STATE CONSUMER DISPUTES REDRESSAL COMMISSION,
HARYANA,CHANDIGARH.

Revision Petition
~~Revision~~ No 85 of 199.9

Date of decision: 27-9-1999

Haryana Urban Development Authority through its Secretary, Panchkula

~~xxxxxxxxxx~~ Petitioner

Vs.

Dharam Singh son of Bholar Singh, resident of House No. 8-C, Narain Singh Park, Panipat.

Respondent(s)

Present: Shri R.S. Ghuman, Advocate for the appellant.

BEFORE;

Hon'ble Mr.Justice Amarjeet Chaudhary,President.
Shri A.D. Malik, Member.

ORDER

Amarjeet Chaudhary,J.

We have heard the counsel for the petitioner and have also perused the impugned order. After taking into consideration the submissions of the counsel, we are convinced that District Forum, Panipat should not have ordered the personal appearance of Chief Administrator, HUDA, Chandigarh ; especially when copy of the order of the State Commission passed in the appeal preferred by HUDA , has not been communicated to the parties. It is pertinent to note that in the execution application filed by the complainant Senior Officers of HUDA stationed at Panipat would have served the purpose as the entire record is with them. However, it is pointed out that if personal appearance of any officer is required, notice to the concerned officer alongwith copy of the execution application should have been communicated and ample time to the officers should have been afforded to enable them to

Revision Petition No. 85 of 1999.

put in appearance. If personal appearance is required in future of the concerned officer, he is to be given sufficient time as mentioned in the earlier part of the order. The revision petition is allowed and the impugned order is quashed. A copy of the order be given dasti to the counsel for the petitioner for official use only.

Sd/-
(Amarjeet Chaudhary)
President.

Sd/-
(A.D.Malik)
Member.

September 27, 1999.

Certified to be a true copy
Superintendent
State Consumer Disputes
Redressal Commission
Haryana, Chandigarh.