
(1994) 05 NCDRC CK 0027

In the National Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission

METRO CHEM INDUSTRIES

APPELLANT

Vs

NATIONAL INSURANCE CO. LTD.

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 10-05-1994

Acts Referred:

Citation : 1994 0 NCDRC 135 : 1994 2 CPJ 118 : 1995 2 CLT 399

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

Advocate : RAJENDRA SINGHVI , R.P.BHATT , TANUJA SHEEL , P.R.AGARWAL

Judgement

1. COUNSEL appearing on both sides have agreed before us that the dispute forming the subject matter of this Original Petition may be referred for consensual adjudication to Mr. Justice R.C. Mankad, former Judge of the Gujarat High Court, Ahmedabad for adjudication of all the issues arising in the case as disclosed by the records which will be transmitted to him. We are informed by Mr. R.P. Bhatt, Senior Advocate, that Justice Mankad is willing to undertake this assignment. He may fix the terms regarding remuneration. A complete set of record will be forwarded to Mr. Justice Mankad at the address furnished by Mr. Bhatt, by the Registrar of this Commission.

2. THE parties will appear before Justice Mankad on the 27th May, 1994 at 11.00 a.m. at his residence to receive directions from the learned Judge as to the dates on which he would conduct adjudication. Mr. Mankad is requested to complete the adjudication as far as possible within a period not exceeding four months from today. After completion of the adjudication the records together with the report incorporating the findings of the adjudicator will be forwarded to this Commission and thereafter an order will be passed by this Commission after considering the findings of the Adjudicator. It is made clear that the adjudication to be conducted by Mr. Justice Mankad is only a consensual adjudication and not an arbitration under the Arbitration Act. We may mention that Mr. Bhatt submitted before us that the Insurance Company has agreed to the above process of consensual adjudication only on the basis of the special facts and circumstances of this case and that it may not be treated as a precedent.