

**DEVENDRA KUMAR GOEL V.
ANTRIKSH DEVELOPERS AND
PROMOTERS PVT. LTD.**

**Devendra Kumar Goel Vs. Antriksh Developers and Promoters Pvt.
Ltd.**

1. DEVENDRA KUMAR GOEL
KC-102/2, OLD KAVI NAGAR, GHAZIABAD-201002
GHAZIABAD, UTTAR PRADESH

.....Appellants(s)

Versus

1. ANTRIKSH DEVELOPERS AND PROMOTERS PVT. LTD.
34/C-8, SECTOR-8, ROHINI, DELHI-110085
NORTH WEST, DELHI
2. SMT MANSI GOEL
KC-102, OLD KAVI NAGAR
GHAZIABAD
UTTAR PRADESH

.....Respondent(s)

Case No. : REVIEW APPLICATION NO. 418 OF 2023

Date of Judgement : 04 December 2023

Judges : MR. SUBHASH CHANDRA

For Appellant :

For Respondent :



Facts

- *This is a Review Application no. 418 of 2023 filed seeking review of order dated 20.09.2023 passed in CC/474/2017*
- *The original case was filed by Devendra Kumar Goel against Antriksh Developers and Promoters Pvt. Ltd. and Smt Mansi Goel*
- *Devendra Kumar Goel had alleged deficiency in service on part of Antriksh Developers*
- *The impugned order held that there was no deficiency in service but still directed payment with interest @ 9% p.a. to the complainant*

Court's Elaborate Opinions

- *The court considered the review application*
- *The court noted that Antriksh Developers has been held liable for the admitted delay in the impugned order*
- *The court did not find any error apparent on the face of the record*
- *The court held that no reason warranting review of the impugned order exists*

Sections

- ***The review application has been filed under Section 60 of the Consumer Protection Act, 2019***

Referred Laws

- ***Consumer Protection Act, 2019***

Order

- ***Review Application no. 418 of 2023 has been dismissed***

Download	Court	Copy
: https://dreamlaw.in/wp-content/uploads/2023/12/task-16-nitis-hu.pdf		

Full text of Judgement :

1. The review application under section 60 of the Consumer Protection Act, 2019 has been filed alleging that the impugned order dated 20.09.2023 holds that there is no deficiency in service on the part of opposite party no.1 but directs payment with interest @ 9% per annum to the complainant.

2. The review application has been considered. The opposite party no.1 has been held liable for the admitted delay in the impugned order. No error apparent on the face of the record is seen. No reason warranting review of the order therefore, exists.

3. Review application no.418 of 2023 is accordingly dismissed.

–END–