



2025:DHC:9584



\$~91

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
% **Judgment pronounced on: 28.10.2025**

+ **W.P.(C) 16302/2025**

M/S VSR INFRATECH PVT. LTD.

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sandeep Phogat, Advocate.

versus

MEERA NAYAR

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Akshay Srivastava and Ms. Avani
Sharma, Advocates.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN DATTA

SACHIN DATTA, J. (Oral)

CM APPL.66693/2025 (Exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. Application stands disposed of.

W.P.(C) 16302/2025

3. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner assailing an order dated 20.03.2023 passed by the State Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission (SCDRC), Delhi in Revision Petition No. 76/2023 titled AS “VSR Infratech Pvt. Ltd. vs. Meera Nayar”, whereby the State Commission dismissed the revision petition and affirmed the orders dated 23.11.2023 and 11.11.2022 passed by the District Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission(DCDRC), Dwarka, Delhi in Consumer Complaint No. 243/2021 titled as “Meera Nayar vs. VSR Infratech Pvt. Ltd.”
4. The order dated 11.11.2022 reads as under:



2025:DHC:9584



“The OP had collected the complaint copy on 22.12.2021, however has not filed the reply till date despite several opportunities on 09.06.2022. The employee for the complainant states that he has not received any advance copy of reply till date. The statutory provision to file the written statement as per the Consumer Protection Act, 2019 has elapsed. Presence of the OP be awaited till 4.00 PM”

5. It is submitted by the petitioner that the aforesaid order erroneously records that the written statement was not filed by the petitioner within the stipulated time. It is further pointed out that in terms of the said order, the petitioner was proceeded *ex-parte*.
6. The petitioner's application seeking recall of the aforesaid order, came to be dismissed *vide* order dated 23.11.2023.
7. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that great prejudice has been caused to the petitioner on account of the aforesaid orders. It is submitted that the non-appearance of the petitioner was only on two dates of hearing that too on account of miscommunication on the part of the concerned counsel. Further, the order dated 11.11.2022 wrongly notes that the written statement had not been filed by the petitioner. It is submitted that the impugned order dated 20.03.2025 passed by the State Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission does not examine/take note of the relevant factual conspectus of the matter at all.
8. After some hearing, it is agreed by respective counsel, that subject to the payment of costs of Rs.1,00,000/- by the petitioner to the respondent, the order dated 11.11.2022, whereby the petitioner was proceeded *ex-parte*, be set aside and the petitioner be allowed to file its rebuttal evidence before the District Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission. It is directed accordingly.



2025:DHC:9584



9. The District Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission is requested to bestow its urgent consideration to the matter and make an endeavour to dispose of the said consumer complaint no. 243/2021 as expeditiously as possible and preferably within a period of 6 months from today.

10. The present petition stands disposed of in the above terms.

SACHIN DATTA, J

OCTOBER 28, 2025/at/ys