

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

WP(C) No.8149 of 2022
(Through Hybrid mode)

Madhusudan Law University and others ***Petitioners***

Mr. Tushar Kanti Satapathy, Advocate

-versus-

Diptirekha Nayak and others ***Opposite Parties***

CORAM: JUSTICE ARINDAM SINHA

ORDER
30.03.2022

Order No.

- 01.** 1. Mr. Satpathy, learned advocate appears on behalf of petitioners and submits, his clients are the university. The State Commission acted on purported complaint made by the students regarding change of examination centre. The students cannot be called consumers and the Commission clearly acted without jurisdiction. He wants to rely on judgments.
2. This Bench has already held in –
- (i) **Order dated 15th December, 2021 in WP(C) no.32749 of 2021 [M/s. Balimela Hydro Electric Project (Unit of Odisha Hydro Power Corporation Ltd.) v. District Consumer Redressal Commission and another];**

(ii) order dated 9th February, 2022 in WP(C) no.36033 of 2021 (Anantha Charan Das v. State of Odisha); and

(iii) order dated 15th February, 2022 in WP(C) no.39236 of 2021 (TPWODL v. District Consumer Dispute Redressal Commission, Sambalpur)

- that writ petition regarding working of the Consumer Disputes Act is not maintainable as High Courts are bound by the caution in **Cicily Kallarackal v. Vehicle Factory**, reported in (2012) 8 SCC 524.

3. The writ petition is dismissed.

(Arindam Sinha)
Judge

RKS

