

## Telecom Sector

S. NO.	LINK	FACT OF THE CASES	CITATION	FORUM	CASE NO.	DATE OF JUDGEMENT	JUDGEMENT WITH THEME
1.	<a href="http://cms.nic.in/ncdrusersWeb/GetJudgement.do?method=GetJudgement&amp;caseidin=0%2F0%2FRP%2F4184%2F2012&amp;dtofhearing=2014-04-21">http://cms.nic.in/ncdrusersWeb/GetJudgement.do?method=GetJudgement&amp;caseidin=0%2F0%2FRP%2F4184%2F2012&amp;dtofhearing=2014-04-21</a>	Brief facts of the case are that complainant/respondent applied for a site developed by OP/petitioner and deposited Rs.1, 10,244/- by the end of 1999. In spite of several requests, possession of site was not given to the complainant. Alleging deficiency on the part of OP, complainant filed complaint before District forum. OP/petitioner resisted complaint and submitted that site allotted to the complainant was not approved by the Government of Karnataka vide letter dated 7.9.2004. Intimation was given to the complainant vide letter dated 27.9.2006. It was further submitted that OP issued letter to receive refund of the amount and prayed for dismissal of complaint.	<p>Sri Namadev Krishna Hiremani (Complainant /Petitioner) Versus The Commissioner, City Corporation (Respondent)</p> <p>The Commissioner, City Corporation (Appellant/Petitioner) Versus Sri Namadev Krishna Hiremani (Respondent)</p> <p>The Commissioner, City Corporation (Petitioner) Versus Sri Namadev Krishna Hiremani (Respondent)</p>	<p>DISTRICT FORUM</p> <p>SCDRC Bangalore</p> <p>NCDRC</p>	<p><i>Complaint no.</i></p> <p><i>First appeal no.1357/2007</i></p> <p><i>Revision petition no.4184 of 2012</i></p>	<p>22.05.2008</p> <p>21.04.2014</p>	<p>Allowed complaint and directed OP to deliver possession of plot and execute sale deed and further awarded Rs.2,000/- as compensation and Rs.1000/- as costs alleging deficiency in service on the part of OP.</p> <p>Dismissed the appeal and upheld the order of District Forum on the same ground.</p> <p>National commission dismissed the application for condonation of delay, therefore, dismissed the revision petition as barred by limitation at admission stage with no order as to costs.</p>
2.	<a href="https://lexofy.com/document/2fc3c50c1f99d436c70916a979205469">https://lexofy.com/document/2fc3c50c1f99d436c70916a979205469</a>	Briefly stated, the facts of this case are that the revision petitioner herein who is the original complainant had entrusted the work of constructing a residential building with a plinth area of 600 sq. ft. @ Rs.750/- per sq. ft. to the respondents/opposite parties on 23.6.2008. As per the agreement between the parties, the construction of the building was to be completed by January, 2009. The opposite parties had also agreed to construct a compound wall at a cost of Rs.20,000/-.	G.Subramania pillay (Complainant) Versus M.Unnikrishan & anr. (Respondents)	District forum Palakkad	<i>Complainant case no. 252/2012 &amp; 608/2012</i>	28.1.2012	The District Forum vide its order partly accepted the complaint in terms of the following reliefs: - “We direct the opposite parties jointly and severally liable to pay to the complainant an amount of Rs.50,000/- as compensation for mental agony and pay Rs.3, 000/- as cost of the proceedings.

		<p>The period of construction was extended for another six months in February, 2009. As per the allegation in the complaint, the complainant had paid Rs.6.2 Lakhs against the cost of construction which came to Rs.4.55 Lakhs. Since there was delay in the completion of the construction within the stipulated time, the complainant filed a consumer complaint claiming Rs.1,65,000/- being the excess payment to the opposite parties and Rs.20,000/- for the depreciation of the building and Rs.45,000/- as rental value for 15 months and Rs.60,000/- by way of compensation for the damages with interest.</p>	<p>G.Subramania pillay (Appellants) Vers M.Unnikrishan &amp;anr. (Respondent)</p>	<p>SCDRC Thiruvananthapuram</p>	<p><i>Appeal no.252&amp;6 08/2012</i></p>	<p>17.4.2013</p>	<p>Order shall be complied within one month from the date of receipt of order, failing which the complainant is entitled for 9% interest per annum for the whole amount from the date of order till realization”.</p> <p>Appellant /complainant had appealed against the order of the District Forum and prayed for higher compensation. State Commission reduced the amount of compensation awarded by the District Forum in favour of the complainant/petitioner from Rs.50,000/- to Rs.30,000/- but confirmed the rest of the order.</p> <p>NCDRC did not find any merit and any such instance which would justify interference with the impugned order in this revision petition which is liable for dismissal. The revision petition was therefore, dismissed but with no order as to cost.</p>
			<p>G.Subramania pillay (Petitioner) Versus M.Unnikrishan &amp;anr. (Respondent)</p>	<p>NCDRC</p>	<p><i>Revision petition no. 2959-2960 /2013</i></p>	<p>24.7.2014</p>	