



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
AT AMARAVATI [3299]
(Special Original Jurisdiction)**

TUESDAY, THE FIRST DAY OF JULY
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY FIVE

PRESENT

**THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE RAVI NATH TILHARI
IAs 1, 2 & 3 OF 2025**

IN

CIVIL REVISION PETITION NO: 2994/2024

Between:

M/s Indus Hospitals

...PETITIONER

AND

Rajeev Lochan Singh

...RESPONDENT

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. RAMANI ANNAM

Counsel for the Respondent:

1. PARTY IN PERSON

The Court made the following:

Heard Sri Ramani Annam, learned counsel for the review petitioner in I.A.No.2 of 2025, which is filed for review of the Judgment and Order passed by this Court dated 02.05.2025 in CRP.No.2994 of 2024.

2. Challenging the said Order dated 02.05.2025 in CRP No.2994 of 2024, SLP (C) No.14677 of 2025 was filed, on which, the Hon'ble Apex Court passed the following Order dated 27.05.2025:

"Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) brought to our notice the fact that the name of the Advocate, who was entrusted for filing the Review Petition in the year 2022, being Mr.G.V.R.Chowdary, was mentioned in the affidavit filed by the petitioner(s) herein dated 17.11.2023. This aspect has not been considered by the High Court while considering the correctness of the order passed by the National Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission in refusing to condone the delay of 21 days in filing the Revision Petition. Learned counsel further submitted that additional material could also be filed to indicate the reasons for the delay.

In the circumstances, we dispose of this Special Leave Petition by reserving liberty to the petitioner(s) herein to file a Review Petition before the High Court bringing to the notice of the High Court the aforesaid aspects and to persuade the High Court to review the impugned order.

In the event, the petitioner(s) is unsuccessful in seeking review of the impugned order, then liberty is reserved to the petitioner(s) herein to assail the

impugned order as well as the order to be made in the Review Petition, if so advised.

Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.”

3. On 27.06.2025 learned counsel for the petitioner made request for listing of the review petition citing urgency, as also the Order of the Hon’ble Apex Court dated 27.05.2025, as aforesaid. The permission was granted for the matter to be listed on 01.07.2025 at 3.30 p.m after obtaining the necessary orders from the Hon’ble the Chief Justice.

4. The matter has been so listed today.

5. Learned counsel for the review petitioner submits that before the National Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission, New Delhi (in short ‘National Commission’), in the revision filed by the petitioner, the name of the counsel, who lost the file in transit, was not disclosed.

6. The Order of the National Commission was challenged in CM (M) No.1818 of 2023 before the Delhi High Court. The Delhi High Court, by Order dated 07.11.2023, granted time to the petitioner to file an affidavit disclosing the name of the Advocate to whom the file was entrusted for filing revision in the year 2022.

7. Pursuant thereto, the petitioner filed affidavit in CM (M) No.1818 of 2023 before the Delhi High Court, disclosing the name of the Counsel in para-4 of the affidavit dated 17.11.2023 as ‘G.V.R.Chowdary’.

8. Copy of the said affidavit dated 17.11.2023 was annexed to the present civil revision petition as P6.

9. Learned counsel for the review petitioner further submits that any such affidavit dated 17.11.2023 was not filed before the National Commission.

10. Further, in the grounds taken in the Memo of the present Civil Revision Petition, to challenge the Order of the National Commission, any such ground regarding disclosure of the name of the Counsel, who allegedly lost the file in transit was also not taken.

11. However, in the affidavit in support of the stay application filed with the Civil Revision Petition, in I.A.No.2 of 2024, in para-11 mention was made

that "While granting interim direction, the Hon'ble Court (i.e., Delhi High Court) also directed us to file affidavit by mentioning the name of Advocate who lost our file while travelling. On 17.11.2023 we have file the affidavit by mentioning the name of the advocate". He submits that the said affidavit dated 17.11.2023 was filed as P6.

12. From the aforesaid, it is evident and admitted to the petitioner's counsel that before the National Commission, the name of such counsel was not disclosed and the affidavit dated 17.11.2023 was also not filed before the National Commission, but the said affidavit was filed before the Delhi High Court for the first time, and in the Memo of Civil Revision Petition to challenge the Order of the National Commission, any ground with respect to affidavit dated 17.11.2023 was not raised before this Court.

13. However, considering the contents of para-11 of the affidavit, in support of the application, and the affidavit dated 17.11.2023, which was filed before the Delhi High Court (P6), without observing anything on such ground of review, issue notice to the respondent in I.A.No.1 of 2025 which is for condonation of delay in filing the review petition and also in I.A.No.2 of 2025 which is an application for review of the judgment dated 02.05.2025 to file the response.

14. In addition to the normal mode of service, learned counsel for the petitioner is permitted to take out personal notice for service on the respondent and file proof of service in the Registry by the next date.

15. List on 18.07.2025.

RAVI NATH TILHARI, J

Date: 01.07.2025

Dsr