

A STUDY ON GROWTH OF GOODS AND SERVICES TAX (GST) IN INDIA- AN GOLDEN OPPORTUNITY FOR GROWTH OF INDIAN CORPORATE SECTORS

Dr. P. Govindan*

Abstract

The concept of Goods and Service Tax (GST) is one of the biggest revolutions in decades around the world. The main objective of this research is to investigate that the revenue collection of Goods and Service Tax (GST) month wise and its growth. It also examines that total number of 3 (b) and GSTR 1 return filed in Goods and Service Tax (GST) month, quarter wise and its growth rates as on 30th April, 2019 in India. This study used secondary data. This study used descriptive statistical tools used such as tables, charts, percentage analysis for analysis and interpretation of data. Inferential statistical tools used such as correlation, paired t test to test various hypotheses of the study. The study period covered since its implementation to as on 30th April, 2019. This results of study indicated that total number of 1,31,88,052 GST tax payer and totally 20,31,884 (Rs in Thousand Crore) collected India as on 30th April, 2019. Out of twenty months positive growth having in eleven month and negative growth having nine months compared with previous month collections. This study finally suggested that government of India, ministry of finance, ministry of commerce and various State/UT governments to take necessary reforms in GST registrations, filing of GST return, payment of tax, refund, interest, penalty and various types GST exemptions different type of tax payers. It is finally concluded that the introduction of GST in India has replaced all indirect taxes in one tax and common market for entire nation it will bring positive energy for entrepreneurs for starting new business ventures in India.

Key Words: GST, Tax, Finance, Tax Payers, Indirect Tax

*Assistant Professor in Commerce, Department of Commerce, K.S.Rangasamy College of Arts and Science (Autonomous), Tiruchengode. pgovind.cwa@gmail.com, pgovind.cma@gmail.com

Introduction

Taxation in India is entrenched from the period of Manu Smriti and Arthashastra. Present Indian tax system is based on this ancient tax system which was based on the theory of maximum social welfare. It is an obligatory liability for every citizen of the country. These policies play an important role on the economy. Traditionally India's tax regime relied heavily on indirect taxes. Revenue from indirect taxes was the major source of tax revenue till tax reforms were undertaken during nineties. India has seen a number of tax reforms in the past two decades. The concept of Goods and Service Tax (GST) is one of the biggest revolutions in decades around the world. Value added tax was first introduced by Maurice Laure, a French economist, in 1954. GST was originated in France in 1954 and spread of Value Added Tax (VAT) or Goods and Services Tax (GST) system of Indirect taxes across the globe is showing an increasing trend with more than 160 countries. It is the most logical steps towards the comprehensive indirect tax reform in our country since independence &. It is a major reform in tax structure.

It is an indirect tax which will subsume almost all the indirect taxes of central government and states governments into a unified tax. To remove cascading effect of taxes and provide a common nation-wide market for goods and services, India is moving towards introduction of Goods and Services Tax (GST). GST will merge all Indirect Taxes under an umbrella single tax. GST is expected to create a common market across the country and accelerate economic growth. The expected benefits of GST include widening of the tax base of both Centre and states and significant improvement in the ease of doing business. GST is also beneficial for consumers as there would be only one tax from the manufacturers and service providers to the consumer leading to transparency and efficiency. It will prevent leakages from the system and provide relief in terms of reduced tax burden on most of the commodities, brings a new wave of economic reform in the country and help in improving tax governance in India.

Total number of companies registered and its status in India as on 31.03.2019

Table 1 exhibited that the total number of companies registered and its status in India as on 31.03.2019. Totally 18,73,044 companies were registered. Out of these 6,70,018 companies were closed. In this closed companies 10,640 were liquidated or dissolved, 6,21,966 companies were defunct or struck off as per section 248 of

companies Act 2013, 22,532 companies were amalgamated or merged, 10,086 companies were converted to LLPs, 4,794 companies were converted to LLPs and dissolved, 1,615 companies were lying dormant u/s 455 of the Companies Act 2013, 6,327 were in liquidation, 38,610 companies which process of section 248 of Companies Act 2013, 100 companies were lying AIPG (Active in Progress) and remaining 11,56,374 companies were in active. Out of active companies 11,49,167 were limited by shares, 6,890 companies were limited by guarantee and 317 companies were in unlimited companies as on 31.03.2019 in India

I	Total Number of Companies Registered as on 31.03.2019	18,73,044
2	Total Number of companies closed	6,70,018
I	Total Number of companies liquidated/Dissolved	10,640
II		6,21,966
III	Total Number of companies merged/amalgamated	22,532
IV	Total Number of companies converted to LLPs	10,086
V	Total Number of companies converted to LLPs and dissolved	4,794
2	Total Number of companies lying dormant u/s 455 of CA 2013	1,615
3	Total Number of companies under liquidation	6,327
4	Total Number of companies which are process of section 248 of CA 2013	38,610
5	Total Number of companies lying AIPG (Active in Progress)	100
Total Number of active companies		11,56,374
Of which		
Total Number of companies limited by shares		11,49,167
Total Number of companies by guarantees		6,890
Total Number of companies unlimited companies		317
Source: http://www.mca.gov.in/Ministry/pdf/MIB_Mar_2019.pdf		

State/UT wise Total Number Companies Registered and Active Companies in India Up To 31.03.2019

Table 2 clearly shows that State/UT wise Total Number Companies Registered and Active Companies in India Up To 31.03.2019. In the registered and active companies state of Maharashtra secured first rank in registered 3,70,986 and 2,23,259 active, second rank secured by Delhi 3,33,733 registered and 2,04,143 active. Third rank secured by West Bengal 2,01,792 registered and 1,29,514 active companies. Remaining registered and active companies were in the rest of the States/UTs of India.

SNO	State\UT	Registered Companies	Closed Companies	Dormant US 455 of CA 2013	Under Liquidation companies	Under stuck off companies	AIPG	Active companies
1	Maharashtra	3,70,986	1,41,794	237	1,829	3,831	36	2,23,259
2	Delhi	3,33,733	1,23,482	290	825	4,987	6	2,04,143
3	West Bengal	2,01,792	66,524	222	725	4,805	2	1,29,514
4	Tamil Nadu	1,42,765	62,975	128	364	2,850	15	76,433
5	Uttar Pradesh	1,04,966	28,328	66	214	1,165	5	75188
6	Telangana	1,05,072	38,699	44	243	3,931	12	62,123
7	Karnataka	1,15,926	39,340	92	540	776	4	75,084
8	Gujarat	1,00,191	34,302	36	618	3,783	5	61,447
9	Rajasthan	57,661	18,760	24	91	2,198	1	36,587
10	Kerala	51,809	18,056	126	295	890	2	32,440
11	Haryana	44,987	11,536	72	51	766	-	32,472
12	Andhra Pradesh	30,530	9,863	20	52	1,260	4	19,331
13	Bihar	32,176	6,978	25	41	3,211	3	22,098
14	Madhya Pradesh	38,590	15,104	23	91	218	-	23,154
15	Punjab	30,917	14,308	15	122	241	-	16,231
16	Orissa	25,142	9,540	151	61	33	-	15,357
17	Jharkhand	13,801	3,163	2	12	792	1	9831
18	Chandigarh	14,522	7,218	9	58	142	-	7,095
19	Chhattisgarh	9,922	2,719	14	2	80	1	7,106
20	Assam	11,218	3,330	-	16	1,111	-	6,761
21	Uttarakhand	7,583	2,116	3	15	324	-	5,395
22	Goa	8,580	3,563	8	12	656	-	4,341
23	Himachal Pradesh	6,192	2,549	4	20	172	-	3,447
24	Jammu & Kashmir	5,546	2,412	-	17	83	-	3,034
25	Pondicherry	3,179	1,782	1	6	13	-	1,377
26	Meghalaya	1,024	394	2	1	57	-	570
27	Manipur	820	179	-	-	33	1	607
28	Dadra & Haveli	530	124	-	-	12	-	394
29	Tripura	542	124	-	-	33	-	385
30	A & N Islands	443	104	-	-	4	2	333
31	Arunachal Pradesh	591	277	1	2	56	-	255
32	Daman and Diu	384	95	-	3	36	-	250
33	Nagaland	571	303	-	1	32	-	235
34	Mizoram	153	62	-	-	7	-	84
35	Lakshadweep	18	5	-	-	2	-	11
36	Sikkim	2	-	-	-	-	-	2
	Total	18,73,044	6,70,018	1,615	6,327	38,610	100	11,56,374

Source: http://www.mca.gov.in/Ministry/pdf/MIB_Mar_2019.pdf

Economic Activity wise Total Number of active companies Up to 31.12.2018

Table 3 revealed that the economic activity wise total number of active private, public and total companies and its authorized capital (Rs in Crore). Economic activity wise total number of active private companies were in 10,90,127 with authorized capital of Rs. 22,37,639.27 (Rs in Crore), total number of active public companies were in 66,247 with authorized capital of Rs. 44,23,399.01 (Rs in Crore) and total number of active total companies were in 11,56,374 with authorized capital of Rs. 66,61,038.28 (Rs in Crore) as on 31.12.2018 in India.

Table 3 Economic Activity wise Total Number of active companies Up to 31.03.2019							
S no	Economic activity	Active Number of companies			Authorized capital (Rs in crore)		
		Private	public	Total	Private	public	Total
I	Agriculture	31,441	2,357	33,798	23,716.59	34,271.81	57,988.40
II	Industry	3,27,230	25,051	3,52,281	10,56,043.72	25,74,322.23	36,30,365.95
1	Manufacturing	2,09,012	18,248	2,27,260	5,95,999.22	9,90,730.61	15,86,729.83
i	Metals	72,085	7,885	79,970	2,25,065.22	3,82,115.17	6,07,180.36
ii	Machinery	49,426	3,438	52,864	2,35,872.84	4,78,106.48	7,13,979.32
iii	Textiles	28,744	2,748	31,492	38,749.51	56,087.87	94,837.38
iv	Food stuffs	29,237	2,453	31,160	57,856	41,712.81	99,568.81
V	Paper	13,308	855	14,163	15,228.55	15,887.01	31,155.55
Vi	Others	11,508	499	11,557	16,130.10	13,407.76	29,537.86
Vii	Leather	2,175	191	2,906	3577.45	2,026.07	5,603.52
Viii	Wood products	2,439	179	2,168	3519.58	1,387.45	4907.02
2	Construction	95,909	4,349	1,00,258	2,29,180.79	3,00,743.30	5,29,924.08
3	Electricity	11,813	1,729	13,542	1,87,017.52	12,20,797.11	14,07,814.63
4	Mining	10,496	725	11,221	43,846.20	62,051.21	1,05,897.41
III	Services	7,19,550	36,438	7,55,988	11,10,250.46	16,88,497	27,98,747.46
1	Business ser	3,67,858	10,347	3,78,205	4,32,873.20	649,609.76	10,82,482.96
2	Trading	1,42,400	6,046	1,48,446	2,38,754.37	1,06,241.11	3,44,995.49
3	Real estate	66,776	2,980	69,756	93,415.98	40,190.03	1,33,606.01
4	Community	71,701	3,949	75,650	95,309.70	1,43,453.11	2,38,762.81
5	Finance	36,773	11,507	48,280	1,92,835.93	4,25,733.38	6,18,569.31
6	Transport	33,284	1,460	34,744	56,244.32	2,71,199.01	3,27,443.33
7	Insurance	758	149	907	816.97	52,070.60	52,887.57
IV	others	11,906	2,401	14,307	47,628.50	1,26,307.97	1,73,936.48
Total		10,90,127	66,247	11,56,374	22,37,639.27	44,23,399.01	66,61,038.28

Source: http://www.mca.gov.in/Ministry/pdf/MB_Mar_2019.pdf.

After implementing Goods and Service Tax (GST) Number of companies registered in India during the months 01.07.2017 to 31.03.2019

Table 4 revealed that the month wise total number of active private, public and total companies after implementing Goods and Service Tax (GST) Number of companies registered in India during the months 01.07.2017 to 31.03.2019.

Month	Public	Private	Total
July 2017	153	9,223	9,386
August 2017	161	9,252	9,252
September 2017	151	8,698	8,698
October 2017	146	7,410	7,556
November 2017	130	7,755	7,885
December 2017	176	8,371	8,547
January 2018	174	8,478	8,652
February 2018	153	7,585	8,011
March 2018	244	11,795	12,039
April 2018	187	10,364	10,551
May 2018	250	10,517	10,767
June 2018	204	8,838	9,042
July 2018	152	7,593	7,745
August 2018	149	7,591	7,740
September 2018	276	13,120	13,396
October 2018	286	11,339	11,625
November 2018	191	8,554	8,745
December 2018	211	9,273	9,484
January 2019	304	12,160	12,464
February 2019	331	11,445	11,776
March 2019	270	10,300	10,570

Source: http://www.mca.gov.in/Ministry/pdf/MIB_Mar_2019.pdf.

Importance and significance of the study

The historic GST or goods and services tax has become a reality of the new tax system was launched at a function in Central Hall of Parliament on 1st July, 2017. It is a single indirect tax for the whole nation, one which will make India a unified common market. It is the survival of the India's economy in the face of increasing international competition consequent to globalization and liberalization and GST have a positive impact on

various sectors and industry for tax reform would be to address the problems of the current system. The impact of GST on inflation depends also on the change in tax rates due to the introduction of the new tax regime. The goods and services tax law in India is a comprehensive, multi-stage, destination-based tax that is levied on every value addition. It is levied by both the national and the state governments.

Indian taxing system is undergoing revolutionary change today. Tax is one of the most important sources of revenue to the Government and at the same time one of the deciding parameter for economic growth. The fundamental aim of GST is to make uniform the scattered indirect tax system in India and avoid the cascading effect in taxation. The impact going to make by GST will be a transformation in the entire tax system by simplify the indirect tax regime in India. It is an instrument in the indirect tax system of the country. GST is a destination based consumption tax and would be applicable on the supply of goods or services as against the earlier concept of tax on the manufacture or sale of goods or provision of services. This means that tax would accrue to the State or the Union Territory where the consumption takes place. In this surrounding this present is essential to indentify the total revenue collection of Goods and Service Tax (GST) month wise, quarter wise and total number of various types of total registered tax payers as on 30.04.2019.

Review of literature

Sachin Abda(2017), studied that the objective of the study is to understand the concept, benefits and features of GST. This study found that comparing challenges with its advantages, it is clearly visible that its advantages are more compared to challenges.

Mohapatrar et al., (2018), concluded that there is still a lack of awareness about the new tax reform and also a deficiency of understanding and knowledge which can be attributed to various reasons like lack of government initiatives towards digitization, awareness campaigns, lack of internet connectivity, and glitches in GSTIN.

Mohamad et al., (2016), findings indicated that the level of awareness of the GST is still not reached a satisfactory level. It also showed that the level of awareness was moderate and the majority of respondents give a high negative perception to the impact of GST.

Pallavi Chaturvedi et al.,(2017).GST will give a major boost to the 'Make in India' initiative of the Government of India by making goods and services produced in India competitive in the National as well as International market.

Azharuddin Mohammad Mussaiyib (2016), concluded that GST will surely bring the economic well being for the country. It will strengthen the tax system of India and will impact various industries in a positive manner.

Chandu Ravi Kumar (2015), found that significantly help in removing economic biases caused by present complex tax structure and will help in progress of a common national market.

Dash (2017), Results Indicated that the Impact the GST we need to wait for the time and the Government needs to communicate more and more about the systems. It could be a good way to reduce the black money and good effort by the Government of India after the Demonetization. In these surroundings the present investigation differs from the early researches in different approaches and contributed the existing literature.

Research Methodology used

The research study is based on the secondary data collected from various national and international articles, journals, working papers and various government ministries of India and non government websites. This study used to descriptive statistical tools used such as tables, charts, percentage analysis for analysis and interpretation of data. Inferential statistical tools used such as correlation, paired t test to test various hypotheses of the study.

The study period covered since its implementation to as on 30th April, 2019.

Objectives of the study

The following are the objectives of the present study.

1. To examine total number companies registered in India as on 31.03.2019.
2. To study on total revenue collection of Goods and Service Tax (GST) month wise and its growth rates as on 30th April, 2019.
3. To examine the total number of 3 (b) and GSTR 1 returns filed in Goods and Service

Tax (GST) month wise and its growth rates as on 30th April, 2019.

4. To investigate the total number of 3 (b), GSTR 1 and GSTR 4 returns filed in Good and Service Tax (GST) month, quarter wise and its growth rates as on 30th April, 2019.

**Descriptive statistical tools Results -Analysis and interpretation of data
 Registration of Goods and Service Tax (GST) As on 30th April, 2019**

S. No.	Details	As on 30th April, 2019
1	No. of transited (migrated) taxpayers	66,25,077
2	Total No. of new applications received for registration	76,98,644
3	No. of applications approved	65,62,975
4	No. of applications rejected	10,91,708
5	No. of taxpayers who have opted for composition scheme	17,74,379
6	Total No. of taxpayers; new + migrated (1 + 3)	1,31,88,052

Source: GST- Concept & Status (01.05.2019)-CBIC, www.cbic.gov.in

Table 5 show that the total number of 1,31,88,052 GST tax payer in India as on. Out of them transited or migrated tax payer are 66, 25,077. Total number of new applications for registration are 76,98,644 out of this 65,62,975 applications were accepted remaining applications 10,91,708 were rejected. 17, 74,379 GST tax payer opted composition scheme as on 30th April, 2019.

Total Revenue Collection of Goods and Service Tax (GST) As on 30th April, 2019

S. No.	Revenue Collected in the Month of	Amount (in Rs. Thousand crore)	% Total GST As on 30th April, 2019	% (+/-) compared with previous month
1	July, 2017	21,572	1.19	-
2	August, 2017	95,633	5.28	343.32
3	September, 2017	94,064	5.19	-1.64
4	October, 2017	93,333	5.15	-0.78
5	November, 2017	83,780	4.63	-10.24
6	December, 2017	84,314	4.65	0.64
7	January, 2018	89,825	4.96	6.54
8	February, 2018	85,962	4.75	-4.30
9	March, 2018	92,167	5.09	7.22
10	April, 2018	1,03,458	5.71	12.25

11	May, 2018	94,016	5.19	-9.13
12	June, 2018	95,610	5.28	1.70
13	July, 2018	96,483	5.33	0.91
14	August, 2018	93,960	5.19	-2.61
15	September, 2018	94,442	5.21	0.51
16	October, 2018	1,00,710	5.56	6.64
17	November, 2018	97,637	5.39	-3.05
18	December, 2018	94,726	5.23	-2.98
19	January, 2019	1,02,503	5.66	8.21
20	February, 2019	97,247	5.37	-5.13
21	March, 2019	1,06,577	5.25	9.59
22	April, 2019	1,13,865	5.60	6.84
Total		20,31,884	100	
Source: GST- Concept & Status (01.05.2019)-CBIC, www.cbic.gov.in				

Table 6 that the total amount of revenue collection of Goods and Services Tax (GST) month wise (Rs in Thousand Crore) from its implementation to as on 30.04.2019 in India. Totally 20,31,884 (Rs in Thousand Crore) collected during the period. Out of this fourteen months are having collection of more than five percentage of total GST collection in India. Out of twenty two months positive growth having in thirteen month and negative growth having nine months compared with previous month collections.

Total Number of 3 (B) and GSTR 1 Returns Filed in Goods and Service Tax as on 31st March, 2019

Table 7 shows that total numbers of 3(B) and GSTR-1 returns were filed in GST as on 31.03.2019 in India. Starting from July 2017 to March 2019 totally twenty one months results shows that total numbers of 3(B) returns were filed in GST tax payer has increasing trend in fifteen months decreasing trend only in four months compare with previous month tax payers. Total numbers of GSTR-1 returns were filed in GST tax payer has positive growth in ten months negative growth only in nine months compare with previous month tax payers.

Table 7 Total Number of 3 (B) and GSTR 1 Returns filed in GST as on 31.03.2019

S. No.	Month and Year	Total Returns Filed as on 31.03.2019			
		3 (B) Returns	compared with previous month	GSTR 1 returns	compared with previous month
		Numbers	% (+/-)	Numbers	% (+/-)
1	July, 2017	65,83,994	-	60,74,768	-
2	August, 2017	71,71,991	8.93	25,45,112	-58.10
3	September,2017	75,20,180	4.85	68,79,719	170.31
4	October, 2017	72,78,859	-3.21	26,26,933	-61.82
5	November, 2017	73,71,650	1.27	26,67,225	1.53
6	December, 2017	74,58,618	1.18	69,88,089	162.00
7	January, 2018	75,76,046	1.57	26,74,723	-61.72
8	February, 2018	77,00,842	1.65	26,83,169	0.32
9	March, 2018	78,10,442	1.42	71,75,188	167.41
10	April, 2018	78,78,410	0.87	28,28,034	-60.59
11	May, 2018	80,21,065	1.81	28,55,077	0.96
12	June, 2018	81,22,257	1.26	73,92,526	158.93
13	July, 2018	82,10,463	1.09	28,81,064	-61.03
14	August, 2018	82,96,925	1.05	28,77,308	-0.13
15	September, 2018	83,59,627	0.76	74,81,145	160.01
16	October, 2018	83,79,707	0.24	28,51,678	-61.88
17	November, 2018	82,49,927	-1.55	28,14,722	-1.30
18	December, 2018	82,58,464	0.10	72,25,851	156.72
19	January,2019	81,83,612	-0.91	26,87,331	-62.81
20	February, 2019	80,51,242	-1.62	25,37,573	-5.57
21	March, 2019	72,13,483	-10.41	49,35,407	94.49

Source: [GST- Concept & Status \(01.05.2019\)-CBIC, www.cbic.gov.in](http://GST-Concept&Status(01.05.2019)-CBIC, www.cbic.gov.in)

Total Number of GSTR 4 returnsfiled in Goods and Service Tax (GST) as on 30th April, 2019

Table 8 Total Number of GSTR 4 returnsfiled Quarterly in Goods and Service Tax (GST) As on 31th March, 2019

S. No.	Quarter & Year	GSTR 4 returnsfiledas on 30 th April, 2019			
		Goods and Service Tax (GST)		Revenue Collection	
		Number GSTR 4	% (+/-) compared with Previous Quarter	Amount (in Rs. Thousand crore)	% (+/-) compared with Previous Quarter
1	July-Sep, 2017	10,08,134	-	94064	-
2	October-Dec 2017	15,19,062	50.68	261427	177.92
3	Jan-March, 2018	15,77,910	3.87	267954	2.50
4	April-June, 2018	15,51,534	-1.67	293084	9.38
5	July-Sep, 2018	15,09,654	-2.70	284885	-2.80
6	October-Dec 2018	14,43,553	-4.38	293073	2.87
7	Jan-March, 2019	12,52,548	-13.23	306327	4.52

Source: [GST- Concept & Status \(01.05.2019\)-CBIC, www.cbic.gov.in](http://GST-Concept&Status(01.05.2019)-CBIC, www.cbic.gov.in)

Table 8 shows that total number of GSTR-4 returns filed quarterly. It shows that July 2017 to September 2017 quarter 10,08,134 were filed and followed by next quarter 15,19,062 were filed. Its shows positive growth (50.68%) comparing with last quarter. During the 2018 the firstquarter 15,77,910 were field and shows positive growth (3.87%) comparing with last quarter. Second quarter 15,51,534 were field and shows negative growth (-1.67%) comparing with last quarter. Third quarter 15,09,654 were field and shows negative growth (-2.70%) comparing with last quarter. Last quarter 14,43,553 were field and shows negative growth (-4.38%) comparing with last quarter. First Quarter of 2019 were filed 12,52,548 its shows negative growth of -13.23% comparing with last quarter. It also shows quarterly Goods and Service Tax (GST)Revenue CollectionAmount(in Rs. Thousand crore).

3. Inferential statistical tools Results - Paired Samples T-Test Statistics results

The table 9 indicated that results of paired samples t-test statistics. Totally nine hypotheses were tested and seven variables used in the study.

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	VAR1	91334.24	21	17002.32	3710.21
	VAR4	204.71	21	60.30	13.16
Pair 2	VAR1	91334.24	21	17002.32	3710.21
	VAR5	9507.67	21	1701.15	371.22
Pair 3	VAR1	91334.24	21	17002.32	3710.21
	VAR6	9711.00	21	1745.47	380.89
Pair 4	VAR2	7795133.52	21	488518.61	106603.50
	VAR5	9507.67	21	1701.15	371.22
Pair 5	VAR2	7795133.52	21	488518.61	106603.50
	VAR4	204.71	21	60.30	13.16
Pair 6	VAR2	7795133.52	21	488518.61	106603.50
	VAR6	9711.00	21	1745.47	380.89
Pair 7	VAR3	4270602.00	21	2074002.66	452584.48
	VAR5	9507.67	21	1701.15	371.22
Pair 8	VAR3	4270602.00	21	2074002.66	452584.48
	VAR6	9711.00	21	1745.47	380.89
Pair 9	VAR1	91334.24	21	17002.32	3710.21
	VAR2	7795133.52	21	488518.61	106603.50
Pair 10	VAR1	91334.24	21	17002.32	3710.21
	VAR3	4270602.00	21	2074002.66	452584.48
Pair 11	VAR2	7795133.52	21	488518.61	106603.50
	VAR3	4270602.00	21	2074002.66	452584.48
Pair 12	VAR7	1408913.57	7	207145.70	78293.71
	VAR8	257259.14	7	73599.48	27817.99

Paired Samples Correlations results

The table 10 shows that results of paired samples correlations. Totally nine hypotheses were tested and seven variables used in the study.

Table 10 Paired Samples Correlations				
		N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1	VAR1 & VAR4	21	0.367	0.101
Pair 2	VAR1 & VAR5	21	0.203	0.377
Pair 3	VAR1 & VAR6	21	0.205	0.373
Pair 4	VAR2 & VAR5	21	0.321	0.156
Pair 5	VAR2 & VAR4	21	0.449	0.041
Pair 6	VAR2 & VAR6	21	0.334	0.139
Pair 7	VAR3 & VAR5	21	0.221	0.337
Pair 8	VAR3 & VAR6	21	0.210	0.361
Pair 9	VAR1 & VAR2	21	0.611	0.003
Pair 10	VAR1 & VAR3	21	-0.230	0.316
Pair 11	VAR2 & VAR3	21	-0.055	0.812
Pair 12	VAR7 & VAR8	7	0.756	0.049

Hypotheses Testing- 1

(1) Null and Alternative Hypotheses

The following null and alternative hypotheses need to be tested:

H0: $\mu_1 = \mu_2$: There is no association between the Revenue collected in month wise (Rs in Thousands Crore) and Number of public companies registered in month wise 31.03.2109.

H0 $\mu_1 \neq \mu_2$: There is association between the Revenue collected in month wise (Rs in Thousands Crore) and Number of public companies registered in month wise 31.03.2109. This corresponds to a two-tailed test, for which a t-test for two paired samples be used.

(2) Rejection Region:

Based on the information provided, the significance level is $\alpha=0.05$, and the degrees of freedom are $df=20$. Hence, it is found that the critical value for this two-tailed test is $t_c=2.101$, for $\alpha=0.05$ and $df=20$. The rejection region for this two-tailed test is $R= \{t:|t| > 2.101\}$.

The 95% confidence interval is $83400.20 < \mu_D < 98858.84$.

(3) Test Statistics: The t-statistic is computed as shown in $t=24.59$

(4) Decision about the null hypothesis

Since it is observed that $|t|=24.59 > t_c=2.101$, it is then concluded that *the null hypothesis is rejected*. Using the P-value approach: The p-value is $p=0$ and since $p=0 < 0.05$, it is concluded that the null hypothesis is rejected.

(5) Conclusion

It is concluded that the null hypothesis H_0 is *rejected*. Therefore, there is enough evidence to claim that population mean μ_1 is different than μ_2 , at the 0.05 significance level.

Paired t Test Hypotheses Testing- 2

(1) Null and Alternative Hypotheses

The following null and alternative hypotheses need to be tested:

$H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2$: There is no association between the Revenue collected in month wise (Rs in Thousands Crore) and Number of private companies registered in month wise 31.03.2109.

$H_0 \mu_1 \neq \mu_2$: There is association between the Revenue collected in month wise (Rs in Thousands Crore) and Number of private companies registered in month wise 31.03.2109.

(2) Rejection Region

Based on the information provided, the significance level is $\alpha=0.05$, and the degrees of freedom are $df=20$. Hence, it is found that the critical value for this two-tailed test is $t_c=3.101$, for $\alpha=0.05$ and $df=20$. The rejection region for this two-tailed test is $R= \{t:|t| > 3.101\}$. The 95% confidence interval is $74206.60 < \mu_D < 89446.54$.

(3) Test Statistics: The t-statistic is computed as shown in $t= 22.40$

(4) Decision about the null hypothesis

Since it is observed that $|t| = 22.40 > t_{\alpha} = 3.101$, it is then concluded that *the null hypothesis is rejected*. Using the P-value approach: The p-value is $p = 0$, and since $p = 0 < 0.05$, it is concluded that *the null hypothesis is rejected*.

(5) Conclusion

It is concluded that the null hypothesis H_0 is *rejected*. Therefore, there is enough evidence to claim that population mean μ_1 is different than μ_2 , at the 0.05 significance level.

Hypotheses Testing- 3

(1) Null and Alternative Hypotheses

The following null and alternative hypotheses need to be tested:

$H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2$: There is no association between the Revenue collected in month wise (Rs in Thousands Crore) and Number of public companies registered in month wise 31.03.2109.

$H_0 \mu_1 \neq \mu_2$: There is association between the Revenue collected in month wise (Rs in Thousands Crore) and Number of public companies registered in month wise 31.03.2109.

This corresponds to a two-tailed test, for which a t-test for two paired samples be used.

(2) Rejection Region

Based on the information provided, the significance level is $\alpha = 0.05$, and the degrees of freedom are $df = 20$. Hence, it is found that the critical value for this two-tailed test is $t_{\alpha} = 2.81$, for $\alpha = 0.05$ and $df = 20$. The rejection region for this two-tailed test is $R = \{t: |t| > 2.81\}$. The 95% confidence interval is $-5018747.367 < \mu_D < -3038510.738$.

(3) Test Statistics: The t-statistic is computed as shown in $t = 22.36$.

(4) Decision about the null hypothesis

Since it is observed that $|t| = 22.36 > t_{\alpha} = 2.81$, it is then concluded that *the null hypothesis is rejected*. Using the P-value approach: The p-value is $p = 0$, and since $p = 0 < 0.05$, it is concluded that the null hypothesis is rejected.

(5) Conclusion

It is concluded that the null hypothesis H_0 is *rejected*. Therefore, there is enough evidence to claim that population mean μ_1 is different than μ_2 , at the 0.05 significance level.

Hypotheses Testing- 4

(1) Null and Alternative Hypotheses

The following null and alternative hypotheses need to be tested:

$H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2$: There is no association between the total number of 3(b) return filed in month wise and Number of private companies registered in month wise 31.03.2109.

$H_0 \mu_1 \neq \mu_2$: There is association between the total number of 3(b) in month wise (Rs in Thousands Crore) and Number of private companies registered in month wise 31.03.2109.

This corresponds to a two-tailed test, for which a t-test for two paired samples be used.

(2) Rejection Region

Based on the information provided, the significance level is $\alpha=0.05$, and the degrees of freedom are $df=20$. Hence, it is found that the critical value for this two-tailed test is $t_c=2.571$, for $\alpha=0.05$ and $df=20$. The rejection region for this two-tailed test is $R=\{t: |t| > 2.571\}$. The 95% confidence interval is $7563502.08 < \mu_D < 8007749.63$.

(3) Test Statistics: The t-statistic is computed as shown in $t=73.12$

(4) Decision about the null hypothesis

Since it is observed that $|t|=73.12 > t_c=2.571$, it is then concluded that *the null hypothesis is rejected*. Using the P-value approach: The p-value is $p=0$, and since $p=0 < 0.05$, it is concluded that the null hypothesis is rejected.

(5) Conclusion

It is concluded that the null hypothesis H_0 is *rejected*. Therefore, there is enough evidence to claim that population mean μ_1 is different than μ_2 , at the 0.05 significance level.

Hypotheses Testing- 5

(1) Null and Alternative Hypotheses

The following null and alternative hypotheses need to be tested:

$H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2$: There is no association between the total number of 3(b) return filed in month wise and Number of public companies registered in month wise 31.03.2109.

$H_0 \mu_1 \neq \mu_2$: There is association between the total number of 3(b) in month wise (Rs in Thousands Crore) and Number of public companies registered in month wise 31.03.2109.

This corresponds to a two-tailed test, for which a t-test for two paired samples be used.

(2) Rejection Region

Based on the information provided, the significance level is $\alpha=0.05$, and the degrees of freedom are $df=20$. Hence, it is found that the critical value for this two-tailed test is $t_c=2.571$, for $\alpha=0.05$ and $df=20$. The rejection region for this two-tailed test is $R=\{t: |t| > 2.571\}$. The 95% confidence interval is $7572570.13 < \mu_D < 8017287.49$.

(3) Test Statistics: The t-statistic is computed as shown in $t=73.13$

(4) Decision about the null hypothesis

Since it is observed that $|t|=73.13 > t_c=2.571$, it is then concluded that *the null hypothesis is rejected*. Using the P-value approach: The p-value is $p=0$, and since $p=0 < 0.05$, it is concluded that the null hypothesis is rejected.

(5) Conclusion

It is concluded that the null hypothesis H_0 is *rejected*. Therefore, there is enough evidence to claim that population mean μ_1 is different than μ_2 , at the 0.05 significance level.

Hypotheses Testing- 6

(1) Null and Alternative Hypotheses

The following null and alternative hypotheses need to be tested:

$H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2$: There is no association between the total number of 3(b) return filed in month wise and Number of total companies registered in month wise 31.03.2109.

$H_0 \mu_1 \neq \mu_2$: There is association between the total number of 3(b) in month wise (Rs in Thousands Crore) and Number of total companies registered in month wise 31.03.2109.

This corresponds to a two-tailed test, for which a t-test for two paired samples be used.

(2) Rejection Region

Based on the information provided, the significance level is $\alpha=0.05$, and the degrees of freedom are $df=20$. Hence, it is found that the critical value for this two-tailed test is $t_c=2.571$, for $\alpha=0.05$ and $df=20$. The rejection region for this two-tailed test is $R=\{t: |t| > 2.571\}$. The 95% confidence interval is $7563315.86 < \mu_D < 8007529.18$.

(3) Test Statistics

The t-statistic is computed as shown in $t=73.12$

(4) Decision about the null hypothesis

Since it is observed that $|t|=73.12 > t_c=2.571$, it is then concluded that *the null hypothesis*

is rejected. Using the P-value approach: The p-value is $p=0$, and since $p=0 < 0.05$, it is concluded that the null hypothesis is rejected.

(5) Conclusion

It is concluded that the null hypothesis **Ho is rejected**. Therefore, there is enough evidence to claim that population mean μ_1 is different than μ_2 , at the **0.05** significance level.

Hypotheses Testing- 7

(1) Null and Alternative Hypotheses

The following null and alternative hypotheses need to be tested:

$H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2$: There is no difference between total Number of GSTR-1 return filed in month wise and Number of private companies registered in month wise as on 31.03.2019.

$H_0 \mu_1 \neq \mu_2$: There is difference between total Number of GSTR-1 return filed in month wise and Number of private companies registered in month wise as on 31.03.2019.

This corresponds to a two-tailed test, for which a t-test for two paired samples be used.

(2) Rejection Region

Based on the information provided, the significance level is $\alpha=0.05$, and the degrees of freedom are $df=20$. Hence, it is found that the critical value for this two-tailed test is $t_{c} = 2.571$, for $\alpha=0.05$ and $df=20$. The rejection region for this two-tailed test is $R = \{t: |t| > 2.571\}$. The 95% confidence interval is $3316982.65 < \mu_D < 5204799.35$

(3) Test Statistics: The t-statistic is computed as shown in $t=9.42$.

(4) Decision about the null hypothesis

Since it is observed that $|t|=9.42 > t_{c} = 2.571$, it is then concluded that *the null hypothesis is rejected*. Using the P-value approach: The p-value is $p=0$, and since $p=0 < 0.05$, it is concluded that the null hypothesis is rejected.

(5) Conclusion

It is concluded that the null hypothesis **Ho is rejected**. Therefore, there is enough evidence to claim that population mean μ_1 is different than μ_2 , at the 0.05 significance level.

Hypotheses Testing-8

(1) Null and Alternative Hypotheses

The following null and alternative hypotheses need to be tested:

$H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2$: There is no difference between total Number of GSTR-1 return filed in month wise and Number of total companies registered in month wise as on 31.03.2019.

$H_0 \mu_1 \neq \mu_2$: There is difference between total Number of GSTR-1 return filed in month wise and Number of total companies registered in month wise as on 31.03.2019.

This corresponds to a two-tailed test, for which a t-test for two paired samples be used.

(2) Rejection Region

Based on the information provided, the significance level is $\alpha=0.05$, and the degrees of freedom are $df=20$. Hence, it is found that the critical value for this two-tailed test is $t_{c\alpha}=2.571$, for $\alpha=0.05$ and $df=20$. The rejection region for this two-tailed test is $R=\{t:|t|>2.571\}$. The 95% confidence interval is $-7921524.24 < \mu_D < -7486074.33$.

(3) Test Statistics: The t-statistic is computed as shown in $t = -73.81$.

(4) Decision about the null hypothesis

Since it is observed that $|t| = -73.81 > t_{c\alpha} = 2.571$, it is then concluded that *the null hypothesis is rejected*. Using the P-value approach: The p-value is $p=0$, and since $p=0 < 0.05$, it is concluded that the null hypothesis is rejected.

(5) Conclusion

It is concluded that the null hypothesis H_0 is *rejected*. Therefore, there is enough evidence to claim that population mean μ_1 is different than μ_2 , at the 0.05 significance level.

Hypotheses Testing-9

(1) Null and Alternative Hypotheses

The following null and alternative hypotheses need to be tested:

$H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2$: There is no difference between total revenue collected in month wise (Rs in Thousands Crore) and Number of GSTR-1 return filed in month wise as on 31.03.2019.

$H_0 \mu_1 \neq \mu_2$: There is difference between total revenue collected in month wise (Rs in Thousands Crore) and Number of GSTR-1 return filed in month wise as on 31.03.2019.

This corresponds to a two-tailed test, for which a t-test for two paired samples be used.

(2) Rejection Region

Based on the information provided, the significance level is $\alpha=0.05$, and the degrees of freedom are $df=20$. Hence, it is found that the critical value for this two-tailed test is $t_c=2.571$, for $\alpha=0.05$ and $df=20$. The rejection region for this two-tailed test is $R=\{t:|t|>2.571\}$. The 95% confidence interval is $-5125151.06<\mu D<-3233384$.

(3) Test Statistics: The t-statistic is computed as shown $t=-9.22$

(4) Decision about the null hypothesis

Since it is observed $|t|=-9.22>t_c=2.571$, it is then concluded that *the null hypothesis is rejected*. Using the P-value approach: The p-value is $p=0$, and since $p=0<0.05$, it is concluded that the null hypothesis is rejected.

(5) Conclusion

It is concluded that the null hypothesis H_0 is *rejected*. Therefore, there is enough evidence to claim that population mean μ_1 is different than μ_2 , at the 0.05 significance level.

Hypotheses Testing-10

(1) Null and Alternative Hypotheses

The following null and alternative hypotheses need to be tested:

$H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2$: There is no difference between total revenue collected in month wise (Rs in Thousands Crore) and Number of GSTR-1 return filed in month wise as on 31.03.2019.

$H_0 \mu_1 \neq \mu_2$: There is difference between total revenue collected in month wise (Rs in Thousands Crore) and Number of GSTR-1 return filed in month wise as on 31.03.2019.

This corresponds to a two-tailed test, for which a t-test for two paired samples be used.

(2) Rejection Region

Based on the information provided, the significance level is $\alpha=0.05$, and the degrees of freedom are $df=5$. Hence, it is found that the critical value for this two-tailed test is $t_c=2.571$, for $\alpha=0.05$ and $df=5$. The rejection region for this two-tailed test is $R=\{t:|t|>2.571\}$. The 95% confidence interval is $934632.964<\mu D<1314124.703$.

(3) Test Statistics: The t-statistic is computed as shown in $t=15.233$

(4) Decision about the null hypothesis

Since it is observed $|t|=15.233>t_c=2.571$, it is then concluded that *the null hypothesis is rejected*. Using the P-value approach: The p-value is $p=0$, and since $p=0<0.05$, it is concluded that the null hypothesis is rejected.

(5) Conclusion

It is concluded that the null hypothesis H_0 is *rejected*. Therefore, there is enough evidence to claim that population mean μ_1 is different than μ_2 , at the 0.05 significance level.

3.11 Hypotheses Testing-11

(1) Null and Alternative Hypotheses

The following null and alternative hypotheses need to be tested:

$H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2$: There is no difference between total Number of 3 B return filed in month wise and Number of GSTR-1 return filed in month wise as on 31.03.2019.

$H_0 \mu_1 \neq \mu_2$: There is no difference between total Number of 3 B return filed in month wise and Number of GSTR-1 return filed in month wise as on 31.03.2019.

This corresponds to a two-tailed test, for which a t-test for two paired samples be used.

(2) Rejection Region

Based on the information provided, the significance level is $\alpha=0.05$, and the degrees of freedom are $df=20$. Hence, it is found that the critical value for this two-tailed test is $t_{c\alpha}=2.571$, for $\alpha=0.05$ and $df=20$. The rejection region for this two-tailed test is $R=\{t:|t|>2.571\}$. The 95% confidence interval is $2542721.31<\mu D\alpha<4506341.74$.

(3) Test Statistics: The t-statistic is computed as shown in $t=7.49$

(4) Decision about the null hypothesis

Since it is observed $|t|=7.49>t_{c\alpha}=2.571$, it is then concluded that *the null hypothesis is rejected*. Using the P-value approach: The p-value is $p=0$, and since $p=0<0.05$, it is concluded that the null hypothesis is rejected.

(5) Conclusion

It is concluded that the null hypothesis H_0 is *rejected*. Therefore, there is enough evidence to claim that population mean μ_1 is different than μ_2 , at the 0.05 significance level.

Hypotheses Testing-12

(1) Null and Alternative Hypotheses

The following null and alternative hypotheses need to be tested:

$H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2$: There is no difference between total Number of GSTR-4 return filed in Quarter Wise and Revenue collected in month wise (Rs in Thousands Crore) in Quarter Wise as on 31.03.2019.

$H_0 \mu_1 \neq \mu_2$: There is difference between total Number of GSTR-4 return filed in Quarter Wise and Revenue collected in month wise (Rs in Thousands Crore) in Quarter Wise as on 31.03.2019.

This corresponds to a two-tailed test, for which a t-test for two paired samples be used.

(2) Rejection Region

Based on the information provided, the significance level is $\alpha=0.05$, and the degrees of freedom are $df=7$. Hence, it is found that the critical value for this two-tailed test is $t_c=2.571$, for $\alpha=0.05$ and $df=7$. The rejection region for this two-tailed test is $R=\{t:|t| > 2.571\}$. The 95% confidence interval is $1004600.59 < \mu D < 1298708.27$.

(3) Test Statistics: The t-statistic is computed as shown in $t=19.16$

(4) Decision about the null hypothesis

Since it is observed $|t|=19.16 > t_c=2.571$, it is then concluded that *the null hypothesis is rejected*. Using the P-value approach: The p-value is $p=0$, and since $p=0 < 0.05$, it is concluded that the null hypothesis is rejected.

(5) Conclusion

It is concluded that the null hypothesis H_0 is *rejected*. Therefore, there is enough evidence to claim that population mean μ_1 is different than μ_2 , at the 0.05 significance level.

		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Results of Hypotheses Testing
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference					
					Lower	Upper				
Pair 1	VAR1 - VAR4	91129.52	16980.26	3705.40	83400.20	98858.84	24.59	20	0.00	Association
Pair 2	VAR1 - VAR5	81826.57	16740.02	3652.97	74206.60	89446.54	22.40	20	0.00	Association
Pair 3	VAR1 - VAR6	81623.24	16731.84	3651.19	74006.99	89239.48	22.36	20	0.00	Association
Pair 4	VAR2 - VAR5	7785625.86	487975.49	106484.98	7563502.08	8007749.63	73.12	20	0.00	Association
Pair 5	VAR2 - VAR4	7794928.81	488491.54	106597.59	7572570.13	8017287.49	73.13	20	0.00	Association
Pair 6	VAR2 - VAR6	7785422.52	487937.88	106476.78	7563315.86	8007529.18	73.12	20	0.00	Association
Pair 7	VAR3 - VAR5	4261094.33	2073628.12	452502.75	3317190.13	5204998.54	9.42	20	0.00	Association
Pair 8	VAR3 - VAR6	4260891.00	2073637.24	452504.74	3316982.65	5204799.35	9.42	20	0.00	Association
Pair 9	VAR1 - VAR2	-7703799.29	478311.88	104376.21	-7921524.24	-7486074.33	-73.81	20	0.00	Association
Pair 10	VAR1 - VAR3	-4179267.76	2077975.91	453451.52	-5125151.06	-3233384.47	-9.22	20	0.00	Association
Pair 11	VAR2 - VAR3	3524531.52	2156902.43	470674.70	2542721.31	4506341.74	7.49	20	0.00	Association
Pair 12	VAR7 - VAR8	1151654.43	159003.64	60097.73	1004600.59	1298708.27	19.16	6	0.00	Association
Source: SPSS output										
VAR1 - Revenue collected in month wise(Rs in Thousands Crore) VAR2 - Number of 3 B return filed in month wise VAR3 - Number of GSTR-1 return filed in month wise VAR4 - Number of public companies registered in month wise						VAR5 - Number of private companies registered in month wise VAR6 - Number of total companies registered in month wise VAR7 - Number of GSTR-4 return filed in Quarter Wise VAR 8 - Revenue collected in month wise(Rs in Thousands Crore) in Quarter Wise				

Conclusion

This research study results shows that total number of 1,31,88,052 GST tax payer in India. Out of them transited or migrated tax payer are 66, 25,077. Total number of new

applications for registration are 76,98,644 out of this 65,62,975 applications were accepted. 10,91,708 applications were rejected. 17,74,379 GST tax payer opted composition scheme as on 30.04.2019. Totally 20,31,884 (Rs in Thousand Crore) collected during the period. Out of this fourteen months are having collection of more than five percentage of total GST collection in India. Out of twenty months positive growth having in eleven month and negative growth having nine months compared with previous month collections.

This study results also reveals that total numbers of 3(B) returns were filed in GST tax payer has increasing trend in fifteen months decreasing trend only in four months compare with previous month tax payers. Total numbers of GSTR-1 returns were filed in GST tax payer has positive growth in ten months negative growth only in nine months compare with previous month tax payers. This study finally suggested that government of India, ministry of finance, ministry of commerce and various State/UT governments to take necessary reforms in GST registrations, filing of GST return, payment of tax, refund, interest, penalty and various types GST exemptions different type of tax payers. It is finally concluded that the introduction of GST in India has replaced all indirect taxes in one tax and common market for entire nation it will bring positive energy for entrepreneurs for starting new business ventures in India.

References

- Barhate G.H(2017). Study of Awareness and Perception towards GST amongst Traders in Rural Areas, *International Research Journal of Engineering and Technology*, 1133-1142.
- Rajesh Chadha (2009). Moving to Goods and Services Tax in India: Impact on India's Growth and International Trade, Prepared for the Thirteenth Finance Commission, Government of India, NCAER, 1-78
- Rupa.R(2017). GST in India: an overview, *International Education & Research Journal*, 88-89.
- Saurabh Gupta, Sarita, Munindra kumar, Komal and Hemraj Kumawat(2017). Good and Service Tax: An International Comparative Analysis, *International Journal of Research in Finance & Marketing*, 164-173.

- S.Kawle1 and Yogesh.L.Aher (2017). GST: An economic overview: Challenges and Impact ahead, *International Research Journal of Engineering and Technology (IRJET)*, 2760-2763.
- Rekha & Dev Karan (2018).An Overview of Goods and Services Tax (GST) In India,*International Journal of Business and Management*,13-18
- Rajesh R. Desai and Ankit D. Patel (2015).Goods and services tax in India: an opportunities and challenges,*International Journal of Current Research*, 23347-23349.
- Karteek Madapana, and Kotini Avinash Gupta (2016).A Review on Goods and services tax (GST): A panacea for Indian economy & its impact on various sectors, *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Education and Research*,12-15.
- ASSOCHAM (2015).Goods and Services Tax in India Taking stock and setting expectations, Deloitte,1-25.
- Anand Nayyar and Inderpal Singh (2018).A Comprehensive Analysis of Goods and Services Tax (GST) in *India,Indian Journal of Finance*, 51-71
- Pranesh Debnath(2016).Implementation of Goods and Service Tax (GST) in India and its Control over the Tax Collection, *Journal of Commerce & Trade*, 28-3.
- SANKAR R (2017). GST: Impact and Implications on Various Industries in Indian Economy, *Journal of Internet Banking and Commerce*, 1-9
- Surendra S. Yadav, Ravi Shankar, (2018).Goods and service tax (GST): how and why, *Journal of Advances in Management Research*, Vol. 15 Issue: 1, 2-3.
- Satya Poddar and Ehtisham Ahmad(2009).GST Reforms and Intergovernmental Considerations in India, Working Paper No.1/2009-DEA, Department of Economic Affairs, Ministry of Finance ,Government of India,1-45.

- Goutam Bhattacharya (2017). Evaluation and implementation of GST in Indian growth: A study, *International Journal of Commerce and Management Research*, 65-68.
- Sacchidananda Mukherjee(2015).Present State of Goods and Services Tax (GST) Reform in India, Working Paper No. 2015-154, National Institute of Public Finance and Policy, New Delhi,1-24.
- Milandeep Kour, Kajal Chaudhary, Surjan Singh and, Baljinder Kaur(2016). A Study on Impact of GST after Its Implementation, *International Journal of Innovative Studies in Sociology and Humanities (IJISSH)*,17-24.
- Jose Sebastian (2017): Goods and Services Tax: Rationale, Relevance and Implications for India's Fiscal Federalism, Policy Dialogue Series, Working Paper 1, Institute for Sustainable Development and Governance, 1-23.
- PhD Research Bureau. Goods and Service Tax (GST) impact on economy history and people,PhD Research Bureau, PhD Chamber of Commerce and Industry,New Delhi,1-33.
- A Lourdunathan F and Xavier P (2017).Study on implementation of goods and services tax(GST) in India: Prospectus and challenges, *International Journal of Applied Research*, 626-629.
- Anand Deo(2017).Goods & Services Tax (GST) – Impact analysis &road ahead, *IBMRD's Journal of Management & Research*, 17-28.
- Yogesh Kailashchandra Agrawal(2017). Goods and Services Tax and Its Impact on Indian Economy, 26-30.
- Shilpa Rani(2017).A research paper on goods and service tax (GST) and its impact on Indian economy, *International Journal of Advanced Research and Development*,209-212

- Dash A (2017). Positive and Negative Impact of GST on Indian Economy, *International Journal of Management and Applied Science*, 159-160
- Vasanthagopal R (2011). GST in India: A Big Leap in the Indirect Taxation System, *International Journal of Trade, Economics and Finance*, 144-146.
- Venugopal Reddy(2017). A Study on Prospects and Challenges in Implementation of Goods and Services Tax (GST) in India, *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, 31-34.
- Ehtisham Ahmad and Satya Poddar(2009). GST Reforms And Intergovernmental Considerations In India, *Asia Research Centre Working Paper 26*, 1-43.
- Sthanu R. Nair & Leena Mary Eapen(2017). Goods and Services Tax and Price Control Measures: Lessons for India from Australian Experience, *W.P.IIMK/WPS/227/EA/2017/11*.
- Subhamoy Banik and Arundhuti Das (2017). GST in India: Impact and challenges, *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, 07-10.
- Esha Bansal(2018). A Study on Impact of GST on Indian Economy, *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Applied Science*, 17-20.
- Kankipati Ajay Kumar(2017). A Journey of Goods and Services Tax (GST) and Structural Impact of GST on the Growth of GDP in India, *Advances in Sciences and Humanities*, 50-53
- Pramod Kumar Pandey(2017). The Impact of Indian Taxation system on its Economic Growth, *SSARSC International Journal of Management*, 1-8.
- Jadhav Bhika Lala(2017). Impact of GST on Indian economy, *International Journal of Recent Scientific Research*, 17505-17508.
- Raghuram K.S and Deepa(2015). Goods and Services Tax: The Introduction Process, *W.P. No.2015-03-01, Indian Institute of Management, Ahmedabad*, 1-43.

- Naresh Kumar (2018). Goods and Services Tax (GST): Networking and its working process, *IJRDO-Journal of Business Management*, 27-40.
- Dr. H.A.C. Prasad & S. S. Singh (2017). Services Sector: Challenges, Issues and Policy Suggestion with special focus on IT-BPM, Tourism, Shipping, Real Estate Services and Project Exports, Working Paper No. 2/2017-DEA, Government of India, Ministry of Finance Department of Economic Affairs, 1-51
- Sachin Abda (2017). Research Paper on Effects of Goods and Services Tax on Indian Economy, *International Education & Research Journal*, 584-5485.
- Mohapatra., Joliyap., Kamalvanshi V. and Kushwaha S (2018). Perception of GST in Varanasi district of Uttar Pradesh, *International Journal of Agriculture Sciences*, 7369-7371
- Mohamad Ali Roshidi Ahmad, Zuriadah Ismail, and Hazianti Abdul Halim (2016). Awareness and Perception of Taxpayer towards Goods and Services Tax (GST) Implementation, *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 75-93.
- Pallavi Chaturvedi and Suruchi Madan (2017). Goods and Service Tax: A Game Changer for Indian Economy, *INSPIRA-Journal of Commerce, Economics & Computer Science*, 305-308
- Azharuddin Mohammad Mussaiyib (2016). Goods and Services Tax in India: An Insight, *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Applied Science (IJRIAS)*, 11-15.
- Chandu Ravi Kumar (2015). GST in Indian Economy: Its Benefits and Impact, *International Journal of Science and Research*, 759-761.
- Dash (2017). Positive and negative impact of GST on Indian economy, *International Journal of Management and Applied Science*, 160-162