UTPE No. 104/2008

CORAM

Hon'ble Dr. Justice Arijit Pasayat Chairman

Hon'ble Mr. Rahul Sarin, Member

Hon'ble Ms. Pravin Tripathi Member

IN THE MATTER OF

D.G. [I & R]Complainant

Versus

Greater NOIDA Industrial
Development AuthorityRespondent

Appearances: Mr. C. Shanmugam, DDG for the D.G. [I & R]

None for the respondent

ORAL ORDER 19-08-2010

Issue afresh Notice to the respondent. The directions as contained in the order dated 22.04.2010 shall be complied with.

List the matter on 18th November, 2010.

[Dr. Arijit Pasayat] Chairman

> [Rahul Sarin] Member

UTPE No. 44/2007

CORAM

Hon'ble Dr. Justice Arijit Pasayat Chairman

Hon'ble Mr. Rahul Sarin, Member

Hon'ble Ms. Pravin Tripathi Member

IN THE MATTER OF

D.G. [I & R]Complainant

Versus

Vodaphone Essar Mobiles Co.

& another ...Respondents

Appearances: Mr. C. Shanmugam, DDG for the D.G. [I & R]

Mr. Ajit Kumar Singh, Advocate for the respondent

ORAL ORDER 19-08-2010

Representative of the D.G. [I & R] states that no rejoinder needs to be filed. As the proceedings are complete, the following issues are framed :-

- 1) Whether any unfair trade practice has been established, as alleged?
- 2) If the answer to the first question is in the affirmative, whether it is prejudicial to the public interest?

Affidavit of evidence of the complainant shall be filed within four weeks. If any documents are filed, the admission/denial shall take place on 27^{th} October,2010. The matter shall be listed on 15^{th} November, 2010.

[Dr. Arijit Pasayat] Chairman

> [Rahul Sarin] Member

C.A. No. 82/2008

CORAM

Hon'ble Dr. Justice Arijit Pasayat Chairman

Hon'ble Mr. Rahul Sarin, Member

Hon'ble Ms. Pravin Tripathi Member

IN THE MATTER OF

Dr. Archana AggarwalApplicant

Versus

Wipro GE Medical System Pvt.
Limited & othersRespondents

Appearances: None for the Applicant

Mr. Sumit Singh Benipal, Advocate for the

respondent

ORAL ORDER 19-08-2010

The matter shall be listed on 15th November, 2010.

[Dr. Arijit Pasayat] Chairman

> [Rahul Sarin] Member

UTPE No. 97/2008

CORAM

Hon'ble Dr. Justice Arijit Pasayat Chairman

Hon'ble Mr. Rahul Sarin, Member

Hon'ble Ms. Pravin Tripathi Member

IN THE MATTER OF

Lt. Col. (Retd.) Mohan Mamtani

....Complainant

Versus

M/s. Narne Construction Pvt. Ltd.

...Respondent

Appearances: Complainant in person

Mr. Bhagabati Prasad, Advocate for R-1

ORAL ORDER 19-08-2010

Admission/denial, in respect of the further documents filed by the complainant, shall be done on 25^{th} October, 2010. The matter shall be listed on 15^{th} November, 2010.

The reply to the Notice of Enquiry shall be filed during the course of the day, as undertaken. If it is not filed, the same shall not be taken on record.

[Dr. Arijit Pasayat] Chairman

> [Rahul Sarin] Member

UTPE No. 104/2001

CORAM

Hon'ble Dr. Justice Arijit Pasayat Chairman

Hon'ble Mr. Rahul Sarin, Member

Hon'ble Ms. Pravin Tripathi Member

IN THE MATTER OF

Kamlesh & othersComplainants

Versus

NOIDA ...Respondent

Appearances: Mr. Uchit Bhandari, Advocate for the Complainants

Mr. Ravinder Kumar, Advocate for the respondent

ORAL ORDER 19-08-2010

We have heard at length the learned counsel for the complainants. We had asked him earlier to specify which provision of Section 36-A of the Monopolies & Restrictive Trade Practices Act, 1969 (in short the "Act") covers his case. He refers to Section 36A(1)(vi) of the Act. The said provision reads as follows:-

"36-A Definition of Unfair trade practice – In this Part, unless the context otherwise requires, "unfair trade practice" means a trade practice which, for the purpose of promoting the sale, use or supply of any goods or for the provision of any services [adopts any unfair method or unfair or deceptive practice including any of the following practices]; namely –

(1) the practice of making any statement, whether orally or in writing or by visible representation which, -

XXX XXX XXX

(vi) makes a false or misleading representation concerning the need for, or the usefulness of, any goods or services;"

The basic case of the complainant is that the District Magistrate who had undertaken the process of verification to find out which persons were operating in the concerned place had given the report, which according to him was of 12 pages. In the reply filed by the respondent, the entire documents running into 12 pages have been filed. The stress of the learned counsel for the applicant was that the list should have been of 12 pages. reading of a letter of the District Magistrate, we do not find any substance in the plea. As a matter of fact a list of vegetable vendors has been given. It contains 19 names and the names of the applicants do not find place in that list. There are separate lists made for different types of vendors e.g. vegetable vendors, fruit vendors and meat vendors etc. Therefore, the stand of the complainants that there were other lists of vendors annexed by the District Magistrate has no substance. In any event, clause referred to by the learned counsel for the complainant does not apply to this case, as prayer was for a direction to the Authority to give him Tender Form so that he can participate. In the present proceedings such direction cannot be given. On the contrary allegations in the petition do not refer to any of the infractions enumerated in Section 36A of the Act. It only speaks of alleged faulty working style of the respondent. That being so, this petition is without substance and is dismissed.

> [Dr. Arijit Pasayat] Chairman

> > [Rahul Sarin] Member

C.A. No. 101/2006

CORAM

Hon'ble Dr. Justice Arijit Pasayat Chairman

Hon'ble Mr. Rahul Sarin, Member

Hon'ble Ms. Pravin Tripathi Member

IN THE MATTER OF

D.G. [I & R]

....Complainant

Versus

The Managing Director, Delhi Financial Corporation

...Respondent

Appearances: Mr. C. Shanmugam, DDG for the D.G. [I & R]

None for the respondent

ORAL ORDER 19-08-2010

Heard the representative of the D.G. [I & R]. The basic dispute is whether the property can be auctioned. Such a question cannot be examined under the provisions of Monopolies & Restrictive Trade practices Act, 1969 (in short the "Act"). The compensation application is, therefore, dismissed.

[Dr. Arijit Pasayat] Chairman

> [Rahul Sarin] Member

C.A. No. 11/2008

CORAM

Hon'ble Dr. Justice Arijit Pasayat Chairman

Hon'ble Mr. Rahul Sarin, Member

Hon'ble Ms. Pravin Tripathi Member

IN THE MATTER OF

Keshav Kumar Singhal

....Applicant

Versus

AJS Builders Pvt. Ltd.

...Respondent

Appearances: Mr. S. K. Jha, Advocate for the Applicant

None for the respondent

ORAL ORDER 19-08-2010

Heard the learned counsel for the applicant. None appears for the respondent. On 3-11-2008, the respondent was set ex-parte and the notice issued was received with an endorsement "refused". On the next date of hearing, learned counsel for the respondent states that he would file an application to recall that order and that was not filed and finally on 14.05.2009, the Monopolies & Restrictive Trade Practices Commission (in short the "Commission") took a very dim view of the conduct of the respondent in delaying the proceedings and the application was permitted to be filed with condition a cost of Rs.1000/- was to be paid. It is stated that the cost has not been paid. However, on 4th September, 2009, the Commission was informed that the applicant proposes to file an application for withdrawing the compensation application. Time was granted till 6.11.2009 to file an application. Today learned counsel for the applicant states that the applicant does not want to withdraw his

Compensation Application. Though the application for setting aside the order was filed on 14.05.2010, no one appears to press that application when the matter was taken up today. That being so, the application for setting aside ex-parte order is rejected. The matter is now listed for framing of issues on 16.11.2010.

[Dr. Arijit Pasayat] Chairman

> [Rahul Sarin] Member

UTPE No. 43/2007

CORAM

Hon'ble Dr. Justice Arijit Pasayat Chairman

Hon'ble Mr. Rahul Sarin, Member

Hon'ble Ms. Pravin Tripathi Member

IN THE MATTER OF

Hema MehtaComplainant

Versus

Greater NOIDA Industrial Development Authority

...Respondent

Appearances: Mr. Rajiv Sharma with Ms. Shipra Shukla,

Advocates for the Complainant

Mr. Ravinder Kumar, Advocate for the respondent

ORAL ORDER 19-08-2010

The affidavit of evidence shall be filed within three weeks. If the same is filed along with documents, admission/denial of the documents shall take place on 25.10.2010 and the matter shall be listed on 15.11.2010.

[Dr. Arijit Pasayat] Chairman

> [Rahul Sarin] Member

RTPE No. 76/2000

CORAM

Hon'ble Dr. Justice Arijit Pasayat Chairman

Hon'ble Mr. Rahul Sarin, Member

Hon'ble Ms. Pravin Tripathi Member

IN THE MATTER OF

Ashok Kumar TiwariComplainant

Versus

Shakti Bhog Foods Ltd. ...Respondent

Appearances: Mr. A. S. Rana, proxy counsel for Mr. A.S.

Kulshreshtha, Advocate for the Complainant

Mr. P.N. Sharma, Advocate for the respondent

ORAL ORDER 19-08-2010

At the request of the respondent, the matter is adjourned to 16.11.2010.

[Dr. Arijit Pasayat] Chairman

> [Rahul Sarin] Member

UTPE No. 58/2008

CORAM

Hon'ble Dr. Justice Arijit Pasayat Chairman

Hon'ble Mr. Rahul Sarin, Member

Hon'ble Ms. Pravin Tripathi Member

IN THE MATTER OF

D.G. [I & R]Complainant

Versus

M/s. City Finance Consumer
Finance India Ltd. ...Respondent

Appearances: Mr. C. Shanmugam, DDG for the D.G. [I & R]

Ms. Archana Lakhotia, Advocate for the respondent

ORAL ORDER 19-08-2010

The matter shall be listed on 11.11.2010 for the purpose of cross-examination of the DG's witness.

[Dr. Arijit Pasayat] Chairman

> [Rahul Sarin] Member