Order Sheet

Г



M/s. Bharat Aluminium Company limited *Versus* Union of India and others

24.06.2021	Mr. Copal Mundra, councel for the petitioner
24.06.2021	Mr. Gopal Mundra, counsel for the petitioner. Mr. Ramakant Mishra, Assistant Solicitor General, for
	Respondent No.1/ Union of India.
	Mr. Alok Bakshi, Addl. Advocate General for the State.
	Heard on admission and I.A.No.1 for grant of ad-interim relief.
	Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the notice
	was served on petitioner vide Annexure P-1 dated 01.07.202020 wherein
	an Input Tax Credit as claimed by the petitioner was 95464.59 lakhs and
Jeb Co	2A GST, ITC Form was of 86606.67 in lakhs, which if the seller declares.
	He would submit that the difference of tax 8857.91 lakhs has been
n Court of Chha	claimed along-with interest. He would submit that as per the Press
	Release of GST Council dated 04th May 2018, there shallnot be any
Bilasp	automatic reversal of Input Tax Credit of buyer on non- payment of tax
	by the seller. It is submitted that in case the seller has not paid the tax, a
	recovery has to be made from the seller and here in this case, the
	petitioner has come out with the purchases made, but it did not
	tally/match with 2A ITC shown by the seller meaning thereby theseller
	may not have filed return to remove the same. When the physical
	verification was offered to be made by petitioner it was not accepted. Itis
	stated that for the recovery of like nature from the buyer, the action can
	only be available in the exceptional circumstances. He relies on a
	proposition laid down by Madras High Court in M/s. D.Y. Beather
	Enterprises Vs. State Tax Officer [W.P.(MD) No.2127 of 2021] and



-		
		would submit that in case, it has been held if the default is made by non-
		payment of tax by the seller, the recovery shall be made from the seller
		and only in exceptional circumstances, it can be from the recipient,
		therefore, the Input Tax Credit which was claimed by the petitioner
		cannot be denied for the reason that the seller has not uploaded their
		invoices on time.
		Learned Counsel appearing for the Union of India and Learned
		State Counsel pray for time to file reply.
		A perusal of the notice and recovery order dated 22.01.2021
		would show that the issue raised by the petitioner needs consideration.
		The petition is admitted for hearing. Let
		the reply be filed within four weeks.
AN	epuc	It is directed that on petitioner's depositing 5% amount of
111	A	Rs.14,93,79,211/- demanded vide order dated 22.01.2021 (Annexure P-
High	Court or Unna	9) within a period of 15 days, no coercive steps shall be takenpursuant
$\langle \cdot \cdot \rangle$	DIL	to the said order.
	allasb	List it in the week commencing 02nd August, 2021.
		Cc as per rules.
	Dee	Sd/- GOUTAM BHADURI
	Rao	JUDGE