

**(1994) 06 NCDRC CK 0003**

**In the National Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission**

CHIRAYINKIL C.P.BHADRAKUMAR

APPELLANT

Vs

S.MAHENDRAN

RESPONDENT

---

**Date of Decision :** 17-06-1994

**Acts Referred:**

**Citation :** 1994 0 NCDRC 90 : 1994 1 CLT 295 : 1994 2 CPJ 112

**Hon'ble Judges :** V.BALAKRISHNA ERADI , Y.KRISHAN , B.S.YADAV J.

**Advocate :** K.V.VISVANATHAN , K.R.NAMBIAR , S.G.G.Nair

---

**Judgement**

1. AFTER hearing the Counsel appearing on both sides we are constrained to remand this case to the State Commission for fresh disposal on the ground that the impugned Order passed by the State Commission is absolutely cryptic in nature and does not contain any discussion whatever of the materials adduced in evidence nor does it furnish any clue as to the reasons which prompted the State Commission to come to the conclusions that have been incorporated by it in the impugned Order.

2. THE Order in appeal before us does not satisfy the minimal requirements of law that when a judicial or quasi judicial authority renders a decision against which an appeal or revision lies there should be a speaking Order discussing the evidence and stating the reasons for the conclusions recorded by the authority. The appeal is accordingly allowed on the aforesaid limited ground and the complaint petition is remanded to the State Commission for fresh disposal in accordance with law on the merits untrammelled by any of the observations or conclusions in the earlier Order. The parties will bear their respective costs.