therewith, the High Court may be pleased tomay be pleased to issue Writ of Mandamus or any other appropriate Writ or Order or direction declaring (1) the action of the 1st Respondent in passing the Proceedings, dated 11.02.2025, within 5 days from the date of issue of Show Cause Notice, dated 06.02.2025, though 7 days time granted in the Show Cause Notice, dated 06.02.2025 to file objections by the Petitioner, is not valid in the eye of law and in violation of Principles of Natural Justice and Rule of Law (2) the action of the 1st Respondent in issuing the Show Cause Notice, dated 06.02.2025 and

passing the Proceedings, dated 11.02.2025, for the tax period 2023-24, without signature either physically or digitally in the Show Cause Notice, dated 06.02.2025 and the Proceedings, dated 11.02.2025, which is contrary to the provisions of the CGST/APGST Acts, 2017 and nonest in the eye of law (3) the Orders of the 1st Respondent is contrary to sub-section (2) of Section 73 of the CGST/SGST Acts 2017 (4) the action of the 1st Respondent in issuing the Show Cause Notice, dated 06.02.2025 and passing the Proceedings, dated 11.02.2025, without generating DIN, is not valid in the eye of law and consequently set aside the Proceedings, dated 11.02.2025 passed by the 1st Respondent, for the tax period 2023-24 under the CGST/SGST Act 2017, as null and void and pass such

IA NO: 1 OF 2026

Petition under Section 151 CPC praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the petition, the High Court may be pleased may be pleased to suspend the operation of the Proceedings, dated 11.02.2025 passed by the 1st Respondent, for the tax period 2023-24 under the CGST/SGST Acts 2017, pending disposal of the above Writ Petition, as otherwise, the Petitioner will be put to severe loss and hardship.

IA NO: 2 OF 2026

Petition under Section 151 CPC praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the petition, the High Court may be pleased may be pleased to direct the 1st Respondent to revoke the Notice for Attachment and sale of immovable shares under Section 79, dated 16.02.2026 issued by the 1st Respondent to the Petitioner, for the tax period 2023-24 under the CGST/SGST Acts 2017, pending disposal of the above Writ Petition, as otherwise, the Petitioner will be put to severe loss and hardship.

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. SHAIK JEELANI BASHA

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. GP FOR COMMERCIAL TAX
2.

The Court made the following:

The Court made the following Order:

(Per Hon'ble Sri Justice R. Raghunandan Rao)

Heard Sri Shaik Jeelani Basha, the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and the learned Government Pleader for Commercial Taxes, appearing for the respondents.

2. The petitioner was served with an order of assessment, in FORM GST DRC-07, dated 11.02.2025, passed by the 1st respondent, under the Goods and Services Tax Act, 2017 [for short "the GST Act"], for the tax period, 2023-2024. This order has been challenged by the petitioner in the present writ petition.

3. This assessment order, in Form GST DRC-07, is challenged by the petitioner, on various grounds, including the ground that the said proceeding does not contain the signature of the assessing officer and also DIN number, on the impugned assessment order.

4. Learned Government Pleader for Commercial Taxes, on instructions, submits that there is no signature of the assessing officer and does not contain DIN number, on the impugned summary of the assessment order.

5. The effect of the absence of the signature, on an assessment order was earlier considered by this Court, in the case of **A.V. Bhanoji Row Vs. The Assistant Commissioner (ST)**, in W.P.No.2830 of 2023, decided on 14.02.2023. A Division Bench of this Court, had held that the signature, on the assessment order, cannot be dispensed with and that the provisions of

Sections-160 & 169 of the Central Goods and Service Tax Act, 2017, would not rectify such a defect. Following this Judgment, another Division Bench of this Court, in the case of **M/s. SRK Enterprises Vs. Assistant Commissioner**, in W.P.No.29397 of 2023, decided on 10.11.2023, had set aside the impugned assessment order.

6. Another Division Bench of this Court by its Judgment, dated 19.03.2024, in the case of **M/s. SRS Traders Vs The. Assistant Commissioner ST & ors**, in W.P.No.5238 of 2024, following the aforesaid two Judgments, had held that the absence of the signature of the assessing officer, on the assessment order, would render the assessment order invalid and set aside the said order.

7. The question of the effect of non-inclusion of DIN number on proceedings, under the G.S.T. Act, came to be considered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Pradeep Goyal Vs. Union of India & Ors***[1]. The Hon'ble Supreme Court, after noticing the provisions of the Act and the circular issued by the Central Board of Indirect Taxes and Customs *(herein referred to as "C.B.I.C.")*, had held that an order, which does not contain a DIN number would be invalid.

8. A Division Bench of this Court in the case of ***M/s. Cluster Enterprises Vs. The Deputy Assistant Commissioner (ST)-2, Kadapa*** [2], on the basis of the circular, dated 23.12.2019, bearing No.128/47/2019-GST, issued by the

[1] **2022 (63) G.S.T.L. 286 (SC)**
[2] **2024 (88) G.S.T.L. 179 (A.P.)**

C.B.I.C., had held that non-mention of a DIN number would mitigate against the validity of such proceedings. Another Division Bench of this Court in the case of ***Sai Manikanta Electrical Contractors Vs. The Deputy Commissioner, Special Circle, Visakhapatnam*** [3], had also held that non-mention of a DIN number would require the order to be set aside.

9. In view of the aforesaid judgments and the circular issued by the C.B.I.C., the non-mention of a DIN number and absence of the signature of the assessing officer, in the impugned assessment order would have to be set aside.

10. This Court is also cogent of the fact that the impugned summary of the assessment order has been passed some time back and the present Writ Petition has been filed with delay. However, Rule 26(3) of the CGST Rules, 2017 stipulates that service of notice or orders, without signature, would not amount to service at all. The Hon'ble High Court of Madras, in T.V.L. Deepa Traders vs. The Deputy Commissioner (W.P.No.19277 of 2024, dated 13.08.2024) had held the same view. Consequently, there is no service of the impugned order even as of today, on account of the absence of signature on the impugned proceeding. In those circumstances, the delay in approaching this Court would not be a relevant factor.

[3] **2024 (88) G.S.T.L. 303 (A.P.)**

11. However, the learned Government Pleader for Commercial Taxes, appearing for the respondents, would contend that the order, under challenge, has been passed, on 11.02.2025, and the petitioner has approached this Court with inordinate delay and such delay has not been properly explained.

12. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the copy of the said order had not been served on the petitioner, in the conventional method and the respondents are claiming that the order is served on the petitioner by uploading the same in the portal.

13. The learned Government Pleader, on the other hand, would contend that Section 169 (1) (d) of the GST Act, 2017, prescribes the uploading of the order, in the portal, as a method of service on the registered persons and in that view of the matter, it must be held that service has been effected on the petitioner.

14. The Hon'ble High Court of Allahabad in **M/s. Bambino Agro Industries Ltd. vs. State of Uttar Pradesh and Another,** in Writ Tax No.2707 of 2025, had held that uploading the order in the portal, mentioned by the GST Authorities, would not be sufficient service of the order on the registered person. This Court has taken a contrary view in W.P.No.5397 of 2026.

15. However, the fact remains that a very large number of registered persons have approached this Court with the contention that they were unable to access the portal either on account of their ignorance or on account of the fact that the persons, authorized by them, who act on their behalf, are not

informing them of such orders. In the normal course, this Court would not accept such a contention as neither ignorance of law nor the inability to access the portal, could have been accepted is a sufficient cause for condoning the delay in approaching this Court.

16. This Court is also not unaware of the practical difficulties that have arisen on account of the introduction of the GST regime and the introduction of the online mechanism, under this regime, for the administration of tax collection, etc.

17. Keeping in view the hardships that are being faced by various registered persons, especially in cases where the orders suffer from patent irregularities, the impugned orders of assessment would have to be set aside.

18. In the circumstances, with a view to balance both the difficulties being faced by the registered persons and the need for the State to maintain its administration of tax collection, it would be appropriate that writ petitions, filed by such registered persons, with delay, can be considered, subject to the registered persons depositing 20% of the disputed tax, under the impugned order. We are also fortified, in this course of action, in view of the Judgment of the Hon'ble High Court of Madras in W.P.No.1474 of 2026.

19. In these circumstances, keeping in view the fact that the present order, under challenge, suffers from an inherent defect of absence of a DIN number and the signature on the impugned order, the same is set aside and the assessment is remanded back to the Assessing Officer to pass appropriate

orders, after giving due opportunity of hearing, available to the petitioner, under the provisions of the GST Act. This order is subject to the condition of the petitioner depositing 20% of the disputed tax under the impugned order, within a period of six (06) weeks from the date of receipt of this order. Such deposit shall abide by the decision in the order of assessment. Any payment made or any amount recovered from the petitioner, after the passing of the impugned order, shall be adjusted against the aforesaid 20%.

20. Needless to say, the period from the date of filling of this Writ Petition till the date of receipt of this order by the Assessing Officer, shall be excluded for the purposes of limitation and all issues are left open to be raised by the petitioner before the Assessing Officer.

21. Accordingly, this Writ Petition is disposed of. There shall be no order as to costs.

As a sequel, pending miscellaneous applications, if any, shall stand closed.

R. RAGHUNANDAN RAO, J

T.C.D. SEKHAR, J

Dated 06.05.2026
KA

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE R RAGHUNANDAN RAO

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE T.C.D.SEKHAR

WRIT PETITION NO: 9032/2026

Dated 06.05.2026
KA