



\$~56 to 58

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

+ W.P.(C) 15772/2023 & CM APPL. 63359/2023

PRAMOD KUMAR GUPTA

..... Petitioner

Through: Ms. Saroj Tripathi, Mr. Naveen
Kumar Tripathi and Mr. Sanjay
Kumar Pandey, Advocates.

versus

CENTRAL BANK OF INDIA AND ORS.

..... Respondents

Through: Ms. Meera Mathur, Advocate for R-1
to 3.

+ W.P.(C) 15863/2023 & CM APPL. 63816/2023

VISHAL GUPTA

..... Petitioner

Through: Ms. Saroj Tripathi, Mr. Naveen
Kumar Tripathi and Mr. Sanjay
Kumar Pandey, Advocates.

versus

CENTRAL BANK OF INDIA AND ORS.

..... Respondents

Through: Ms. Meera Mathur, Advocate for R-1
to 3.

+ W.P.(C) 15864/2023 & CM APPLs. 63819/2023, 63821/2023

PRAMOD KUMAR GUPTA AND ANR.

..... Petitioners

Through: Ms. Saroj Tripathi, Mr. Naveen
Kumar Tripathi and Mr. Sanjay
Kumar Pandey, Advocates.

versus

CENTRAL BANK OF INDIA AND ORS.

..... Respondents



Through: Ms. Meera Mathur, Advocate for R-1 to 3.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBRAMONIUM PRASAD

ORDER
20.03.2024

%

1. W.P.(C) 15772/2023 has been filed challenging the Order dated 25.07.2023 passed by the NCDRC allowing the Revision Petition bearing No.1049/2020 setting aside the Order dated 16.03.2020 passed by the State Commission and Order dated 22.12.2017 passed by the District Forum and remanding back the case to the District Forum for fresh disposal on merits.
2. W.P.(C) 15863/2023 has been filed challenging the Order dated 25.07.2023 passed by the NCDRC allowing the Revision Petition bearing No.1047/2020 setting aside the Order dated 16.03.2020 passed by the State Commission and Order dated 22.12.2017 passed by the District Forum and remanding back the matter to the District Forum for fresh disposal on merits.
3. W.P.(C) 15864/2023 has been filed challenging the Order dated 25.07.2023 passed by the NCDRC allowing the Revision Petition bearing No.1048/2020 setting aside the Order dated 16.03.2020 passed by the State Commission and Order dated 22.12.2017 passed by the District Forum and remanding back the matter to the District Forum for fresh disposal on merits.
4. The short submission of the learned Counsel for the Petitioner is that the National Commission in exercising its jurisdiction under Section 21 of the Consumer Protection Act, 2019 ought not to have remanded the matter back and could have decided the matter as remanding the matter back will delay the procedure and result in unnecessary expense.



5. In view of the fact that the National Commission *vide* Impugned Order dated 25.07.2023 remanded the matters back to the District Forum for a fresh disposal on merits since it could not have entered into the thicket of facts by comparing the signatures of the Petitioners on the withdrawal forms submitted by the Respondent Bank, this Court finds no infirmity in the Impugned Order dated 25.07.2023. However, since the complaint was filed in the year 2013 and more than 11 years have passed, the District Forum is requested to decide the matters as expeditiously as possible, preferably within six weeks from today.

6. The writ petitions are disposed of, along with pending application(s), if any.

7. It is made clear that this Court has not made any observations on the merits of the cases. It is for the District Forum to take a decision as to whether the opinion of the CFSL regarding the signatures should be called or not.

SUBRAMONIUM PRASAD, J

MARCH 20, 2024

S. Zakir