



\$~65

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

+ LPA 1190/2024, CM APPL. 72046/2024 (INTERIM ORDERS) CM APPL. 72047/2024 (EXEMP.), CM APPL. 72048/2024 (SEEKING PERMISSION TO FILE LENGTHY SYNOPSIS AND LIST OF DATES) & CM APPL. 72049/2024 (DELAY 43DAYS IN RE-FILING APPEAL)

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES WELFARE HOUSING ORGANIZATION (CGEWHO)Appellant

Through: Mr. Apoorv Agarwal, Mr. Gaurav Singh, Mr. Bhanukaran Singh, Mr. Kamlesh Raj Singh and Ms. Muskan Goel, Advocates.

versus

INDERJIT SINGH AHUJARespondent

Through: Appearance not given.

CORAM:
HON'BLE THE ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TUSHAR RAO GEDELA

ORDER
09.12.2024

%

1. The appellant has filed the present appeal impugning the order dated 23.08.2024 passed by the learned Single Judge in Writ Petition (C) No. 11625/2024 captioned "*Central Government Welfare Housing Organization vs. Inderjit Singh Ahuja*".
2. The appellant had filed the aforementioned petition impugning an



order dated 20.02.2024 passed by the State Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission (State Commission) in Complaint Case No. CC/1443/2018 captioned as ***Inderjit Singh Ahuja vs. Central Government Welfare Housing Organisation.*** In terms of the said order, the appellant's written statement was directed to be taken off record as it was filed beyond the period stipulated for filing the written statement. The State Commission has also noted that the delay was not condoned.

3. According to the learned counsel appearing for the appellant, the delay in filing the written statement was requested to be condoned and in fact, the written statement was already placed on record. He also submits that the order removing the written statement from the record was not communicated to any of the parties. Further, the State Commission itself was also not aware of the said order, therefore, had permitted filing of a rejoinder

4. The learned Single Judge declined to interfere with the proceedings of the State Commission and dismissed the petition filed by the appellant. Undisputedly, the State Commission has the discretion whether to condone the delay in filing of a written statement. More importantly, the appellant has a remedy against the final order passed by the State Commission. The learned Single Judge has declined with the proceedings before the State Commission. We find no infirmity with the said order.

5. It is clarified that the observations made by the learned Single Judge in the impugned order as well as by this Court will not preclude the petitioner from pursuing any remedy before the State Commission or any appellate proceedings against any final order that may be passed by the State Commission.



6. Accordingly, the present appeal is dismissed.

ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE, J

TUSHAR RAO GEDELA, J

DECEMBER 09, 2024

kct

Click here to check corrigendum, if any