



\$~61 to 63, 7 and 8

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ CM(M) 4033/2024

M/S TDI INFRASTRUCTURE LTD.

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Kanika Agnihotri and Mr. Sachin
Sharma, Advocates.

versus

SURENDER SHARMA

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Jitender Vashisht, Advocate.

62.

+ CM(M) 4034/2024

M/S TDI INFRASTRUCTURE LTD

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Kanika Agnihotri and Mr. Sachin
Sharma, Advocates.

versus

KUSUM GAUR & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Jitender Vashisht, Advocate.

63.

+ CM(M) 4035/2024

M/S TDI INFRASTRUCTURE LTD

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Kanika Agnihotri and Mr. Sachin
Sharma, Advocates.

versus

VED PRAKASH

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Jitender Vashisht, Advocate.

7.

+ CM(M) 3814/2024

M/S TDI INFRASTRUCTURE LTD.

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Kanika Agnihotri and Mr. Sachin
Sharma, Advocates.



versus

KABITA BHATTACHARYARespondent
Through: Mr. Jitender Vashisht, Advocate.

8.

+ CM(M) 3815/2024
TDI INFRASTRUCTURE LTDPetitioner
Through: Ms. Kanika Agnihotri and Mr. Sachin
Sharma, Advocates.

versus

VED PRAKASHRespondent
Through: Mr. Jitender Vashisht, Advocate.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAVINDER DUDEJA

ORDER
% **10.12.2024**

CM APPL. 72147/2024 (exemption) in CM (M) 4033/2024

CM APPL. 72160/2024 (exemption) in CM (M) 4034/2024

CM APPL. 72162/2024 (exemption) in CM (M) 4035/2024

CM APPL. 66257/2024 (exemption) in CM (M) 3814/2024

CM APPL. 66260/2024 (exemption) in CM (M) 3815/2024

Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

These applications stand disposed of.

CM (M) 4033/2024 & CM APPL. 72146/2024 (stay)

CM (M) 4034/2024 & CM APPL. 72159/2024 (stay)

CM (M) 4035/2024 & CM APPL. 72161/2024 (stay)



CM (M) 3814/2024 & CM APPL. 66256/2024 (stay)

CM (M) 3815/2024 & CM APPL. 66259/2024 (stay)

1. The petitioner seeks to set aside the order dated 06.05.2024 passed by the National Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission [‘National Commission’] in first appeal Nos. 856/2020, 857/2020, 860/2020, 859/2020, 858/2020 and order dated 05.05.2020 passed by the State Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission [‘State Commission’] in Consumer Complaint bearing No. 1315/2016, 1316/2016, 1318/2016, 1317/2016.
2. The State Commission ruled in favour of the respondents directing the petitioner to refund the amount deposited with 12% interest with effect from date of deposit till realisation alongwith Rs. 30,000/- as litigation cost.
3. In appeal, the National Commission upheld the decision of the State Commission to award 12% interest rate on the refund, thereby rejecting the petitioner’s request to reduce it to 6% or 9%.
4. Issue notice. Notice is accepted by learned counsel representing the respondents. Written synopsis be filed by the respondents within four weeks.
5. Learned counsel for the petitioner has prayed for stay of execution pending before the State Commission. It is submitted that the petitioner has made the refund alongwith interest @ 9%.
6. Subject to the petitioner depositing the differential interest of 3% with the State Commission within a period of four weeks, the execution proceedings shall be stayed. The differential interest amount so deposited be kept in the shape of FDR in auto-renewal mode.
7. List on 26.03.2025.

RAVINDER DUDEJA, J

DECEMBER 10, 2024/v