



\$~72

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

% ***Date of decision: 28th August, 2024***

+ **CM(M) 157/2024 & CM APPL. 4894/2024 & CM APPL. 9680/2024**

**JANSEWA GRIHA NIRMAN DEVELOPERS AND BUILDERS
THROUGH MR. SHAILENDRA BANODE**

.....Petitioner

Through: **Mr. Shreeyash U. Lalit, Ms. Runjhun
Garg, Advocates.**

versus

SMT. KALPANA C. CHAFALE

.....Respondent

Through: **None.**

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN

J U D G M E N T (oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India challenging order dated 04.05.2023 passed by Hon'ble National Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission (in short 'NCDRC') in Revision Petition No. 2037/2017.
2. Said Revision Petition was filed before NCDRC impugning order dated 18.06.2016 passed by the State Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission, Nagpur, Maharashtra in Appeal No.2476/2005.
3. Since the entire cause of action pertaining to the present subject matter has arisen within the jurisdiction of Maharashtra, relying upon judgment dated 04.03.2024 passed by Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Siddhartha S Mookerjee vs. Madhab Chand Mitter*, Civil Appeal Nos. 3915-16/2024,



learned counsel for petitioner prays that he may be permitted to withdraw the present petition with liberty to approach the jurisdictional High Court.

4. This Court has gone through said order wherein the Hon'ble Supreme Court has, very categorically, observed that merely because NCDRC had allowed petition, the jurisdiction would not vest with Delhi High Court and observing that since the cause of action had arisen in Kolkata and the matter had been dealt with by the State Commission of West Bengal, it was held that the jurisdiction of High Court of Calcutta should have been invoked.

5. The situation is precisely the same here, too.

6. The petition stands disposed of as withdrawn. Liberty, as prayed for, is granted.

(MANOJ JAIN)
JUDGE

AUGUST 28, 2024/sw