

Date: March 20, 2026

To
The General Manager
Capital Market (Listing)
National Stock Exchange of India Ltd
Exchange Plaza, Bandra-Kurla Complex,
Bandra (East), Mumbai-400051.

SYMBOL: TOTAL

Subject: Intimation under Regulation 30 of SEBI (LODR) Regulations, 2015 – Receipt of Order from GST Authorities:

Dear Sir/Madam,

Pursuant to Regulation 30 read with Schedule III, Para B, sub-para 8 of the SEBI (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2015 and in accordance with the Industry Standards Note on Regulation 30 issued by the Industry Standards Forum, we wish to inform that the Company has received an Order-in-Original dated December 31, 2025 from the Assistant Commissioner, Central Goods & Services Tax & Central Excise, Division- VIII, Mumbai East Commissionerate under the CGST Act, 2017 and MGST Act, 2017 read with IGST Act, 2017.

The said order pertains to alleged non-compliance under the GST laws for the relevant period April 2018 to March 2019 and has resulted in a demand aggregating to ₹63,85,350, comprising tax amount of ₹31,92,675 and penalty amount of ₹31,92,675. The Company is currently evaluating the legal remedies available, including filing an appeal before the appropriate appellate authority within the prescribed timelines. The Company will keep the stakeholders informed on any further developments and actions taken in this regard.

Further, pursuant to Regulation 30(6), the disclosure of the aforesaid order could not be made immediately upon receipt, as the Company was in the process of evaluating and understanding its implications. This included assessing the Probable, Possible or Remote (PPR) criteria under Ind AS 37 and undertaking a preliminary assessment of materiality in line with Regulation 30 read with the applicable Industry Standards. Upon completion of this assessment, the Company is making the present disclosure in compliance with the applicable regulatory requirements. The delay, if there was any, was neither intentional nor deliberate, but occurred due to the time required for the aforesaid evaluation. Upon completion of this assessment, the Company is making the present disclosure in compliance with the applicable regulatory requirements.

The Company shall keep the Stock Exchange(s) informed of any material developments in this matter, as and when required, in accordance with the SEBI (LODR) Regulations, 2015.

The details as required with respect to said order under SEBI Listing Regulations read with SEBI Master Circular No. HO/49/14/14(7)2025-CFD-POD2/1/3762/2026 dated January 30, 2026, are enclosed as **Annexure I**.

For and on behalf of,
Total Transport Systems Limited

Bhavik Trivedi
Company Secretary & Compliance Officer
Membership No. A49807
Place: Mumbai
TOTAL TRANSPORT SYSTEMS LIMITED



Annexure I

Disclosure as per Regulation 30 of the Securities and Exchange Board of India (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2015, along with SEBI Master Circular No. HO/49/14/14(7)2025-CFD-POD2/1/3762/2026 dated January 30, 2026:

Sr. No.	Particular	Details								
1.	Brief details of litigation viz. name(s) of the opposing party, court/ tribunal/agency where litigation is filed, brief details of dispute/litigation;	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Details:</td> <td>Order pertaining to wrongful claim of Input Tax Credit.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Name of parties:</td> <td>Total Transport Systems Limited vs. Assistant Commissioner of Central Goods & Services Tax & Central Excise Division, Mumbai</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Court/ tribunal/agency where litigation is filed:</td> <td>Assistant Commissioner, Central Goods & Services Tax & Central Excise Division, Mumbai</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Details of the dispute/ litigation:</td> <td> <p>The order focuses on two primary violations:</p> <p>1. Ineligible ITC from Non-Compliant Suppliers: The Company claimed ITC on invoices from suppliers whose GST registrations were either cancelled Suo-moto before the invoice date or who failed to file their GSTR-3B returns. This violates Section 16(2), which requires that the tax charged must actually be paid to the Government for the recipient to be eligible for credit.</p> <p>2. Excess ITC Claims (GSTR-3B vs. GSTR-2A): The Company claimed significantly more ITC in their monthly GSTR-3B returns than what was reflected in GSTR-2A (the statement auto-populated by suppliers' GSTR-1 filings).</p> </td> </tr> </table>	Details:	Order pertaining to wrongful claim of Input Tax Credit.	Name of parties:	Total Transport Systems Limited vs. Assistant Commissioner of Central Goods & Services Tax & Central Excise Division, Mumbai	Court/ tribunal/agency where litigation is filed:	Assistant Commissioner, Central Goods & Services Tax & Central Excise Division, Mumbai	Details of the dispute/ litigation:	<p>The order focuses on two primary violations:</p> <p>1. Ineligible ITC from Non-Compliant Suppliers: The Company claimed ITC on invoices from suppliers whose GST registrations were either cancelled Suo-moto before the invoice date or who failed to file their GSTR-3B returns. This violates Section 16(2), which requires that the tax charged must actually be paid to the Government for the recipient to be eligible for credit.</p> <p>2. Excess ITC Claims (GSTR-3B vs. GSTR-2A): The Company claimed significantly more ITC in their monthly GSTR-3B returns than what was reflected in GSTR-2A (the statement auto-populated by suppliers' GSTR-1 filings).</p>
Details:	Order pertaining to wrongful claim of Input Tax Credit.									
Name of parties:	Total Transport Systems Limited vs. Assistant Commissioner of Central Goods & Services Tax & Central Excise Division, Mumbai									
Court/ tribunal/agency where litigation is filed:	Assistant Commissioner, Central Goods & Services Tax & Central Excise Division, Mumbai									
Details of the dispute/ litigation:	<p>The order focuses on two primary violations:</p> <p>1. Ineligible ITC from Non-Compliant Suppliers: The Company claimed ITC on invoices from suppliers whose GST registrations were either cancelled Suo-moto before the invoice date or who failed to file their GSTR-3B returns. This violates Section 16(2), which requires that the tax charged must actually be paid to the Government for the recipient to be eligible for credit.</p> <p>2. Excess ITC Claims (GSTR-3B vs. GSTR-2A): The Company claimed significantly more ITC in their monthly GSTR-3B returns than what was reflected in GSTR-2A (the statement auto-populated by suppliers' GSTR-1 filings).</p>									
2.	Expected financial implications, if any, due to compensation, penalty etc.;	The Company is in the process of filing an appeal before the appropriate appellate authority. We are of the view that the demand is not sustainable and would have no material impact on financials, operations or other activities of the Company.								
3.	Quantum of claims, if any;	Demand aggregating to ₹63,85,350, comprising tax of ₹31,92,675 and penalty of ₹31,92,675.								

TOTAL TRANSPORT SYSTEMS LIMITED

