
(2008) 04 NCDRC CK 0069

In the National Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission

GURU NANAK DEV UNIVERSITY

APPELLANT

Vs

ANGREJ LAL

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 01-04-2008

Acts Referred:

Citation : 2008 0 CTJ 857 : 2008 4 CPJ 172

Hon'ble Judges : S.N.Kapoor , B.K.Taimni J.

Advocate : Ajit Singh

Judgement

1. -PETITIONER University was the opposite party before the District Forum, where the respondent/complainant had filed a complaint alleging deficiency in service on the part of the petitioner.

2. UNDISPUTED facts of the case are that the complainant, who was a student of M. A. (Punjabi), Part-I qualified in four papers at the time of final examination but on his request, the petitioner University allowed the complainant to re-appear in one paper (fifth paper), for which necessary formalities were completed and he was allotted roll number 2161 with "lailpur Khalsa College", Jalandhar as the centre of examination. It was the case of the complainant that when he went to this college to write this paper, he was not given admission by the Superintendent Incharge of the above centre, as "list of students" sent by the petitioner University did not contain the name of the respondent/complainant. The complainant approached the petitioner University and it appears that they washed their hands saying that necessary instructions have been issued and when the result was declared, against the complainant's Roll Number, name mentioned was Amandeep Singh, S/o Sewa Singh and declared "fail". It is in these circumstances, alleging deficiency in service on the part of the petitioner, a complaint was filed before the District Forum, who dismissed the complaint. Aggrieved by this order, the respondent/complainant filed an appeal before the State Commission, who allowed the appeal and directed the petitioner to pay a compensation of Rs. 20,000 to the respondent for harassment and mental pain as also awarded Rs. 1000 towards cost. Aggrieved by this order, this

revision petition has been filed before us. We heard the learned Counsel for the petitioner and perused the material on record.

Learned Counsel for the petitioner has also filed documents before us. We have carefully gone through the material and found that in the result sheet declared for M. A. 1st Year April, 2001, against Roll No. 2161, name of Amandeep Singh, s/o Sewa Singh is clearly mentioned. This is inherently contradictory to the statement filed by the petitioner before the District Forum in which it has been clearly stated that the complainant was allotted Roll Number 2161 which ostensibly seems to have been allotted to Amandeep Singh and not to the complainant, i. e. Shri Angrej Lal. It is this discrepancy, which led to the Superintendent of the "examination Centre" of declining admission to the Respondent/complainant for writing the examination for fifth paper of MA Part I, thus, clearly showing that the services rendered by the petitioner were deficient.

3. IN the aforementioned circumstances, we find no ground to interfere with the well reasoned order passed by the State Commission. The revision petition has no merit, hence dismissed. Revision Petition dismissed.