



CWP-27937-2025

-1-

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

116

CWP-27937-2025

Date of Decision: 24.03.2026

Ravinder Kaur

...Petitioner

Versus

District Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission and others**...Respondents****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL**

Present: - Mr. Fatehjeet Singh, Advocate (*through video conferencing*)
and Mr. Vishal Sauda, Advocate for the petitioner

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking setting aside of order dated 01.04.2024 whereby District Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission (for short '**Commission**') has observed that in view of declaration of moratorium by National Company Law Tribunal ('**NCLT**') the proceedings against the company cannot be allowed to continue.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner filed Execution Application No.77 of 2014 before Commission seeking execution of order dated 17.02.2014 passed by it. The Commission rejected his application and he preferred appeal before State Commission which was withdrawn with liberty to approach before appropriate Forum. The petitioner has no remedy except to approach this Court.

3. On being asked about status of proceedings pending before NCLT, as noticed in impugned order, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he is unaware about present status of the company. He is not a secured creditor, thus, cannot approach NCLT.

**CWP-27937-2025****-2-**

4. Heard the arguments and perused the record.

5. From the perusal of record, it is evident that Commission vide order dated 17.02.2014 allowed petitioner's complaint. On account of non-implementation of award, he approached Commission seeking execution of order dated 17.02.2014. The Commission held that proceedings against company cannot be initiated in view of declaration of moratorium by NCLT. The petitioner has not furnished name of any person against whom criminal proceedings are to be initiated. The petitioner was granted liberty to file fresh execution application by furnishing name of OP No.4 who did not comply with the order.

6. The petitioner is unable to point out present status of the company. The petitioner could have approached Resolution Professional or NCLT and if proceedings are still going on, may approach aforesaid authorities. The petitioner may also approach Commission as per liberty granted to him to initiate criminal proceedings against OP No.4.

7. In the backdrop, this Court is of the considered opinion that petitioner may approach aforesaid forums for the redressal of his grievance. At this stage, there seems no reason to interfere in the impugned order.

8. The petition stands disposed of in above terms.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

24.03.2026
Mohit Kumar

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No