

NATIONAL CONSUMER DISPUTES REDRESSAL COMMISSION

NEW DELHI

REVISION PETITION NO. NC/RP/1414/2025

(Against the Order dated 26th May 2023 in Appeal SC/3/A/562/2022 of the State Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission Punjab)

WITH

NC/IA/13457/2025 (CONDONATION OF DELAY)

NC/IA/13458/2025 (DIRECTIONS)

RUP CHAND BHARDWAJ

PRESENT ADDRESS - H. NO.715 A MIG SUPER PHASE XI SECTOR
65FEROZEPUR,PUNJAB.

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

PUNJAB STATE POWER CORPORATION LTD.

PRESENT ADDRESS - SUB DIVISIONAL OFFICER, P.S.E.B, INDUSTRIAL AREA , PHASE
1FEROZEPUR,PUNJAB.

.....Respondent(s)

BEFORE:

HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SAROJ YADAV , PRESIDING MEMBER

FOR THE PETITIONER:

FOR THE PETITIONER : MR. AMIT DWIVEDI, ADVOCATE MR. ANIKET KUMAR,
ADVOCATE

FOR THE RESPONDENT:

FOR THE RESPONDENT : NEMO

DATED: 05/01/2026

ORDER

1. The present Revision Petition has been filed under Section 58 (1) (b) of the Consumer Protection Act, 2019 by the petitioner/complainant being aggrieved of the order dated 26.05.2023 and 10.08.2023 in RA No. 12 of 2023, passed by the learned Punjab State Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission, Chandigarh, (for short the 'State Commission') in First Appeal No.562 of 2022, arising out of the order dated 13.05.2022 passed by the learned District Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission, Fatehgrah Sahib (for short the 'District Commission') in Complaint Case No.108 of 2018.

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner on the delay condonation application being IA/13457/2025 and also on the Memo of Revision.

3. The present revision petition has been filed with a delay of 707 days as reported by the Registry and a delay of 679 days as mentioned by the petitioner, beyond the prescribed period of 90 days for filing of the revision petition.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is an 83 old senior citizen with limited means therefore, he could not file the revision petition within the time. He further submitted that the petitioner was suffering with age related issues. The time was also consumed in seeking the legal-aid for filing of the present petition.

5. The reasons given in the delay condonation application as well as the submissions made are not sufficient and convincing enough to condone such a huge delay in filing of this revision petition. Furthermore, on the merits also, there appears no illegality, irregularity or jurisdictional error in the orders passed by both the foras below.

6. Admittedly, when the meter was placed by the respondent at a wrong place and the petitioner raised the grievance before the Respondent and that was heard and the meter was put at a right place within a short time. Why the complaint was not raised by the petitioner before the respondent, alleging that no electricity was running or made available to the petitioner through the meter installed, has not been convincingly explained.

7. Both the foras below have considered these points in detail and rightly came to the conclusion that no relief should be granted to the petitioner / complainant.

8. Hence, the present revision is dismissed as time-barred and also lacking merits, at the admission stage itself.

Interim applications pending, if any, shall stand disposed of accordingly.

Let the file be consigned in the record room after necessary action.

.....J
SAROJ YADAV
PRESIDING MEMBER