## Court No. - 5

Case :- WRIT TAX No. - 52 of 2023

**Petitioner :-** M/S Pragati Enterprises, Thru. Its Authorized

Representative Shri Yogesh Pratap Singh

**Respondent :-** The Commissioner, Commercial Tax, Sgst, U.P.

Commercial Tax Bhawan Lucknow And Another

Counsel for Petitioner: - Amit Harsh Sinha, Prabhat Kumar

**Counsel for Respondent :-** C.S.C.

## Hon'ble Vivek Chaudhary, J.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Standing Counsel for the respondents.

Present petition has been filed challenging the order dated 12.11.2021 cancelling the GST registration of the petitioner as well as the order dated 11.01.2023 whereby the appeal preferred by the petitioner has been rejected by the appellate authority and the order dated 22.01.2022 whereby revocation application of the petitioner has been rejected.

The facts, in brief, are that the petitioner is a partnership firm engaged in trading business and supply of construction material etc. in the name and style of 'M/s. Pragati Enterprises). A show cause notice for cancellation of registration was issued to the petitioner, directing the petitioner to furnish a reply to the notice within seven working days from the date of service of the notice.

The case of the petitioner is that he could not respond to the show cause notice issued by the respondents within the stipulated period on account of sickness, thus, an order came to be passed on 12.11.2021 whereby registration of the petitioner was cancelled without assigning any reason. Against the said order, the petitioner filed an appeal which was rejected by the appellate authority on the ground of limitation.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that since he has not been heard while passing the order dated 12.11.2021, as such the present petitioner is also entitled for the benefit benefit of the order passed by this Court in *Writ Tax No.145 of 2022* 

(*Technosum India Pvt. Ltd. Lucknow Vs. Union of India and others*) dated 26.09.2022. In the said judgment, the Court has held that the impugned order does not assign any reason whatsoever for cancelling registration of the petitioner and is passed only on the ground that reply to the show cause notice is not given. The non-submission of reply to the show cause notice cannot be a ground for cancellation of the registration. The relevant Paragraphs 9 and 10, of the judgment in *Technosum India Pvt. Ltd. Lucknow (Supra)*, reads as under:-

"9. The Counsel for the petitioner argues that the appeal has been dismissed as being beyond limitation as such the doctrine of merger would not apply and the petitioner is fair entitled to seek judicial review of the order dated 03.01.2022 on the ground that the same is non speaking order. This Court while deciding Writ Tax No.147 of 2022 (M/S Chandrasen, Sarda Nagar, Lucknow vs Union of India and others) had held that the order of cancellation of registration or any other order passed either on administrative or on judicial side is without any reason and prima facie, without application of mind, the same does not stand the test of scrutiny under Article 14 of the Constitution of India.

10. Thus, following the said judgment rendered in the case of M/s Chandrasen (Supra), the writ petition deserves to be allowed." In view thereof, the present petitioner is also entitled for the same relief. The benefit of the order dated 26.9.2022 passed in Writ Tax No.145 of 2022, shall also be made available to the present petitioner."

In view thereof, the present petitioner is also entitled for the same relief. The benefit of the order dated 26.9.2022 passed in Writ Tax No.145 of 2022, shall also be made available to the present petitioner.

Accordingly, the present petition is *allowed*.

The order dated 12.11.2021 as well as the appellate order dated 11.1.2023 and the order dated 22.1.2022, are set aside. The petitioner is permitted to appear before the respondent along with the reply to the show cause notice and the certified copy of this order as well as the copy of the judgment passed in Writ

Tax No.145 of 2022 (Technosum India Pvt. Ltd. Lucknow Vs. Union of India and others) dated 26.09.2022, within three weeks from today. In case, the petitioner appears along with the reply and the certified copy of this order, the respondents shall proceed to pass a fresh order in accordance with law.

(Vivek Chaudhary, J.)

**Order Date :-** 28.2.2023

Arjun/-