

(2008) 12 SC CK 0022

In the Supreme Court Of India

Case No : Civil Appeal No. 7304 of 2008 (Arising out of SLP (C) No. 10725 of 2007) and Civil Appeal No. 7305 of 2008 (Arising out of SLP (C) No. 10277 of 2007)

R. Senthil Babu

APPELLANT

Vs

State of Tamil Nadu and Another

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 16-12-2008

Acts Referred:

Constitution of India, 1950 — Article 14

Citation : (2008) 13 JT 508 : (2009) 3 MLJ 734 : (2009) 1 SCALE 34 : (2009) 2 SCC 309

Hon'ble Judges : Mukundakam Sharma, J;Arijit Pasayat, J

Bench : Division Bench

Advocate : Aribam Guneshwar Sharma, for the Appellant; R. Nedumaran, for the Respondent

Final Decision : Dismissed

Judgement

Arijit Pasayat, J.—Leave granted.

2. The short question which arises for determination in these Civil Appeals concerns challenge to the Constitutional validity of Tamil Nadu Motor Vehicles Taxation (Amendment) Act, 1998, by which initially the rate of tax in respect of contract carriage stood increased from Rs. 1500/- per seat per quarter to Rs. 2000/- per seat per quarter, and subsequently the said rate stood enhanced from Rs. 2000/- per seat per quarter to Rs. 3000/- per seat per quarter vide Notification No. 1184 dated 30.11.2001 with effect from 1st December 2001.

3. The basis of the challenge rests on the uneven burden placed on the owners of contract carriage vis-a-vis stage carriage. Broadly it is contended that there is no rational in the imposition of the levy, that tax is imposed indiscriminately, that it is levied to cross-subsidize stage carriage and that uneven burden has been placed on the owners of contract carriage which has no nexus with the services or amenities provided.

4. Generally, in a matter of this nature, the quantifiable data forms the basis of the challenge. At the initial stage when the petition is filed in such cases there has got to be a precise formulation of the ground of challenge from the side of the appellants based on some statistical data as to disproportionality of the rate of tax. It is only thereafter that the burden will shift on to the State to submit quantifiable and measurable data.

5. In the present case we find that the initial burden on the appellants itself has not been discharged in the sense that the petitions filed before the High Court were very sketchy. A challenge of this nature requires the appellants to furnish greater details before the State could be called upon to submit quantifiable and measurable data justifying the impugned rate. Ultimately, it is the State which has to meet the allegations made in the writ petitions and if those allegations made in the writ petitions are vague, inaccurate or insufficient then it would not be possible for the State to submit its reply/data to the Court.

6. One more aspect in these cases also needs to be mentioned. It has been argued before us that the tax in question is a compensatory tax. Certain judgments of this Court are also relied upon in this regard, the latest being the judgment in the case of Jindal Stainless Ltd. and Another Vs. State of Haryana and Others, .

7. In our view, this repeated increase in the rate of tax, particularly the incidence of which is more on the contract carriage vis.-a-vis. stage carriage raises question of public importance. At the same time the State can certainly rely upon the data available to show cross subsidization, if it so exists in a given case, by which stage carriage gets subsidized in public interest.

8. Keeping in mind the gamut of the dispute involved, we are of the view that we cannot interfere with the impugned judgment of the High Court, particularly when the pleadings at the initial stage were insufficient.

9. Realizing this difficulty, learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the appellants fairly stated that he would seek permission of this Court to withdraw the civil appeals/special leave petitions with liberty to file proper writ petition in the High Court giving requisite details and available data. Normally, we would not have granted such permission. However, as stated above, questions of public importance arises in these matters, particularly in the context of the principles of proportionality under Article 14 of the Constitution and the later development of law as indicated by this Court in the case of Jindal Stainless Ltd. (Supra).

10. In the circumstances we permit the appellants herein to withdraw the Civil Appeals with liberty to file proper writ petition, if so advised. We make it clear that we do not find any infirmity in the impugned judgment of the High Court which is based on the petition originally filed by the petitioners. Subject to above, Civil Appeals stand dismissed with no order as to costs. We make it clear that if a proper writ petition is filed giving requisite data to the satisfaction of the High Court, then any observation made in the impugned judgment will not come

in the way of the appellants. All contentions of both sides are expressly kept open.

11. Similar order was passed in a group of cases i.e. Tamil Nadu Omni Bus Owners Association v. State of Tamil Nadu and Anr. i.e. Civil Appeal No. 1177 of 2006 etc. disposed of on 28.11.2007.