



WEB COPY



CRP Nos. 6035 and 6037 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 05-06-2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE T.V.THAMILSELVI

CRP Nos. 6035 and 6037 of 2025

1. P. Ragunathan
S/o.K.O.Palanisamy, Resident of No.172/2,
BKL Building 10th Main BKL Building
10th Main BKL Colony, A Sector Near
PO/PS Naharlagun, Papumpare, Arunachal
Pradesh, having his Office at, No.10/3,
Thanalakshmi Nagar, New Sidhapur,
Coimbatore 641 044

Petitioner in both the
revisions

Vs

1. National Insurance Company
Rep by its Branch Manager, No.930,
Sathyamanaglam Road, Gadhipuram,
Coimbatore 641 012

Respondent in both the
revisions

C.R.P.No.6035 of 2025 is filed against the order in F.R.SR.No.1348 of 2024 on the file of Tamil Nadu State Consumer Dispute Redressal Commission, Chennai dated 11.09.2024 against the order in RBT/CC/21/2024 on the file of District Consumer Dispute Redressal Commission, Namakkal dated 21.05.2024.



CRP Nos. 6035 and 6037 of 2025

C.R.P.No.6037 of 2025 is filed against the order in F.R.SR.No.1599 of 2024 on the file of Tamil Nadu State Consumer Dispute Redressal Commission, Chennai dated 03.10.2024 against the order in CMP No.21 of 2024 in RBT/CC/21/2024 on the file of District Consumer Dispute Redressal Commission, Namakkal dated 02.04.2024.

For Petitioner(s): K.Mohanamurali

For Respondent(s): M/s.S.Arun Kumar

ORDER

Challenging the rejection orders passed in F.R.SR.No.1348 of 2024 and F.R.SR.No.1599 of 2024, the appellant/complainant has preferred the above revisions.

2. Learned counsel for the revision petitioner submits that the petitioner preferred an appeal in C.C.No.242 of 2022 before the Tamil Nadu State Consumer Dispute Redressal Commission, Chennai against the order passed by District Consumer Dispute Redressal Commission. Since certain defects were pointed out by the Registry, the revision petitioner/appellant rectified and re-presented the appeal in a proper manner. When the matter was called on 11.09.2024, there was no representation for the revision petitioner/appellant. Hence, the appeal was rejected for non-appearance as well as for not complying with the defects. Aggrieved by the same, the appellant has preferred the above revisions. Learned counsel relied on the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of *Ibrat Faizan vs Omaxe Buildhome Private Limited* reported in (2023) 11



CRP Nos. 6035 and 6037 01 2023

WEB COPY

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has complied with all the defects, but, due to lack of communication, he could not appear on the hearing date and therefore prays for setting aside the rejection order.

4. Heard the learned counsel for the respondent. Relying on the ratio laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of *Ibrat Faizan vs Omaxe Buildhome Private Limited* reported in (2023) 11 SCC 594, this Court is empowered to hear the revisions, filed by the petitioner.

5. Considering the facts that the petitioner has complied with all the defects and only due to lack of communication, he could not appear on the hearing date, this Court is inclined to give one more opportunity to the revision petitioner.

6. Accordingly the civil revision petitions are allowed. Liberty is granted to the revision petitioner to re-present the appeal in a proper manner before the Tamil Nadu State Consumer Dispute Redressal Commission, Chennai within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. No costs.

05.06.2026

sr
Index:yes/no
Website:yes/no
Speaking order/Non-speaking Order



WEB COPY



CRP Nos. 6035 and 6037 of 2025

T.V.THAMILSELVI.,J

sr

To

1. The Tamil Nadu State Consumer Dispute Redressal Commission, Chennai
2. The District Consumer Dispute Redressal Commission, Namakkal

CRP Nos. 6035 and 6037 of 2025

05.06.2026