**BEFORE THE HON'BLE DISTRICT CONSUMER DISPUTES REDRESSAL COMMISSION AT [LOCATION]**

**IN RE: COMPLAINT NO. \_/20**

**IN THE MATTER OF**:

Ruchika Gupta  
501A, Block 4A, HIG DDA Flats, Motia Khan, Paharganj, New Delhi-110055  
 .....................................................................Complainant

**Versus**

Capital Cars Private Ltd. (Prime Honda),  
Plot No. 1, Patparganj Industrial Area, Delhi-92.

Honda Cars India Ltd (Zonal Office North),  
Plot No. A-1, Sector 40/41 Surajpur Kasna Road, Greater Noida, U.P.  
 .....................................................................Opposite Party(s)

**COMPLAINT UNDER SECTION 35 OF THE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT, 2019**

**RESPECTFULLY SHOWETH:**

1. That the Complainant, Ms. Ruchika Gupta, residing at 501A, Block 4A, HIG DDA Flats, Motia Khan, Paharganj, New Delhi-110055, is the owner of a Honda City Car bearing registration number DL 7CF 3706.
2. That the Complainant had her car serviced by OP1, who is an authorized service station for Honda cars. Despite paying a service charge of Rs. 26,165, the services were found to be incomplete and unsatisfactory.
3. That the vehicle was not properly cleaned, and mechanical issues like loose door hinges and noisy clutch pedals were observed post-service, indicating negligence on OP1's part.
4. That despite complaints and subsequent visits by OP1's technicians, the issues persisted, causing inconvenience and mental agony to the Complainant.
5. That OP2, being the manufacturer of the Honda City Car, is also responsible for ensuring quality after-sales service through its authorized dealers like OP1.
6. **CAUSE OF ACTION**: Arises from the failure of OP1 to provide satisfactory service to the Complainant's car, and OP2's inability to ensure quality service through its authorized dealer.
7. **EVIDENCE**: The Complainant attaches herewith the service invoice, complaints made to OP1 and OP2, and other relevant documents to substantiate her claim.
8. **JURISDICTION**: The Hon'ble District Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission has jurisdiction as the services were availed and the cause of action arose within its territorial limits.
9. **LIMITATION**: The cause of action arose on [Date of Final Unsatisfactory Service], which is within the limitation period prescribed under the Consumer Protection Act, 2019.
10. **PRAYER**: The Complainant humbly prays before the Hon'ble Commission for the following relief:
    1. Direct OP1 to refund the service charge of Rs. 26,165 to the Complainant.
    2. Direct OP1 and OP2 to jointly and severally pay compensation for the mental agony and inconvenience suffered by the Complainant
    3. Any other relief that the Hon'ble Commission may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case.

**Place: [Location]  
Date: [Date of Filing]** Signature of Complainant]

**VERIFICATION:**

I, Ruchika Gupta, do hereby verify that the contents of this complaint from para 1 to [last para number] are true and correct to my knowledge, no part of it is false, and nothing material has been concealed therein.

Verified at [Location] on this [Date of Verification].

[Signature of Complainant]  
Ruchika Gupta

**ANNEXURE OF EVIDENCE**[List of Documents Attached]