

\$~

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ W.P.(C) 835/2015

PRADEEP KUMAR GOEL Petitioner
 Through Petitioner in person.

versus

M/S J.K. SYNTHETICS LTD. & ANR Respondents
 Through Mr. Nitin Soni, Advocate for R-1.
 Mr. R.P. Pahwa, Advocate for R-2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANMOHAN

ORDER
04.05.2016

%

Present writ petition has been filed challenging the orders dated 6th March, 2014, 15th May, 2014 and 9th September, 2014.

At the outset, learned counsel for respondent no. 1 raises a preliminary objection to the maintainability of the present writ petition on the ground that the petitioner has an alternate effective remedy by way of an appeal under Section 23 of the Consumer Protection Act, 1986 [for short 'Act, 1986'].

Petitioner, who appears in person, states that there is no bar on the maintainability of the writ petition.

While it is true that there is no legal bar on the maintainability of a writ petition but the settled practice is that courts do not entertain a writ petition when an alternate effective remedy is available to the petitioner.

In the present case, the impugned orders have been passed by the National Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission while exercising its original jurisdiction under Section 21(i)(a) of the Act, 1986. Accordingly, the said orders are appealable under Section 23 of the Act, 1986.

Consequently, as the petitioner has an alternate effective remedy, present writ petition is dismissed with liberty to file proceedings in accordance with law.

MANMOHAN, J

MAY 04, 2016

rn