

(2006) 01 NCDRC CK 0080

In the National Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission

JUNIOR TELECOM OFFICER, GINGEE

APPELLANT

Vs

A.THANIKACHALAM

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 03-01-2006

Acts Referred:

Citation : 2006 1 CPC 607 : 2006 2 CPJ 81

Hon'ble Judges : K.Sampath , PonGunasekaran J.

Final Decision : Appeal dismissed

Judgement

1. THE opposite party in O.P. No. 33/98 on the file of the District Consumer Disputes Redressal Forum, Villuppuram, is the appellant.

2. THE short facts are that the complainant who as a Councillor in Chengi Town Panchayat had his telephone disconnected on the ground that he had not paid the bill of Rs. 1,106 dated 1.7.97. According to the complainant, he had paid the charges for the bill on 21.7.97 and obtained a receipt bearing No. 90. As soon as he obtained a receipt he informed the appellant/opposite party that he had paid the charges, still on 4.8.97 his telephone was disconnected. THE said part of it is that even after he called the officer and told him that he had paid the bill and he had also given the receipt number. Still, the telephone was disconnected. This would clearly amount to deficiency in service as found by the District Forum. Accordingly to the opposite party, they had asked the complainant to meet them at their office and produce the bill. THE complainant had informed them and had also given the receipt number, still the telephone was disconnected. THE appellant had all the means to find out through its accounts section whether what the complainant had stated was true or not. Without verifying the same, it was indeed wrong on its part to have directed disconnection of the telephone. On the above reasoning, the District Forum granted relief to the complainant. In our view, the reasoning and the conclusion reached by the District Forum are perfectly justified and absolutely no interference is called for. It is a very common feature these days the public bodies do not update their records, have a knack for harassing people by asking for production of receipts and bills and

drive them from pillar to post to get even routine things done. Time was when people joined duty, did duty and retired from duty. Nowadays the whole concept has changed. Nobody is willing to concede that people are the masters and it is only their tax money that feeds the public bodies. We wonder whether anybody could get even the most lawful of things done on a single visit to the place concerned without being asked to come again. As one much respected columnist put it: for any one government job five people are employed; on any given day, two are absent and the other three: if they are not in the canteen, get together and discuss three very important matters-their promotion, increment and transfer and the hapless citizen is asked to come some other day as they are very busy that day. It is a sad reflection on the current state of affairs. Banks bounce cheques even when there are adequate funds in the account. The life policy or medical claim policy applicants suppress or lie about their previous health problems when they submit their proposal forms with the active connivance of insurance agents. Insurance Companies also take up cudgels to defeat even straightforward claims. Medical shops sell medicines with expiry dates long gone. Taxis and autos fleece people and if their unreasonable demands are not met, choicest epithets come gushing out from their mouths and the passengers have had it. It will be one of their unpleasantest days. In the present case, the complainant as a paying customer had the right to enjoy uninterrupted services and should not have been put through this harrowing experience.

In the result, the appeal fails and the same is dismissed. There will be no order as to costs. Appeal dismissed