

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE C.V.NAGARJUNA REDDY

AND

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.KESHA RAO

WRIT PETITION No.23233 of 2011

17.08.2018

Between:

O.P.Tibrewala

..Petitioner

and


The Andhra Pradesh State Consumer Disputes Redressal
Commission, Hyderabad and another

..Respondents

Counsel for the petitioner: None appeared

Counsel for the respondents: Assistant Government Pleader
for Civil Supplies

The Court made the following:



ORDER: (Per the Hon'ble Sri Justice C.V.Nagarjuna Reddy)

This writ petition is filed for *certiorari* to quash common order, dated 19.06.2009, in F.A.Nos.1399 and 1439 of 2006 of respondent No.1.

2. At the hearing, there is no representation for the petitioner. Therefore, the writ petition is liable to be dismissed for non-prosecution. Even otherwise, also we are not inclined to entertain the writ petition for adjudication on merits in view of the fact that against the order of respondent No.1 impugned in this writ petition, the petitioner has the remedy of revision under Section 21(b) of the Consumer Protection Act, 1986, which is held to be effective alternative remedy by a Division Bench of this Court in **Andhra Pradesh Cooperative Housing Societies Federation Ltd., Hyderabad v. Andhra Pradesh State Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission, Hyderabad**¹.

3. In the light of the above position in law and on the facts of the case, we do not find this case as an exception to the doctrine of alternative remedy.

¹ 2015(5) ALD 695 (DB)

4. The writ petition is, accordingly, dismissed with liberty to the petitioner to avail the alternative remedy in terms of the observations made hereinbefore.

5. As a sequel to dismissal of the Writ Petition, interim order, dated 18.08.2011, in W.P.M.P.No.28438 of 2011, is vacated and W.P.M.P.No.28438 of 2011 filed by the petitioner for interim relief stands dismissed as infructuous.

C.V.NAGARJUNA REDDY, J

P.KESHAHA RAO, J

17th August, 2018
GHN

