



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

CWP-22986-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision:-4.11.2025

Haryana Urban Development Authority and another ... Petitioners

Versus

Suhani Garg ... Respondent

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

Present:- Mr. Shivendra Swaroop, Advocate;
Ms. Kushaldeep Kaur, Advocate,
Mr. Siddhanth Arora, Advocate and
Ms. Sharvi Dadhwal, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J. (Oral)

1. The Petitioner - Haryana Urban Development Authority (hereinafter referred to as "*the HUDA*"), which is presently renamed as Haryana Shehri Vikas Pradhikaran (HSVP) assails order dated 13.3.2024 (Annexure P-16) passed by National Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission (hereinafter referred to as "*the NCDRC*") vide which a revision petition filed by the petitioners herein has been dismissed being time barred. The petitioner also assails order dated 14.7.2022 (Annexure P-14) passed by learned State Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission, Panchkula dismissing the appeal filed by the petitioners against order dated 19.3.2018 (Annexure P-12) passed by District Consumer Disputes Redressal Forum.



2. Briefly stated, the respondent – Suhani Garg had instituted a consumer complaint before the District Consumer Disputes Redressal Forum, Hisar averring therein that she had been allotted a plot measuring 14 marlas in Sector 14, Part-II, Urban Estate, Hisar vide allotment letter dated 3.2.2014 (Annexure P-1) in respect of which she had deposited an amount of Rs.4,69,800/- towards 10% of the total cost of plot alongwith the application and another amount of Rs.8,22,150/- towards 15% of the cost was deposited within a period of 30 days of the said allotment letter. The HUDA, which had allotted the plot as per the terms of the allotment was supposed to complete the development work of the residential plots within a period of 3 years from the date of allotment and was to offer possession after completion of all the development works. The Estate Officer, Haryana Shehri Vikas Pradhikaran sent a letter dated 13.2.2017 (Annexure P-2) to the respondent/allottee offering possession, but when the respondent visited the site of the plot it was found that the development work had not been carried out completely and there was no possibility of residing or raising the construction thereupon. The respondent requested Haryana Shehri Vikas Pradhikaran to withdraw the letter offering possession and further requested that first the development work be completed and possession of the plot be offered thereafter, but to no avail and rather the HUDA started charging interest on the entire cost of the plot. The petitioners in their written statement stated that as on the date of offer of possession, the development work pertaining to providing basic amenities had already been completed and that since it is the respondent/complainant, who had not chosen to raise construction, therefore, there was no question of withdrawal of the letter offering possession. The



District Consumer Disputes Redressal Forum, Hisar had appointed a Local Commission for spot inspection, which *inter alia* reported that although some roads had been constructed and some electricity poles, wires etc. had also been laid, but there was no street light and across the road there was open 'kacha' space in which there existed as many as 50 huts for labourers. The District Consumer Disputes Redressal Forum also took notice of the report issued under Right to Information Act (RTI) to the effect that development work in respect of 45 meters wide road was yet to be carried out. Consequently, the complaint was accepted and a direction was issued to the HUDA to withdraw the letter offering possession i.e. letter dated 13.2.2017 (Annexure P-2).

3. The petitioners preferred an appeal before the State Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission, but the said appeal was also dismissed. The petitioners thereafter approached the NCDRC by way of filing a revision petition, which was dismissed being time barred.
4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the impugned order passed by the NCDRC cannot sustain as too hyper-technical an approach had been taken by the NCDRC, whereas a delay of 110 days is not that huge particularly when it is well known that in government offices/semi-government institutions some delay is occasioned on account of the volume of work and the fact that such like matters are required to be dealt with at multiple stages before a final decision is taken. It has further been submitted that, in any case, even the orders passed by District Consumer Disputes Redressal Forum as well as State Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission are against the factual and legal position.



CWP-22986-2025 (O&M) (4)

5. We have considered the aforesaid submissions and have also gone through the impugned orders passed by the NCDRC; District Consumer Disputes Redressal Forum as well as State Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission.
6. The reasoning recorded by the NCDRC while dismissing the revision petition being time barred cannot be said to be erroneous in any manner. The petitioners were expected to explain the delay in filing the revision petition, which they have miserably failed. The District Consumer Disputes Redressal Forum as well as State Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission, in any case, have taken note of all the material aspects of the case and have thereafter passed the impugned orders.
7. This Court in exercise of powers under Articles 226/227 of Constitution of India so as to assail order dated 13.3.2024 (Annexure P-16) passed by the NCDRC in revision petition would exercise very limited jurisdiction. We find that the District Consumer Disputes Redressal Forum; State Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission and the NCDRC have passed the orders after duly appreciating the factual position. There is no infirmity in the orders under challenge so as to warrant any interference in the same. The petition is sans merit and is hereby dismissed.

(GURVINDER SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

4.11.2025
Pankaj

(RAMESH KUMARI)
JUDGE

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