CGA LEGAL

The Tax Bulletin

September 2026 — Issue I

Your authoritative digest of GST legal developments, judicial precedents, compliance deadlines, and strategic tax alerts — curated by **Team CGA Legal**.

CGA LEGAL | GST & TAX LAW UPDATES | SEPTEMBER 2026

About The Tax Bulletin

The **Tax Bulletin** from Team CGA Legal keeps readers updated on critical legal and judicial developments in **Goods & Services Tax** and related tax laws. Each edition features a dedicated **Tax Alerts** column and actionable compliance recommendations to strengthen your business operations.

CGA Legal Tax Alert

Monthly calendar detailing all GST & Income Tax compliance deadlines — ensuring you never miss a filing obligation.

CGA Legal Meet

Monthly webinar series covering trending GST legal issues and compliance challenges, featuring expert analysis and live Q&A.

Newsletter Archive

All past editions are accessible at cgalegal.co.in/newsletters.php and cgalegal.co.in.

In This Issue

This edition covers compliance deadlines, revenue data, system advisories, and five landmark judicial rulings across demand, audit, authentication, and parallel proceedings.

S. No.	Category	Topic
1	Tax Alert	September 2026 Compliance Calendar
2	GST Technical Update	August 2026 Revenue Snapshot & e-Way Bill Advisory
3	Judicial Precedent	SCN validity without fraud pleading — **Tata Steel Ltd. v. UOI** (SC)
4	Judicial Precedent	Audit findings cannot authorize recovery — **SVS Aqua Technologies v. Superintendent** (Bombay HC)
5	Judicial Precedent	Digital signature mandate for GST orders — **Mayur Timber v. State of Rajasthan** (Raj. HC)
6	Judicial Precedent	Parallel CGST/SGST proceedings barred — **Prince Traders v. State Tax Officer** (Madras HC)
7	Judicial Precedent	AI-generated legal material requires verification — **Faiz Enterprise v. State Tax Officer** (Guj. HC)

CGA LEGAL

Tax Alert — September 2026

Key compliance deadlines for September 2026. Plan ahead to avoid penalties.

Date	Return Type	Period	Applicable Taxpayers
07-09-2026	TDS/TCS Payment	Aug 2026	All persons liable to deposit TDS/TCS
10-09-2026	GSTR-7	Aug 2026	TDS Deductors
10-09-2026	GSTR-8	Aug 2026	E-Commerce Operators
11-09-2026	GSTR-1	Aug 2026	Turnover > ₹5 Cr or opted for monthly filing
13-09-2026	Details of Outward Supplies through Invoice Furnishing Facility (IFF)	Aug 2026	QRMP taxpayers, Non-Residents, ISDs
13-09-2026	GSTR-5	Aug 2026	Input Service Distributors (ISD)
13-09-2026	GSTR-6	Aug 2026	Non-Resident Taxable Person
11-09-2026 to filing of GSTR-3B (upto 20-09-2026)	GSTR-1A	Aug 2026	Monthly GSTR-1 filers amending details
15-09-2026	Challan No. ITNS 280	Second Instalment of Advance Tax	45% is cumulative on the total estimated tax liability for FY 2026-27 less advance tax, if any, already paid by 15 June 2026
20-09-2026	GSTR-3B	Aug 2026	Turnover more than INR 5 crore in the preceding FY or Turnover up to INR 5 crore in the preceding FY but opted for monthly return filing.
20-09-2026	GSTR-5A	Aug 2026	OIDAR Service Providers
25-09-2026	PMT-06	Aug 2026	QRMP Scheme taxpayers (Month 2)
28-09-2026	GSTR-11	Aug 2026	UIN Holders
30-09-2026	Form 3CA/ CB & 3CD	FY 2025-26	All audit assessees for AY 2026-27

CGA LEGAL

GST Revenue Snapshot — August 2026

DATED: 01-09-2026

August 2026 GST collections reflect strong economic momentum, with gross revenues up **14.8% year-over-year** and significant refund processing providing working capital relief.

₹1.99L Cr

Gross Collections

14.8% YoY growth — robust momentum across sectors

₹1.68L Cr

Net Revenue

8.3% YoY growth after refunds

₹31,795 Cr

Total Refunds

67.9% surge — proactive processing

+19%

Uttar Pradesh

Top regional performer at ₹9,092 Cr

Regional Highlights

Manufacturing and commercial hubs led growth — UP (+19%, ₹9,092 Cr) and Gujarat (+15%) drove momentum.

Refund Surge — Key Insight

The 67.9% refund spike signals proactive processing, delivering working capital relief — a positive indicator for business liquidity.

CGA LEGAL

Advisory: e-Way Bill Enhancements — On Hold

GSTN ADVISORY UPDATE

IMPLEMENTATION SUSPENDED

GSTN had issued advisories on **9th June 2026** and **17th June 2026** regarding proposed e-Way Bill enhancements, with implementation scheduled for **1st August 2026**. Detailed FAQs followed on **2nd July 2026**.

Current Status: Implementation of the proposed e-Way Bill enhancements has been **kept on hold until further notice**. All stakeholders are advised that **no changes** are required in the production environment. Related advisories and FAQs will be withdrawn from the GST Portal.

No Action Required

Do not implement any changes based on the June advisories until further communication from GSTN.

Advisories Withdrawn

All related advisories and FAQs will be removed from the GST Portal.

Monitor for Updates

Watch for fresh GSTN communication regarding the revised implementation timeline.

CGA LEGAL

JUDICIAL PRECEDENT | DEMAND & RECOVERY | SUPREME COURT OF INDIA

SCN Under Section 74: Foundational Facts Are Mandatory

M/s. Tata Steel Limited v. Union of India — Supreme Court

Facts

The Department issued a Section 74 SCN for FY 2018–19 to 2020–21 based on a CAG audit objection — without alleging fraud, willful misstatement, or suppression. The Assessing Officer had kept the objection in "call book" (abeyance) but revived it as the limitation period neared expiry.

Held

The **Supreme Court** set aside the SCN and consequential order, ruling that invoking the extended five-year limitation requires the Assessing Officer's **independent satisfaction** that the shortfall resulted from fraud, willful misrepresentation, or suppression.

The Department may initiate fresh proceedings under Section 74, provided the new notice discloses requisite foundational facts and an order is passed before **February 28, 2027**.

Key Takeaway: A protective SCN under Section 74 without pleaded foundational facts is legally unsustainable. The "protective measure" concept is alien to the GST regime.

JUDICIAL PRECEDENT | AUDIT | BOMBAY HIGH COURT

Audit Findings (ADT-02) Cannot Independently Authorize Recovery

M/s. SVS Aqua Technologies LLP v. Superintendent — Bombay High Court

Facts

An audit under **Section 65** of the CGST Act resulted in Form GST ADT-02 findings. Without initiating adjudication under Section 73 or 74, the authority directly commenced recovery — which the petitioner challenged as impermissible.

Held

The **Bombay High Court** found substance in the petitioner's submission. Under **Rule 101(5)**, the proper officer informs findings via Form GST ADT-02 — but this does not independently authorize recovery. The Department must follow due process under the CGST Act before effecting recovery.

Rule 101(5) — What It Does

Requires the proper officer to communicate audit findings to the registered person via Form GST ADT-02 — a communication tool, not an enforcement instrument.

What It Does Not Do

ADT-02 does not substitute adjudication under Section 73 or 74. Recovery without such proceedings is legally impermissible.

JUDICIAL PRECEDENT | DEMAND & RECOVERY | RAJASTHAN HIGH COURT

Unsigned GST Notices & Orders Are Non-Existent in Law

M/s. Mayur Timber v. State of Rajasthan — Rajasthan High Court

Facts

The petitioner challenged a Section 74 order (FORM GST DRC-07, dated 15.10.2024). The preceding DRC-01 and SCN were allegedly **unsigned**. The order was uploaded only under "Additional Notices and Orders" — not the main portal section — and no personal hearing was afforded.

Held

The **Rajasthan High Court** ruled that **Rule 26(3)** mandates authentication via digital signature certificate, E-signature, or notified mode. A system-generated reference number tracks a document but **cannot substitute authentication**.

An unsigned notice is **non-existent in law**, and the defect goes to the root of authority. The SCN, adjudication order, and recovery proceedings were set aside. Uploading under "Additional Notices" without proper service also violated the right to hearing.

Key Takeaway: Authentication via digital signature is a jurisdictional prerequisite — not a mere formality. Unsigned GST documents are legally void and unenforceable.

CGA LEGAL

JUDICIAL PRECEDENT | DEMAND & RECOVERY | MADRAS HIGH COURT

Parallel CGST & SGST Proceedings on Same Issues Are Not Permissible

Tvl. Prince Traders v. The State Tax Officer — Madras High Court

Facts

The petitioner challenged an assessment order (20.04.2026) and rectification order (21.05.2026) by State GST authorities, contending these were **duplicate proceedings** — the same issues and period were already subject to a Central GST order, under appeal before the appellate authority.

Held

The **Madras High Court** found both sets of orders concerned the **same issues and assessment period**. Since Central GST authorities had issued the earlier order and the appeal was pending, the subsequent State GST proceedings could not be sustained.

Double Jeopardy Principle

Parallel proceedings on identical issues violate principles of fairness and finality under the GST framework.

Pendency as a Shield

A pending appeal before the appellate authority bars coordinate authorities from initiating duplicate proceedings.

Practical Relief

Taxpayers facing parallel CGST/SGST proceedings on the same issues should cite this ruling to seek quashing of duplicate orders.

CGA LEGAL

JUDICIAL PRECEDENT | DEMAND & RECOVERY | GUJARAT HIGH COURT

AI-generated legal material requires independent verification

Faiz Enterprise Through Proprietor Mahetar Mahir Farukbhai Versus State Tax Officer -Gujarat High Court

Facts

Advocate Mr. Vora argued that the State Tax Officer's order relied on fabricated, AI-generated case laws:

- State of Gujarat v. Aarbee Structures does not exist.
- M/s. Sri Vinayaga Agencies and Jyoti Tar Products have incorrect citations, and their legal rulings (ratios) do not apply to the present case.

Held

The officer tendered an unconditional apology for relying on AI while drafting the order and citing non-existent and irrelevant judgments. The Court directed that the departmental instructions requiring independent verification of AI-derived legal material, human oversight, and the issuing authority's own application of mind shall be scrupulously followed. Violation of the instructions was directed to be treated as contempt of court.

Key Takeaway: The judgment highlights the severe risks of blindly relying on Artificial Intelligence for legal research. A State Tax Officer passed a tax order based exclusively on AI-generated case laws that turned out to be either completely non-existent (fabricated) or irrelevant due to mismatched citations and inapplicable legal ratios.

Get in Touch

For GST advisory, legal consultation, or to follow our latest insights on Indian tax law — connect with **CA. Chitresh Gupta** and **Team CGA Legal**.

CA. Chitresh Gupta

Chartered Accountant

Email

Chitresh.gupta@cgalegal.co.in

LinkedIn

linkedin.com/in/ca-chitresh-gupta-22795920

X (Twitter)

@CAChitreshGupta

Disclaimer: The views expressed are personal and for informational purposes only. These materials do not constitute legal advice on any particular facts or circumstances. No liability is accepted for actions taken or not taken based on this content.