



**In the High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana
At Chandigarh**

CWP-6242-2024 (O&M)
Date of Decision:-27.10.2025

The Chairman, Fazilka Improvement Trust and another ... Petitioners

Versus

Anshul Monga ... Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE RAMESH KUMARI**

Present:- Mr. Sandeep Kumar Bokolia, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Parveen Gupta, Advocate for the respondent.

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioners i.e. the Chairman and the Executive Officer of Fazilka Improvement Trust assail order dated 4.1.2024 (Annexure P-1) passed by National Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission (hereinafter referred to as "*the NCDRC*") vide which a revision petition filed by the petitioners in terms of provisions of Section 58(1)(b) of the Consumer Protection Act, 2019, has been dismissed being time barred as the said revision petition had been filed after more than 116 days of expiry of limitation.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner vehemently argued that the NCDRC was expected to have taken a pragmatic approach and ought to have been aware of the fact that there are some unavoidable delays particularly in government/semi-government institutions on account of the volume of work



and on account of the fact that such like matters are required to be dealt with at multiple stages before a final decision is taken and that in case such delays are not overlooked, it is ultimately the State Exchequer which stands to lose.

3. We have considered the aforesaid submissions.
4. While we do not intend to differ with the observations as recorded by the NCDRC to the effect that the managerial inefficiency and administrative indifference cannot always said to be a ground to justify condonation of delay, but at the same time we find that even on merits the petitioners do not have any case inasmuch it is a case where the respondent/complainant had applied to the petitioners for allotment of a residential plot, which was allotted to him on 1.6.2015. The complainant/respondent had deposited the total sum of Rs.9,21,476/-, but despite the same the petitioners did not undertake the development work at the site so as to enable the respondent to proceed with the construction work. Although the petitioners claimed that they had undertaken the requisite development work, but nothing in this regard was placed on record. So much so neither occupation nor completion certificate was produced.
5. On the other hand, the complainant had produced certain photographs indicating that no development work had been undertaken at the site.
6. Under these circumstances, we do not find any infirmity in the findings as recorded by the District Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission-I, U.T., Chandigarh and as upheld by the State Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission so as to justify any interference in the writ jurisdiction.



CWP-6242-2024 (O&M) (3)

Consequently, finding no merit in the present petition, the same is hereby dismissed.

(GURVINDER SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

27.10.2025
Pankaj

(RAMESH KUMARI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking /reasoned	Yes / No
Whether Reportable	Yes / No