



\$~29

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

% *Date of Decision: 04th July, 2025*

+ CM(M) 1137/2025 & CM APPL. 38479-38481/2025

PACIFICA (CHENNAI PROJECT) INFRASTRUCTURE CO. PVT.
LTD. NOW KNOWN AS PACIFICA BUILDERS PVT. LTD.

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Anirudh Sharma, Mr. Sanjeev
Kumar Sharma, Mr. Rajeev Dalal, Mr.
Ritik Bhanot & Ms. Adity J., Advs.

versus

TOWNSHIP PROJECT BUYERS ASSOCIATION

.....Respondent

Through: None.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN

J U D G M E N T (oral)

1. Petitioner is aggrieved by order dated 04.04.2025 whereby learned *National Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission* (in short 'NCDRC') has permitted the opposite party i.e. petitioner herein, to obtain the requisite *Compact Disc* (CD) and any other document, which is part of the record of NCDRC, from its Registry, and has also granted opposite party one week to file a reply, on receipt thereof.
2. Of course, the complainant itself, in the first place, should have ensured that the entire material is provided to the opposite party, without any delay.
3. This Court is also mindful of the fact that the complaint was lodged with the learned NCDRC way-back in the year 2017 and, till date, the entire



copy of complaint, CD and relevant documents have yet not been provided.

4. This Court, however, is compelled to appreciate the endeavour made by learned NCDRC, in this regard as, in order to ensure that there is no further delay in the matter, it has rather directed its Registry to supply all the relevant documents to opposite party and, simultaneously, the opposite party has also been permitted period of 30 days to file appropriate reply, on receipt of such documents.

5. To the abovesaid extent, the interest and rights of the opposite party have been duly protected.

6. Therefore, this Court does not see any reason to interfere with the impugned order, particularly also appreciating the fact that this happens to be a petition filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India wherein scope of appreciation is, even otherwise, very limited.

7. Since there is no illegality or perversity in the impugned order, the petition is hereby dismissed.

8. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

(MANOJ JAIN)
JUDGE

JULY 4, 2025/ck/pb