

(2004) 08 NCDRC CK 0055

NATIONAL CONSUMER DISPUTES REDRESSAL COMMISSION

Case No: None

PERFECT COMPUTER AND
SERVICES

APPELLANT

Vs

SQN. LDR. B.M. SHUKLA

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision: Aug. 2, 2004

Citation: 2004 4 CPJ 387

Hon'ble Judges: J.D.Kapoor , Rumnita Mittal , Mahesh Chandra J.

Final Decision: Appeal dismissed

Judgement

1. THE present appeal has been directed against order dated 2.8.2000 passed by District Forum (Central), Delhi whereby the District Forum awarded compensation of Rs. 10,000/- and a further sum of Rs. 1,000/- as litigation expenses for deficiency in service inasmuch as it could not provide Pentium II processor to the respondent who purchased personal computer Pentium II for Rs. 18,000/- but the P.C. was not of the required specification and developed snags after two days as the same had been assembled by using sub-standard components. According to the appellant he had assured the respondent that he would replace the Celeron Processor 366 mhz along with personal computer as requested by the respondent and when the respondent found that it was a slow processor, he requested for Pentium processor but the same could not be supplied by the appellant because of Parliament elections.

2. FOR providing P. II processor the appellant demanded Rs. 4,700/- more which was paid by the respondent and the requisite processor was supplied. That even the P. II processor supplied by the appellant proved to be defective and as a result the study

of the children of the respondent suffered immensely. After having received an extra amount of Rs. 4,700/- from the respondent towards the cost of P-II Processor, the minimum expectations of the respondent was to have the working of the computer trouble free. It is no doubt that now-a-days the computers are being used by the students for better studies and, therefore, the mal-functioning of the computer on account of non-functioning of P. II processor caused immense loss in terms of studies of his children and non-replacement of the spare parts by the appellant amounts to gross deficiency in service and, therefore, respondent was rightly granted compensation of Rs. 10,000/- besides cost of litigation. There is no merit in the appeal and is dismissed accordingly. Appeal dismissed.