

BOMBAY ANDHRA TRANSPORT CO. v. GIRIJAN CO-OP CORPORATIVE LTD

BOMBAY ANDHRA TRANSPORT CO.

...Appellant

GIRIJAN CO-OP CORPORATIVE LTD

...Respondent

Case No: REVISION PETITION NO. 88 OF 2005

Date of Judgement: 04 October 2023

Judges:

A. P. SAHI
PRESIDENT

For Appellant: MR. SHIVA NARANG, ADVOCATE

For Respondent: None.

Facts:

This is a Revision Petition filed before the National Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission against the Order dated 12/10/2004 passed in Appeal No. 297/2002 by the State Commission, Andhra Pradesh. The petitioner is Bombay Andhra Transport Co. The respondents are Girijan Co-op Corporative Ltd & Anr and M/s Oriental Aromatics Ltd.

Court's Elaborate Opinion:

The Counsel sought adjournment stating that information regarding the status of a related case pending in the High Court is not available. The status report available on the High Court website indicates that the related case is still pending admission in the High Court. The complaint pertains to a small amount of Rs. 50,000 filed way back in 2001. It is possible the litigant has lost interest in pursuing this old matter.

Referred Sections:

No sections have been referred to.

Referred Laws:

No laws have been referred to.

Order:

Revision Petition consigned to records for want of prosecution by the petitioner, without prejudice to petitioner's rights to seek restoration within permissible limits if any orders become available from the High Court.

Case Laws Referred:

No case laws were referred in the order.

Download

Court

Copy

<https://dreamlaw.in/wp-content/uploads/2023/12/download21.pdf>

Full Text of Judgment:

1. Today when the matter is taken up learned counsel seeks an adjournment on the ground that the information from the High Court has not yet been made available finally except the status report which is available on the website.
2. The said status report indicates that it is still pending admission. This was also noticed in the order dated 01.09.2023, when the learned counsel had been called upon to seek final information or any status by getting the records at the High Court checked up.
3. Learned counsel submits that no information could be received, as a matter of fact no further information is available therefore adjournment is sought.
4. What appears is that the complaint was for a very small amount of Rs.50,000/- and odd that was staked way back in the year 2001. It is quite possible that the litigant may have lost interest in pursuing this matter as a result whereof no information is being furnished by the learned counsel as desired earlier.
5. Accordingly, this revision is consigned to record for want of prosecution on the part of the revisionist without prejudice to his

rights to seek any restoration within the permissible limits in the event there are any orders available from the High Court of Andhra Pradesh.