



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

152

CWP-13747-2026

Date of Decision: 04.05.2026

RAJESH BANBAH AND ANOTHER

...Petitioners

Vs.

STATE CONSUMER DISPUTES REDRESSAL COMMISSION AND
ANOTHER

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present:- Mr. Sanjay Jain, Advocate
for the petitioners

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioners through instant petition under Article 227 of the Constitution of India are seeking direction to respondent No.1-State Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission, Panchkula (for short 'State Commission') to decide Appeal No.A/1482/2023 in a time bound manner.
2. The petitioners filed a complaint before the District Consumer Redressal Commission, Gurugram against respondent No.2-builder which was allowed in their favour vide order dated 05.05.2023. The respondent No.2 filed an appeal before the respondent No.1/State Commission along with application for condonation of delay. Respondent No.1 is delaying the final adjudication on one or another pretext.
3. The petitioner is claiming that direction should be issued to State Commission to adjudicate the appeal at the earliest.

4. It is well known fact that Courts are overburdened. Every Court is inundated with civil and criminal cases. This Court cannot control board of any Court/Authority/Commission. It is State Commission which has to control its board. The petitioner is supposed to approach the State Commission and point out urgency, if any. Ld. State Commission is requested to look into petitioner's grievance if they file any application seeking early adjudication.

5. Disposed of in above terms.

6. Pending application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

May 04, 2026
Deepak DPA

Whether Speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No