

Company: Sol Infotech Pvt. Ltd.

Website: www.courtkutchehry.com

Printed For:

Date: 23/10/2025

PERFECT COMPUTER AND SERVICES Vs SQN. LDR. B.M. SHUKLA

None

Court: NATIONAL CONSUMER DISPUTES REDRESSAL COMMISSION

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 alog 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.