

Heading1

Heading2

First Appeal No. A/314/2015

(Arisen out of Order Dated 16/12/2014 in Case No. 120/2014 of District Palwal)

1. ARUN KUMAR

S/O RATI RAM PRIMARY SCHOOL, KOT HATHIN GIRLS
GOVT.PRIMARY SCHOOL KOT HATHIN DISTT.PALWALAppellant(s)

Versus

1. BLAZFLASH COURIER

C/O LAKHAN PATASE WALA, HODEL DISTT.PALWALRespondent(s)

BEFORE:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE Nawab Singh PRESIDENT

HON'BLE MR. B M Bedi JUDICIAL MEMBER

HON'BLE MR. Diwan Singh Chauhan MEMBER

For the Appellant:

For the Respondent:

ORDER

STATE CONSUMER DISPUTES REDRESSAL COMMISSION HARYANA, PANCHKULA

First Appeal No : 314 of 2015

Date of Institution: 01.04.2015

Date of Decision : 21.04.2015

Arun Kumar s/o Sh. Rati Ram, Resident of Village Bhallout, Tehsil and District Rohtak at present
Government Primary School, Kot Hathin, Girls Government Primary School, Kot Hathin, District Palwal.

Appellants

Versus

Blazeflash Couriers Limited, New Anaj Mandi, State Bank of Patiala, c/o Lakhan Patase wala, Hodal,
District Palwal, through its proprietor.

Respondent

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Nawab Singh, President.

Shri B.M. Bedi, Judicial Member.

Shri Diwan Singh Chauhan, Member

Present: Shri Anil Kumar Gahlawat, Advocate for appellant.

ORDER

NAWAB SINGH J.(ORAL)

This complainant's appeal is directed against the order dated December 16th, 2014, passed by District Consumer Disputes Redressal Forum (for short District Forum), Palwal, seeking a substantial enhancement of the relief granted.

2. Arun Kumar-Complainant applied for a plot to Housing Board, Haryana, Awas Bhawan, Sector-6, Panchkula. He sent his application through courier vide receipt dated July 24th, 2012 (Exhibit C-7). The closing date for receiving the applications in the office of Housing Board was July 26th, 2012. The courier article was received at the destination on July 28th, 2012. Since, the application of the complainant was received after the due date, so it was not entertained by the Housing Board. Alleging deficiency in service on the part of the respondent-opposite party, the complainant filed complaint under Section 12 of the Consumer Protection Act, 1986 seeking compensation of Rs.5.00 lacs.

3. The District Forum vide impugned order accepted complaint and issued direction to the respondent-opposite party to pay Rs.10,000/- as compensation to the appellant.

4. Learned counsel for the appellant-complainant has urged that amount of compensation awarded is on lower side.

5. Having taken into consideration facts of the case and the evidence led by the complainant, this Commission is of the view that the amount awarded to the complainant is just, reasonable and there is no scope for enhancement.

6. Hence, the appeal is dismissed.

Announced	(Diwan Singh Chauhan)	(B.M. Bedi)	(Nawab Singh)
21.04.2015	Member	Judicial Member	President

CL

**[HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE Nawab Singh]
PRESIDENT**

**[HON'BLE MR. B M Bedi]
JUDICIAL MEMBER**

**[HON'BLE MR. Diwan Singh Chauhan]
MEMBER**