



W.P.(MD)No.18341 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED : 07.07.2025

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM

AND

THE HONOURABLE DR.JUSTICE A.D.MARIA CLETE

W.P.(MD)No.18341 of 2025

1.The Manager,
Sri Gokulam Chit & Finance Co (Pvt Ltd),
Pa.Ka.No.356, Pu.Ka.No.66,
Sri Gokulam Tower,
Argot Salai, Kodampakkam,
Chennai-600 024.

2.Sri Gokulam Chit & Finance Co (Pvt Ltd),
Rep., by its Branch Manager,
Madurai Main Road, Opposite to Police Station,
Thirumangalam Town, Madurai.

3.The Branch Manager,
Sri Gokulam Chit & Finance Co (Pvt Ltd),
Akham Road, Ramanathapuram.

... Petitioners

Vs.

1.The Honourable National Consumer
Disputes Redressal Commission,
New Delhi.

2.Arsath Parvesh

...Respondents



W.P.(MD)No.18341 of 2025

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, calling for the entire records connected with the order in NC/R.P.No.718 of 2025 dated 27.05.2025 passed by the 1st respondent and quash the same, consequently, directing the National Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission to dispose of the main revision on merits.

For Petitioners : Mr.S.Malaikani,
for Mr.A.Abdulkabur
For R1 : Mr.K.Prasad

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by ***S.M.SUBRAMANIAM, J.***)

Unconardonable delay cannot be condoned in a routine manner by the Courts. Law of limitation is substantive. Rule is to institute litigation within the time limit prescribed under the statute. Condonation of delay is an exception. Thus, the Courts are expected to consider the reason and its genuinity for the purpose of condoning the long delay. No doubt, the Courts are taking lenient view in condoning the meagre delay. Whenever the delay exceeds, then the Court has to look into the reasons and in the event the reason is not convincing, the Courts may not entertain the appeal.



W.P.(MD)No.18341 of 2025

WEB COPY

2. In the present case, the petitioner / Sri Gokulam Chit & Finance Company (Pvt Ltd) preferred revision petition before the 1st respondent. The 1st respondent has elaborately considered the reasons furnished by the petitioner for condoning the delay of 254 days in filing the revision petition. The 1st respondent found that the reasons furnished by the petitioner are neither candid nor convincing. Thus, the petition was rejected.

3. This Court is of the considered opinion that the reason stated by the 1st respondent in the impugned order is in consonance with the established principles in the matter of condonation of delay. Thus, this petition is devoid of merits. Therefore, this Writ Petition is dismissed. No costs.

(S.M.S., J.) & (A.D.M.C., J.)
07.07.2025
(2/2)

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No

Yuva



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD)No.18341 of 2025

S.M.SUBRAMANIAM, J.

AND

DR.A.D.MARIA CLETE, J.

Yuva

W.P.(MD)No.18341 of 2025

07.07.2025

(2/2)