

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA  
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 2204 OF 2022

THE BRANCH MANAGER, OSL HYUNDAI . . . APPELLANT(S)

VERSUS

RUPARANJAN DAS & ORS. . . . RESPONDENT(S)

O R D E R

Being aggrieved by the judgment dated 25.10.2021 passed by the National Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission, New Delhi (NCDRC) in Revision Petition No.598/2021, the appellant is before this Court.

2. We have heard learned counsel for the appellant and learned senior counsel and learned counsel appearing for the respective respondents and perused the material on record.

3. The main argument raised by learned counsel for the appellant is that while respondent No.1/complainant filed a single complaint as against the four opposite parties in Consumer Complaint No. 275/2013 before the District Forum which was allowed and as against the said order, the matter travelled to the State Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission, Orissa in First Appeal No.367/2015 and other connected appeals which were dismissed and against which separate revision petitions

were filed before the NCDRC (Revision Petition No.598/2021 filed by the appellant herein), only the revision petition filed by the appellant herein was dismissed whereas the Revision Petition Nos. 375 and 450 of 2021 filed by the other respondents are pending consideration before the NCDRC.

4. Learned counsel for the appellant submitted that the appellant could not have been singled out whereas the other revision petitions are pending consideration. This may also lead to contradictory orders being passed by the NCDRC. In the circumstances, this Court may set aside the impugned order and remand the matter to the NCDRC so that Revision Petition No.598/2021 filed by the appellant herein could be clubbed with the aforesaid two revision petitions and the same could be heard and disposed of by a common judgment and order.

5. Learned counsel for respondent No.1 who was the complainant before the District Forum vehemently contended that in view of the impugned order being passed by the NCDRC all that remains is for the NCDRC to follow the said order and dismiss the other two revision petitions also. Therefore, it is unnecessary for this case to be remanded to the NCDRC.

6. However, learned senior counsel and learned counsel appearing for the other respondents also pointed out that they have their respective contentions to urge before the NCDRC and they have good case on merits and

hence the impugned order may not be an impediment for the NCDRC in the consideration of their revision petitions.

7. Having heard learned senior counsel and learned counsel appearing for the respective parties, we find that the ends of justice would be met in the instant case, if we set aside the impugned judgment of the NCDRC passed in Revision Petition No.598/2021 and remand this case to the NCDRC with a direction to the NCDRC to tag this matter with Revision Petition Nos.375 and 450 of 2021 and to hear the arguments on behalf of the respective parties and dispose the same by a common judgment and order. We say so for the salient reason that in respect of the same cause of action other matters pending before the NCDRC could not have been heard independently. This may lead to contradictory judgments and orders being passed.

8. In the circumstances, we set aside the impugned order, remand the matter and restore Revision Petition No.598/2021 on the file of the NCDRC and direct that Revision Petition No.598/2021 be tagged with Revision Petition Nos. 375 and 450 of 2021 so as to be heard together and disposed of by a common judgment and order.

9. Since the complaint was filed by respondent No.1 in the year 2013, we request the NCDRC to dispose of the Revision Petitions as expeditiously as possible.

10. Since the parties before this Court are represented

by their respective senior counsel and counsel, we direct them to appear before the NCDRC on 26.10.2026 without expecting any separate notices from the said Commission.

The appeal is allowed and disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

.....J.  
( B.V. NAGARATHNA )

.....J.  
( AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH )

NEW DELHI;  
SEPTEMBER 18, 2026

ITEM NO.28

COURT NO.2  
S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A  
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

SECTION XVII-A

Civil Appeal No(s). 2204/2022

THE BRANCH MANAGER, OSL HYUNDAI

Appellant(s)

VERSUS

RUPARANJAN DAS & ORS.

Respondent(s)

IA No. 188259/2025 - EARLY HEARING APPLICATION

Date : 18-09-2026 This matter was called on for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE B.V. NAGARATHNA  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH

For Appellant(s) : Mr. Aadya Rayanish Sinha, Adv.  
Mr. Sriram P., AOR  
Mr. Anandhu S Nair, Adv.  
Ms. Komal, Adv.

For Respondent(s) : Mr. Prafulla Kumar Bahera, adv.  
Mr. S. S. Nehra, AOR  
Ms. Monika Chaudhary, Adv.  
Mr. Sanjay Singh, Adv.  
Mr. Aditya Sharma, Adv.  
Dr. K.S. Bhati, Adv.

Mr. Jayant Muth Raj, Sr. Adv.  
Mr. Rajesh P., AOR  
Mr. S. M. Ansari, adv.  
Mr. Bhavya Sareen, Adv.

Mr. Amit Kumar Singh, AOR  
Ms. K. Enatoli Sema, Adv.  
Ms. Chubalemla Chang, Adv.  
Mr. Prang Newmai, Adv.

Mr. Sunil Mund, Adv.  
Mr. Mrityunjay Kumar Singh, Adv.  
Mr. Ramendra Mohan Patnaik, AOR

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following  
O R D E R

The Appeal is allowed and disposed of in terms of the  
signed order.

Pending application (s) shall stand disposed of.

(NEETU SACHDEVA)  
DEPUTY REGISTRAR

(signed order is placed on the file)

(DIVYA BABBAR)  
COURT MASTER (NSH)