



\$~39

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

% *Date of Decision: 04<sup>th</sup> July, 2025*

+ CM(M) 1145/2025 & CM APPL. 38687-38691/2025  
UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ruchir Mishra, Mr. Ramneek Mishra, Mr. Mukesh Kumar Tiwari, Ms. Reba Jena Mishra and Mr. Abhinav Singh, Advocates.

versus

DILIP KUMAR CHATURVEDI

.....Respondent

Through: None.

**CORAM:**  
**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN**

**J U D G M E N T** (oral)

1. The respondent had filed a consumer complaint before the learned District Consumer Forum, Durg.
2. Such complaint was allowed by the learned District Consumer Forum.
3. Feeling aggrieved, the petitioner herein filed an appeal before the learned State Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission, Chhattisgarh which was registered as First Appeal No.881/2018.
4. Fact, however, remains that the learned State Commission set aside the order passed by learned District Forum.
5. The complainant, accordingly, filed a revision petition before the learned National Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission (in short "NCDRC") which was registered as Revision Petition No.1104/2019 and



such Revision Petition has been disposed of by learned NCDRC and the order of the learned District Forum has been revised and the complaint has been allowed in part.

6. Such order dated 14.10.2024 is under challenge.

7. Since the entire cause of action pertaining to the present subject matter has arisen within the jurisdiction of Chhattisgarh High Court, in view of judgment dated 04.03.2024 passed by Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Siddhartha S Mookerjee vs. Madhab Chand Mitter, 2024 SCC OnLine SC 4205*, the petitioner should rather approach the concerned jurisdictional High Court.

8. In *Siddhartha S Mookerjee* (supra), the Hon'ble Supreme Court has, very categorically, observed that merely because learned NCDRC had allowed petition, the jurisdiction would not vest with Delhi High Court and observing that since the cause of action had arisen in Kolkata and the matter had been dealt with by the State Commission of West Bengal, it was held that the jurisdiction of High Court of Calcutta should have been invoked.

9. Moreover, this Court has already *vide* order dated 12.09.2024 passed in *General Manager, Punjab National Bank and Others vs. Rohit Malhotra: (2024) SCC OnLine Del 6415* observed that in view of *Siddhartha S Mookerjee* (supra), any such petitioner should go to the "jurisdictional High Court".

10. In view of the above, the present petition is disposed of as not maintainable on account of lack of jurisdiction. All the rights and contentions of the parties are reserved.

11. Needless to say, the petitioner would be at liberty to invoke the jurisdiction of the jurisdictional High Court i.e. Chhattisgarh High Court by



filing appropriate petition within a period of three weeks from today.

12. In the meanwhile, no coercive process in Execution Petition be taken from a period of three weeks from today to enable the petitioner to file petition before the jurisdictional of High Court.

13. The petition stands disposed of in aforesaid terms.

14. Pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

15. A copy of this Order be also transmitted to the learned District Consumer Forum, Durg by the Registry of this Court.

**(MANOJ JAIN)**  
**JUDGE**

**JULY 4, 2025/ss/SS**