



2024:DHC:7288



\$~35

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**% ***Date of decision: 19th September, 2024***

+ CM(M) 2057/2024 & CM APPL. 14365/2024

PARKWOOD DEVELOPERS PVT. LTD.Petitioner

Through: Ms. Smrit Asmita, Advocate

versus

SANJEEV KUMAR BANOTRA & ORS.Respondents

Through: Mr. Sidharth Mittal with Mr. Darshan
Sejwal, Advocates.**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 20.09.2023 passed by Hon'ble National Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission (in short 'NCDRC') in First Appeal No. 877/2023.
2. The above matter was filed before NCDRC impugning order dated 12.05.2022 passed by the State Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission, Punjab, Chandigarh in Consumer Complaint No. 196/2020.
3. Since the entire cause of action pertaining to the present subject matter has arisen within the jurisdiction of Punjab and Haryana High Court, 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 the petitioner may be permitted to withdraw the present petition with liberty to approach said jurisdictional High Court.
4. This Court has gone through the above said order wherein the Hon'ble



2024:DHC:7288



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. Moreover, this Court has already vide order dated 12.09.2024 passed in title *M/S. TDI Infrastructure Ltd. vs. Birjendra Singh Mallik since Decessednthr LR* in CM(M) No. 2933/2024 observed that in view of *Siddhartha S Mookerjee* (supra), any such petitioner should go to the “jurisdictional High Court”.

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 The petition stands disposed of as withdrawn.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

7. It is stated that execution petition is now listed for further consideration before the learned State Commission on 26th instant. At request, it is also ordered that no coercive process be taken against the judgment debtor in such execution petition for a period of one week to be reckoned from today to enable the petitioner to seek any relief from the jurisdictional High Court. However, it is also undertaken from the side of petitioner that their authorized representative and Director would still appear before the Executing Court on the date fixed.

8. It is, however, made clear that this Court has not expressed any opinion, whatsoever, over the merits of the case.

(MANOJ JAIN)
JUDGE

SEPTEMBER 19, 2024/sw/dr