

96

**NATIONAL CONSUMER DISPUTES REDRESSAL COMMISSION  
NEW DELHI**

**REVISION PETITION NO. 1300 OF 2015**

(Against the Order dated 05/02/2015 in Appeal No. 249/2014 of the State Commission Tamil Nadu)

1. D. THIRUVATEESWARAN & ANR. ....Petitioner(s)

Versus

1. CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVT.  
EMPLOYEES WELFARE HOUSING ORGANISATION .....Respondent(s)

**BEFORE:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE D.K. JAIN, PRESIDENT**

**HON'BLE MRS. M. SHREESHA, MEMBER**

**For the Petitioner : IN PERSON**

**For the Respondent : Mr.Abhijeet Sinha, Advocates**

**Dated : 20 Jul 2016**

**ORDER**

This Revision Petition, by an allottee of a flat under the Chennai Phase-II Housing Scheme, floated for the employees of Central Government, is directed against the order dated 5.2.2015, passed by the State Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission, Chennai (for short "the State Commission") in FA/249/2014. By the impugned order, the State Commission has dismissed the Appeal preferred by the Petitioner against the order dated 29.4.2014, passed by the District Consumer Disputes Redressal Forum, Thiruvallur (for short "the District Forum") in CC/28/2012. By the said order, the District Forum had dismissed the Complaint filed by the Petitioner, wherein he had prayed for a direction to the Respondent, namely, Chief Executive Officer, Central Government Employees Welfare Housing Organization to refund the amount of ₹47,300/-, collected from him towards the cost of the Community Centre and AOA Room, along with interest @ 18% p.a. A compensation, quantified at ₹1.5 lakh was also prayed for. The grievance of the Petitioner was that having collected the said amount, the Community Hall has not been constructed.

Taking note of the averments made by the Respondent in its written version to the effect that the revised plans for construction of the Community Centre, AOA Room have already been got approved and the construction is likely to commence soon, the prayer made by the Complainant has been rejected.

Having heard the Petitioner, who appears in person, and perused the written version filed on behalf of the Respondent, we do not find any jurisdictional error in the impugned order warranting our interference in Revisional jurisdiction.

The Revision Petition is dismissed accordingly.

.....J  
**D.K. JAIN**  
**PRESIDENT**

.....  
**M. SHREESHA**  
**MEMBER**