

RAHEJA DEVELOPERS LIMITED V. MANJIT KAUR MEIJE

Raheja Developers Limited Vs. Manjit Kaur Meije

Case No. : APPEAL EXECUTION NO. 231 OF 2023

1. RAHEJA DEVELOPERS LIMITED

**W4D 204/5, KESHAV KUNJ WESTERN AVENUE, BLOCK-
H NEB SARAI, SAINIK FARM NEW DELHI-110062**

2. NAVIN RAHEJA

**W4D 204/5 KESHAV KUNJ WESTERN AVENUE, NEB
SARAI SAINIK FARM NEW DELHI-110062**

3. AJAY SINGH CHOHAN

**H.NO. 711, THIRD FLOOR, GURUDWARA ROAD GURU
ANGAD NAGAR WEST, LAXMI NAGAR EAST DELHI,
DELHI-110092**

.....Appellant(s)

Versus

1. MANJIT KAUR MEIJE

.....Respondent(s)

Case No. : APPEAL EXECUTION NO. 232 OF 2023

1. M/S RAHEJA DEVELOPERS LIMITED

**W 4D 204/5, KESHAV KUNJ WESTERN AVENUE, BLOCK-
H NEB SARAI, SAINIK FARM NEW DELHI-110062**

2. NAVIN RAHEJA

W 4D-204/5, KESHAV KUNJ WESTERN AVENUE, BLOCK-
H NEB SARAI, SAINIK FARM NEW DELHI-110062

3. AJAY SINGH CHOCHAN
H.NO. 711, THIRD FLOOR, GURUDWARA ROAD GURU
ANGAD NAGAR WEST, LAXMI NAGAR EAST DELHI,
DELHI-110092

.....Appellant(s)

Versus

1. BALRAJ SINGH MIJIE

.....Respondent(s)

Date of Judgement : 04 December 2023

Judges : MR. SUBHASH CHANDRA

DR. SADHNA SHANKER

For Appellant : MR. SUKUMAR PATTJOSHI, SR. ADVOCATE WITH

**MR. SIDDHARTH BANTHIA, MR. RAM
KRISHNA RAO,**

**MR. RAJNISH KUMAR SINGH, ADVOCATES
(PHYSICAL)**

For Respondent : MR. HIMANSHU RAV, MS. SAPNA RANDHAWA,

**MS. ANSHU CHAUDHARY, ADVOCATES
(THROUGH VC)**

Facts

- ***These are two appeal executions filed by Raheja Developers Limited, Navin Raheja, and Ajay Singh Chohan***

(Appellants) against orders dated 26/07/2023 passed in two consumer complaint cases by the State Commission Chandigarh.

- *The complaints were filed by Manjit Kaur Meije and Balraj Singh Mijie (Respondents) against the Appellants regarding some consumer dispute.*
- *On 21/09/2023, the National Commission had passed an order directing the Appellants to comply with something, which they failed to do.*
- *Instead of complying with the order, the Appellants deposited certain amounts with ICICI Bank and took the plea that the Commission's order has been complied with.*

Court's Elaborate Opinions

- *The Commission held that the Appellants' actions are contrary to the directions given in the order dated 21/09/2023 and the undertaking given by them earlier.*
- *It observed that the order has not been complied with by the Appellants.*
- *The Commission dismissed both the appeal executions due to non-compliance of its previous order by the Appellants.*

Sections and Referred Laws

- *The appeals are filed under the Consumer Protection Act 1986.*
- *No specific sections or laws have been referred to in the order.*
- *The Respondents have been allowed to pursue their remedies against the Appellants before the executing court/forum.*



Download **Court** **Copy**
: <https://dreamlaw.in/wp-content/uploads/2023/12/task-6-nitishu.pdf>

Full text of Judgement :

Order dated 21.09.2023 has not been complied with. The Appellant has instead deposited, as per his submission today, the amounts with the ICICI Bank and is now taking the plea that the order of this Commission has been complied with. This is absolutely contrary to the direction of this Commission and the undertaking given by the Appellant on the previous date of hearing.

The Appeal Executions are, therefore, dismissed.

The Respondents are at liberty to pursue their remedies before the executing court.

-END-