



Esha

IN THE HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY AT GOA
WRIT PETITION NO.96 OF 2025

VIJAY KAPOOR

... PETITIONER

Versus

**STATE OF GOA, THR. ITS CHIEF
SECRETARY AND 4 ORS.,**

... RESPONDENTS

Ms. Asha A. Desai, Pro bono Advocate with Ms. Vrunda Kubal,
Advocate for the Petitioner.

Ms. Sapna Mordekar, Additional Government Advocate for
Respondent Nos. 1 and 2.

**CORAM:- BHARATI DANGRE &
NIVEDITA P. MEHTA, JJ.**

DATED :- 3rd April, 2025

P.C:

The Petitioner, a septuagenarian, had several cases pending before the Goa Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission, North and South Goa and he conducted the matters in person.

Aggrieved, that the Commission was acting contrary to the mandate of the Consumer Protection Act, 2019 and being unhappy that he was humiliated by the member of the North Goa Consumer Commission, he was constrained to file a complaint legitimately expecting that all his complaints would be addressed in accordance with under Rule 9 of the Consumer Protection (Appointment etc.) Rules, 2020.

2. However, when no cognizance was taken of his complaints, he approached this Court with a specific relief of conducting an inquiry/scrutiny in accordance with Rule 9 of the Consumer Protection (Appointment etc.) Rules, 2020 into the said complaints.

3. The learned Counsel appointed to represent the Petitioner in person, on instructions, makes a categorical statement that the inquiry is now initiated and the Petitioner is permitted to participate in the said inquiry.

4. As far as prayer clause (b) is concerned, which pray that pending inquiry into the complaints, revert all matters from South Goa District Consumer Redressal Commission to North Goa District Consumer Redressal Commission and also, for a direction to the presiding members of the Goa Consumer Redressal Commission, other than its acting Presiding Officer, to take up the matters that are filed before Respondent No. 4 and transfer them out of North Goa District Commission to any other State outside Goa, we are of the clear view that it is the presumption of the Petitioner that the matters are going to be decided against him and it is too early in the date that we take into cognizance these assumptions.

5. By reserving the liberty to the Petitioner to seek such remedy at the appropriate stage, if he is able to substantiate any discrimination or indifferent treatment being met out to him, which do not fall within the

parameters of law only because he has preferred complaints against the members of the Commission, we grant him liberty to approach this Court by filing appropriate proceedings. Since the prayer clause (a) of the Petition has been taken care of, the Writ Petition stands disposed of.

NIVEDITA P. MEHTA, J.

BHARATI DANGRE, J.