

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

Date of Decision: 17.10.2022

Sr. No.114

CR No.4398 of 2022

Sunil Yadav and another

.... Petitioners

Versus

District Consumer Dispute Redressal
Commission, Mohali and others

... Respondents

Sr. No.115

CR No.4404 of 2022

Shalini Yadav

.... Petitioner

Versus

District Consumer Dispute Redressal
Commission, Mohali and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA

Present: Mr. Himanshu Raj, Advocate
for the petitioners.

TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA, J. (ORAL)

By this common order, two revision petitions are being disposed of as both raise similar issue. The facts, however, are being taken from CR No.4398 of 2022.

This revision petition has been filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India for issuing direction to respondent No.1-District Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission, Mohali (Punjab) to decide Complaint No.CC/344/2021 titled as Sunil Yadav & Shalini Yadav versus M/s Bright Buildtech and Ors, within a stipulated time period of ninety days as mandated by law under Section 38(7) of the Consumer Protection Act,

Learned counsel for the petitioners while referring to the interim orders passed by the respondent-Commission, which have been placed on record as Annexure P-2, states that the respondent-Commission has granted many adjournments to the respondents to file their reply/response, which is delaying the matter. He relies upon the Supreme Court judgment rendered in *Civil Appeal No.10941-10942 of 2013* titled *New India Assurance Co. Ltd. Versus Hilli Multipurpose Cold Storage Pvt. Ltd.*, to contend that the time limit prescribed under the Act for filing the response is mandatory.

Since the petition has been filed against interim orders passed by the respondent-Commission and it is not disputed that orders in question can be challenged before the State Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission, there is no ground to entertain the petition in exercise of revisional jurisdiction of this Court under Article 227 of the Constitution of India.

Accordingly, both the petitions stand dismissed.

A photocopy of this order be placed on the connected file.

(TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA)
JUDGE

17.10.2022
Maninder

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No