

(2013) 04 P&amp;H CK 0190

**High Court Of Punjab And Haryana At Chandigarh****Case No:** CWP No. 15888 of 1989 (O and M)Mohta Electro Steel Limited and  
Another

APPELLANT

Vs

State of Haryana and Another

RESPONDENT

---

**Date of Decision:** April 25, 2013**Acts Referred:**

- Haryana General Sales Tax Act, 1973 - Section 9

**Citation:** (2013) 64 VST 456**Hon'ble Judges:** Ritu Bahri, J; Hemant Gupta, J**Bench:** Division Bench**Advocate:** S.C. Sibal and V.S. Rana, for the Appellant; Mamta Singhal Talwar, Additional Advocate-General, Haryana, for the Respondent

---

**Judgement**

Hemant Gupta, J.

The writ petition seeks quashing of assessment order and the subsequent proceedings creating liability against the petitioners under the provisions of the Haryana General Sales Tax Act, 1973 (hereinafter referred to as "the Act"). The liability created also included liability to pay interest u/s 25(5) of the Haryana General Sales Tax Act. In the writ petition, one of the contentions raised is that u/s 9 of the Act, purchase tax liability has been created if raw material is purchased in the State and used in manufacture of goods which are sent out from the State other than by way of inter-State sale or export which was against the judgment in [Goodyear India Limited Vs. The State of Haryana and Another](#), . This was in the nature of tax on consignment of goods covered by entry 92B of List I. Further, the contention raised is that liability to pay interest as per the scheme of the Act arises in respect of additional liability created under the assessment order and not on the date of transaction of purchase and sale or filing of return. The tax paid as per return does not carry any liability to pay interest till assessment is made. Reliance has been placed on the judgment of honourable Supreme Court in [J.K. Synthetics](#)

Limited and Birla Cement Works and another Vs. Commercial Taxes Officer, State of Rajasthan and another,

2. As regards challenge to the tax liability u/s 9 of the Act is concerned, it is not disputed by learned, counsel for the petitioners that the matter is covered against the petitioner by the judgment of honourable Supreme Court in [Hotel Balaji and others, Vs. State of Andhra Pradesh and others, etc. etc.,](#) . Only contention which has been pressed is about levy of interest for the period prior to the assessment. On this aspect the matter is covered in favour of the petitioner by the judgment of the honourable Supreme Court i [J.K. Synthetics Limited and Birla Cement Works and another Vs. Commercial Taxes Officer, State of Rajasthan and another,](#) and learned counsel for the State has not been able to distinguish the applicability of the judgment. Accordingly, we allow these writ petition to the extent of levy of interest for the period prior to passing of the order of assessment. The Assessing Authority may issue fresh notice of demand accordingly by modifying the interest component in accordance with the principles laid down in [J.K. Synthetics Limited and Birla Cement Works and another Vs. Commercial Taxes Officer, State of Rajasthan and another,](#)