

DISTRICT CONSUMER DISPUTES REDRESSAL COMMISSION, LUDHIANA.

Complaint No:601 dated 20.08.2013.

Date of decision: 03.12.2021.

Gurcharan Singh (since deceased) through his legal heirs

i)Shinder Kaur widow of Gurcharan Singh,

ii)Rajdeep Singh,

iii)Rajinder Singh

sons of Gurcharan Singh all legal heirs of deceased complainant Gurcharan Singh, all residents of Dhanaula, Tehsil and District Barnala.

.....Complainants

1.The Incharge/Authorized signatory, Mohan Dai Oswal Cancer Treatment & Research Foundation, G.T.Sherpur By Pass Road, Ludhiana-141009.

2.Dr. Yogesh Arora Sr.Consultant Depart of Mohan Dai Oswal Cancer Treatment & Research Foundation, G.T.Sherpur By Pass Road, Ludhiana-141009.

3.Doctor Nitin Aggarwal, Mohan Dai Oswal Cancer Treatment & Research Foundation, G.T.Sherpur By Pass Road, Ludhiana-141009.

.....Opposite parties

Complaint under Section 12 of the Consumer Protection Act.

QUORUM:

SH. K.K. KAREER, PRESIDENT

SH. JASWINDER SINGH, MEMBER

COUNSEL FOR THE PARTIES:

For complainants : None

For OP1 and OP2 : Sh. Hemant Kalia, Advocate.

For OP3 : Sh.Rajat Malhotra, Advocate

ORDER

PER K.K. KAREER, PRESIDENT

1. Briefly stated, the case of the complainant is that he was suffering from some urinary ailments for which he visited the OP1 hospital. On 10.03.2012, the complainant was examined by Dr.Raman Arora who referred the complainant to the OP3. OP3 advised him to get some lab tests conducted. After going through the lab reports, OP3 declared that the complainant was suffered from urinary bladder cancer and was required to be operated upon immediately. The complainant was further informed that a sum of Rs.10 lac to 12 lac would be incurred on the operation and the treatment of the complainant. After about 10 days, the complainant again visited the OP1 and was admitted by the OP3 vide No.483274 dated 10.03.2012. On 31.03.2012, the OP3 operated upon the complainant and removed the cancer from urinary bladder of the complainant. The complainant remained in the hospital of OP1 for one week and thereafter, OP3 assured the complainant that the operation was successful and the complainant was fully cured and was further advised to have cycle of chemotherapy and thereafter, the complainant was discharged from the hospital of the OP1. Subsequent to that, the complainant kept coming to the OP1 from time to time for chemotherapy which was concluded by the OP2 on various dates.

2. It is further alleged that in the last week of May 2012, the complainant developed acute pain in his belly upon which the complainant contacted OP3 who told him that this type of pain usually started due to the operation and there was no need to panic. OP3 further prescribed some medicines which the complainant kept taking as per the advise of the OP3. Thereafter, the complainant remained under the consistent care and treatment of the OP3. On 09.08.2012, the complainant again developed pain in his belly all of a sudden and was taken to Civil Hospital, Dhanaula on 09.03.2012 vide registration No.29890. In the said hospital, the complainant was treated and Dr.Rajesh Kumar got done the x-rayed of the belly of the complainant and all the doctors and attendants of the complainant were astonished to see that one scissor of the size of 7 to 10 inches was found inside the belly of the complainant. Dr.Rajesh Kumar in his report dated 09.08.2012 opined that a foreign body is visible in the deli vice area. Thereafter, the complainant was referred to Rajindera Hospital, Patiala/PGI Chandigarh vide Cr.No.8284 dated 09.08.2012. The complainant was taken to PGI where he was operated upon and the scissor was recovered from the belly of the complainant and he remained admitted in the PGI till 18.08.2012 and was still under treatment from the PGI. A sum of Rs.15 lac was spent upon the treatment and operation of the complainant. From the above facts, it is crystal clear that the OP3 failed to discharge his duties efficiently, carefully and with due diligence. Rather the OP3 acted in a highly negligent manner and caused mental and physical pain and agony to the complainant. The complainant made several visits to the office of OP1 to OP3 from time to time and request was made to refund the medical fee charged by them from the complainant and also to compensate him for the negligence of the OP3 but to no avail. Hence the complaint whereby it has been requested that the OPs be directed to pay a sum of Rs.5 lac spent on the treatment of the complainant alongwith Rs.15 lac as compensation for causing mental and physical tension to the complainant.

3. Upon notice, the OPs appeared and contested the complaint. In the written statement filed on behalf of the OP1 and OP2, it has been, inter alia, pleaded that the complaint is bad for

non-joinder of the necessary parties as Oriental Insurance Company, Feroze Gandhi Market, Ludhiana has not made a party. On merits, it has been pleaded that the OP3 Dr.Nitin Aggarwal left the services of the OP1 hospital from 11.09.2012 onwards. It has been admitted that on 10.03.2012, the complainant was examined by Dr.Raman Arora who referred him to OP3. It has also been admitted that initially the complainant was treated as outdoor patient and was attended by the OP3 who advised him some tests. It has, however, been denied that the complainant was told that his treatment would involve expenses of Rs.10 to 12 lac. It is not disputed that the complainant was admitted in the hospital on 10.03.2012 and the OP3 operated upon the complainant on 31.03.2012 and thereafter, the complainant remained admitted in the hospital for about one week and was advised for follow up action for the cycle of Chemotherapy. The complainant was finally discharged from the hospital. It is also admitted that the complainant had been visiting the hospital for Chemotherapy and thereafter, he did not turn up for follow up action, as advised. The operation was successful and the patient was recovering after the operation and never complained of any trouble. It has further been pleaded by the OP1 and OP2 that they are not aware that the complainant developed any pain on May 2012 and contacted OP3, who prescribed him any medicine. It must have been in the knowledge of the OP3 only. According to the OP1 and OP2, the complainant never approached them for treatment after chemo was given and as per the hospital record, he visited the hospital last time on 26.07.2012. It has also been denied that any scissor of size of about 7 to 10 inches was found inside the belly of the complainant. The OPs cannot admit or deny the report of Dr.Rajesh Kumar as the x-ray reports and films have not been supplied to them. The alleged recovery of scissor was not done in the presence of the OPs. The report made by the doctor cannot be considered until the same is produced by the doctor by appearing in the Court. The rest of the averments made in the complaint have been denied as wrong and a prayer for dismissal of the complaint has also been made.

4. In separate written statement filed on behalf of the OP3, it has been, inter alia, pleaded that the OP3 is a qualified Urological Surgeon, M.B.B.S., M.S., M.Ch(Urology) and has successfully performed large number of challenging surgeries and has an impeccable record. The complaint is false and frivolous. According to the OP3, he was only a part of team of doctors who treated the complainant who was admitted in Medical Oncology Department on 10.03.2012. The bills were submitted by the complainant clearly show that the doctor incharge was Dr.Raman Arora. It has further been pleaded that no specific justifiable allegations have been made with regard to the negligence and deficient services against the OP3 and the complainant has miserably failed to show as to how the OP3 was negligent. Moreover, the OP3 is unaware about the events, as alleged by the complainant because the complainant never approached the OP3 for showing or removal of any retained surgical instrument nor discharge ticket of PGI has been produced on record along with the complaint to substantiate the vague allegations that a scissor was recovered from his abdomen. On merits, It has been admitted that the complainant had approached Oncology Department of OP3 for treatment. He was diagnosed having a extremely rare and life threatening disease i.e. Carcinoma Urachus Stage IV with severe hematuria. However, all the first stage tests and diagnoses were done by Dr.Raman Arora and no tests were ever prescribed by the OP3. All the tests were got done on the prescription of Dr.Aman Arora on 10.03.2012 itself. It has also been admitted that the complainant was admitted in the hospital as per the referral of Dr. Raman Arora. As a matter of fact, the complainant has acted as a puppet in the hands of the sworn enemies of OP3 namely Dr.Baldeep Singh, Dr.Gurmeet Kular, Mr.Rohit Kappor, all Directors of Mediways Hospital, Ludhiana who were inimical and jealous towards him for the reason that OP3 was earlier serving in Deep Hospital, Ludhiana and by virtue of sheer hard work and medical skills, he has attained a position whereby he has emerged as a strong contender for purchasing the Mediways Hospital.

5. It is further stated by the OP3 in the written statement that the complainant was operated upon by a team of doctors on 31.03.2012 as per their best ability and knowledge and all the needful were done in the best interest of the patient. The operation was successful for life threatening symptoms i.e. bleeding in urine. However, the OP3 never assured the patient that his primary disease i.e. Carcinoma Urachus Stage IV was fully cured. As per World's International Literature, Carcinoma Urachus Stage IV is not curable at all and the patient suffering from this disease has limited life span. OP3 has further pleaded that the patient never complained of any pain in abdomen during the time he visited the hospital for undergoing chemotherapy in the Oncology Department nor any OPD slip has been appended with the complaint to show that the complainant was attended to by the OP3 after operation. OP3 has further denied having any knowledge if the complainant ever visited the Civil Hospital, Dhanola for any pain or any x-ray. The complainant claims that a scissor size of 7 to 10 inches was found inside his belly but the report of Dr.Rajesh Kumar is not qua such scissor. According to the OP3, it has come to his knowledge from some reliable sources that the doctors at Dhanola had advised the complainant to visit the Oswal Hospital where his chemotherapy was going on. However, the complainant chose to use this occasion as toll of oppression and harassment and a way to extort money and in the process, he fell pray in the hands of the enemies of the OP3 who used this occasions to humiliate, harass and blackmail OP3. Further, OP3 gathered knowledge that the complainant was purposely got referred to PGI instead of Oswal Hospital by blackmailers to achieve their oblique motives. It has also been denied as if the OP3 failed to perform its duties efficiently, carefully or with due diligence rather OP3 has performed as per best of his ability along with the team of doctors and it was only due to this fact that the complainant survived for such a long period of more than 2 years after the operation though he was originally on the verge of losing his life when he reported to the Oswal Hospital. Such a long survival of a patient suffering from Carcinoma Urachus Stage IV(after the operation) is very rare as per the international literature. OP3 has further prayed for dismissal of complaint.

6. It is further pertinent to mention that during the pendency of the complaint, the complainant Gurcharan Singh died and vide order dated 25.08.2014, his legal heirs were ordered to be impleaded.

7. In evidence, Smt.Shinder Kaur, wife of the complainant tendered in evidence her affidavit Ex.CA along with documents Ex.C1 to Ex.C183 and closed the evidence. Further, Shinder Kaur had suffered statement that the evidence of complainant no.1 be also read the evidence of complainant no.2 Rajdeep Singh and complainant no.3 Rajinder Singh.

8. On the other hand, the OP1 and OP2 submitted affidavit Ex. RA of Dr.Yogesh Arora, Senior Consultant of Mohan Dai Oswal Cancer Treatment and Research Foundation, Ludhiana and that of Ex.RB of Sh.B.N.Gupta, General Manager of Mohan Dai Oswal Cancer Treatment and Research Foundation, Ludhiana along with documents Ex.R1, Ex.R2, Ex.OP1/1 and Ex.OP1/2 and thereafter, OP1 and OP2 failed to conclude their evidence and the same was closed by order vide order dated 10.09.2015.

9. Similarly, OP3 submitted affidavit Ex.RC of Dr.Nitin Aggarwal and closed the evidence.

10. None has been appearing on behalf of the complainant since 02.08.2021. We have, however, heard the counsel for the OPs and have gone through the record as well as written submissions made by counsel for the parties.

11. It has been claimed in the written arguments filed on behalf of the complainants that Dr.Nitin Aggarwal i.e. the OP3 admitted the complainant in the hospital of OP1 on 10.03.2012. On 31.03.2012, the OP3 operated upon the complainant and removed the cancer from the urinary bladder of the complainant. The complainant remained admitted in the hospital for one week. The complainant was informed by the OP3 that the operation was successful and he was cured and he was further advised for chemotherapy. The complainant had been attending the hospital of OP1 for chemotherapy from time to time. It has further been submitted that in the last week of May 2012, the complainant felt acute pain in the stomach, for which he again contacted the OP3 who advised him not to panic. On 09.08.2012, when the complainant felt acute pain in his stomach, he was taken to the Civil Hospital, Dhanaula where he was treated and Dr.Rajesh Kumar x-rayed the stomach of the complainant and found a scissor of the size of 7 to 10 inches in the stomach of the complainant. In his report dated 09.08.2012, Dr.Rajesh Kumar clearly gave his opinion that foreign body was visible in the delivice area. The complainant was taken to the PGI Chandigarh where he was operated upon and the scissor was removed. According to the complainant, this amounts to negligence on the part of the OPs especially the OP3 who must be held liable for the negligence and providing deficient services.

12. In the written arguments submitted on behalf of the OP1 and OP2, it has been claimed that allegations of negligence, if any, has been attributed to the OP3 but it is evident from the record that the complainant was suffering from a serious disease due to which he had a very limited life span. However, despite all this, he was operated upon by a specialized team in a successful manner. The complainant further responded well to the chemotherapy and radiation and during that process, the complainant never complained of any abdominal pain. According to the OP1 and OP2, if during the operation any such foreign substance would have been left in the stomach, it would have caused damage to the abdomen. The retention of scissor of size of 7 to 10 inches for such a long time is totally unimaginable. Moreover, there is not even an iota of evidence to prove the fact that scissor of 7 to 10 inches was negligently left by Dr.Nitin Aggarwal i.e. OP3 in the abdomen. OP1 and OP2 have prayed for dismissal of complaint.

13. On behalf of the OP3, it has been contended by counsel for the OP3 that the complainants have miserably failed to prove the case as against the OPs. Nothing was retrieved from the body of the complainant. To prove the fact that a foreign body was found in the stomach of the complainant, only one single view x-ray film has been attached which does not confirm the presence of a foreign body in the abdomen. No opinion of any qualified radiologist is attached. It has also been contended by counsel for the OP3 that in the abdomen x-ray, sometimes a shadow of metallic kripa or belt gives false artifact shadows. That does not mean that there is kripa in the abdomen of the patient. It has further been contended that in the AP view, anything coming between x-ray tube and x-ray camera would surface in the film. No lateral view was taken in this case. Only from the lateral view x-ray, the conditions about depth in the body could be ascertained. X-rays can be done in many ways such as AP view, lateral view or oblique view. In this case, multiple view x-rays were not taken to detect foreign body in the abdomen. In addition to this, counsel for the OP3 has further argued that even x-ray reports has not been validly proved on the file nor the concerned doctor namely Dr.Rajesh Kumar has been examined as a witness and the report of the Radiologist has also not been proved on record by the complainant. In absence of all these, it cannot be said to have proved beyond doubt that some scissor was recovered from the stomach of the complainant.

14. We have weighed the rival contentions raised by counsel for the parties.

15. In this case, it is not disputed that the complainant approached the OPs for his treatment as he was suffering from urinary blood cancer. It is further not disputed that the complainant was admitted in the hospital of the OP1 vide No.483274 dated 10.03.2012. It is further not disputed that on 31.03.2012, the OP3 operated upon the complainant and removed the cancer from the urinary bladder of the complainant. After the operation, the complainant had been coming to the hospital of the OP1 for chemotherapy.

16. The grievance of the complainant is that in the month of May 2012, he developed acute pain in his stomach and he came to the OP3 for check up and the latter prescribed some medicines. However, on 09.08.2012, the complainant again felt acute pain in his belly and was rushed to the Civil Hospital, Dhanaula and was treated there vide registration No.29890 where Dr.Rajesh Kumar x-rayed the belly of the complainant and doctors attending upon the complainant were surprised to see one scissor of size of 7 to 10 inches inside the belly of the complainant. Dr.Rajesh Kumar in his report dated 09.08.2012 stated that foreign body is visible in delivice area and thereafter, the complainant was taken to PGI Chandigarh where he was operated upon and the scissor was removed from the belly of the complainant and the complainant remained admitted in the PGI till 18.08.2012.

17. The controversy in this case narrow down to the point as to whether or not a scissor was left in the stomach of the complainant when he was operated upon by the OP3 on 31.03.2012 which was later on detected at Civil Hospital, Dhanaula on 09.08.2012 in the x-ray report and in the opinion given by Dr.Rajesh Kumar. In this context, it has been vehemently argued by the counsel for the OP3 that the complainant has miserably failed to prove the allegations and on the basis of evidence produced on record by the complainant, it cannot be unequivocally said that the OP3 left the scissor of the size of 7 to 10 inches in the stomach of the complainant at the time of surgery. It has further been contended by counsel for the Op3 that Dr.Rajesh Kumar has not been examined as a witness nor the radiologist who conducted the x-ray, has been made to appear as a witness. It has further been contended that neither Dr.Rajesh Kumar nor the radiologist has been allowed to be cross-examined by the OPs. Therefore, merely on the basis of x-ray films, it cannot be said that a scissor was recovered from the stomach of the complainant. It has further been contended by counsel for the OP3 that even otherwise it is quite arduous to imagine that the complainant could retain a scissor of size of 7 to 10 inches in his stomach for a long period of about 5 months.

18. We have thoughtfully considered the above contentions raised by counsel for the OP3 but found the same to be devoid of any force and substance. It is a well settled law that under the Consumer Protection Act, the complaints are decided by way of summary procedure. Primarily the proceedings before the Civil Court are civil in nature. It is equally well settled proposition of law that civil cases are decided by way of preponderance of evidence unlike criminal cases, where the onus of proving the case to the hilt is on the prosecution alone. The complaint under the Consumer Protection Act cannot be said to be a criminal complaint in which the burden to prove solely can be put on the complainant alone. Rather, as stated above, the complaints are to be decided on the principle of preponderance or probability of evidence. Keeping in view the above proposition of law, the evidence has to be evaluated.

19. As stated above, it is not disputed that a major surgery upon the complainant was carried out by the OP3 on 31.03.2012 to treat and remove the cancer from the urinary bladder. It is not the case of either of the parties that after in between 31.03.2012 to 09.08.2012, when a scissor was detected, the complainant had undergone any other surgery also. Now it has only to be

ascertained as to whether or not, it is proved from the record of the case that a foreign body i.e. scissor was detected from the stomach of the complainant on 09.08.2012 or not.

20. Apart from the averments made in the complaint, the allegations made in the complaint has been supported by affidavit Ex.CA of Shinder Kaur, the wife of the complainant Sh.Gurcharan Singh (since deceased). Apart from this, there is OPD slip Ex.C1 issued by the Civil Hospital Barnala. In the OPD slip Ex.C1, the date of admission of the complainant is mentioned as 10.08.2012 at 10:35 AM while the date of discharge as same date at 11:25 AM. Ex.C2 is a referral card issued by Civil Hospital, Dhanaula (Barnala) whereby the patient/complainant is shown to have been referred to Rajindra Hospital, Patiala/PGI Chandigarh. In Ex.C3, the record of chief complaints, investigation done, treatment given for stabilizing the patient has been mentioned. Under the column of chief complaint in Ex.C3, it is mentioned that the complainant complained of pain in abdomen for the last eight days and vomiting for the last one day. Under the column of investigation done, it is mentioned in hand by the Dr.Rajesh Kumar that in abdomen x-ray, foreign body was visible in the pelvic area in transverse position and further that it should be verified from the medical board. In Ex.C3, some medicines were prescribed as stated under the column, treatment given for stabilizing the patient. Ex.C3 is duly signed by Dr.Rajesh Kumar and all the writing of Ex.C3 seems to be in the hands of Dr.Rajesh Kumar. Ex.C4 is the admission record of the complainant with date of admission as 09.08.2012 at 9:00 PM and date of discharge as on same day at 09:45 PM. This document is also signed by Dr.Rajesh Kumar. The complainant has further placed reliance upon x-ray film Ex.C6, in which a seizure is visible with the naked eye. The complainant has further placed on record another x-ray film Ex.C7 and in this x-ray film, the name of complainant Gurcharan Singh is mentioned with date of x-ray done on 08.10.2012. The name of Department of Radio Diagnosis, PGIMER, Sector-12, Chandigarh can also be viewed/inscribed in the x-ray film Ex.C7 itself.

21. It is vehemently argued by counsel for the OP3 that since Dr.Rajesh Kumar has not been examined in this case, therefore, reports Ex.C2, Ex.C3 and Ex.C4 and x-ray films Ex.C6 and Ex.C7 cannot be said to have been validly proved on record and cannot be relied upon. However, it is pertinent to mention that during the pendency of the case, the OP3 filed an application on 08.12. 2015 seeking permission to cross-examine Dr.Rajesh Kumar stating that in view of the allegations made in the complaint, it is utmost essential to cross-examine Dr.Rajesh Kumar, Civil Hospital, Dhanaula on this point, so that truth could be extracted. The said application was disposed of vide order dated 13.12.2016 whereby the request made for cross-examination of Dr.Rajesh Kumar was declined and instead the OP3 was directed to submit the interrogatories in writing which would be forwarded to the Dr.Rajesh Kumar for appropriate reply. Consequently, the OP3 submitted interrogatories on 07.02.2017. In the interrogatories, certain questions were posed to Dr.Rajesh Kumar to which he had replied vide his affidavit dated 30.06.2017. In his affidavit, Dr.Rajesh Kumar confirmed that he had advised the x-ray of the complainant Gurcharan Singh only. The x-ray abdomen was not done in lateral view by the Radiographer and he could not comment on the Radiologist opinion. With regard to the fact as to whether artifact shadows or a foreign body was below inside or above the patient seen, Dr.Rajesh Kumar evaded giving any specific answer and replied that only Radiologist can say for the same and rest of the questions have also been answered by Dr.Rajesh Kumar saying that he was only doing the duty of Medical Officer and treated the patient regarding the complaint of pain in the abdomen and further only Radiologist can answer the questions posed in the interrogatories.

22. Surprisingly enough, in the interrogatories, Dr.Rajesh Kumar was not confronted with whatever he had mentioned in Ex.C2 and Ex.C3 while treating the complainant. In Ex.C3, it is clearly mentioned by Dr.Rajesh Kumar that foreign body is visible in the pelvic area in transverse

position and it should be verified from the medical board. Obviously, had Dr.Rajesh Kumar been confronted with as to what he mentioned in Ex.C3, it would have gone against the OPs especially the OP3. Since no interrogatories with regard to the observations made by Dr.Rajesh Kumar in Ex.C3 was posed, the OPs, in a way, did not challenge and dispute the observations made by Dr.Rajesh Kumar in Ex.C3 and further they also did not dispute whatever is mentioned in Ex.C3 coupled with x-ray films Ex.C6 and Ex.C7. Thus, it can be safely inferred and held that a foreign body i.e. scissor was detected in the abdomen of the complainant on 09.08.2012. There is absolutely no evidence or any possibility that in between i.e. after surgery and before the scissor was detected in the abdomen, the complainant underwent any other surgery. Even otherwise, it seems to be highly improbable that a patient, who reposed complete faith in the doctor who performed surgery to save him from a serious disease of cancer, would level false allegations or manipulate or twist facts to raise an accusing finger against the same doctor i.e. OP3.

23. In the written statement as well as in the written arguments made on behalf of the OP3, it has been claimed that the complainant has been playing at the hands of enemies of the OP3 i.e. some doctors who have been jealous of progress of the OP3 in his profession but these contentions also seem to be far-fetched and nothing but a novel idea to create a defence for himself. A doctor while carrying out life saving operation such as surgery to remove cancer from the part of the body, the doctor is supposed to exercise extreme care, caution and due diligence and even slightest of error or mistake can play havoc with the life of the patient. Taking into consideration these standards, leaving an object like scissor inside the body of the patient while carrying out surgery is out and out is an act of negligence on the part of the OP3 who had that time was working with the OP1 as an employee.

24. Now a word about quantum of compensation. It has been claimed by the complainant that he spent a sum of Rs.15 lac on his surgery and has also placed on record the bills but no details or any final bill issued by the OP1 mentioning the total expenditure on his treatment has been placed on record. The complainant has also placed on record certain bills of PGI, Chandigarh which again are not of much value. Therefore, the quantum of compensation has to be assessed by some guess work and estimation. In the given circumstances, in our considered view, it would be just and proper, if the compensation of Rs.7 lac is awarded in this case as against the OP1 and OP3 along with interest @7% per annum from the date of filing of complaint till the actual payment along with Rs.50,000/- as litigation expenses. As there are no allegations as against the OP2 of any negligence, the complaint as against him deserves to be dismissed.

25. As a result of above discussion, the complaint as against the OP2 is dismissed but the same is allowed as against the OP1 and OP3 with an order that they shall jointly and severally pay a sum of Rs.7,00,000/-(Rupees Seven Lacs) as compensation to the complainants along with interest @7% per annum from the date of filing of complaint till the actual payment along with Rs.50,000/- as litigation expenses. The compliance of the order be made within 40 days from the date of receipt of copy of order. Copies of order be supplied to parties free of costs as per rules. File be indexed and consigned to record room.

26. Due to rush of work and spread of COVID-19, the case could not be decided within statutory period.

(Jaswinder Singh)

(K.K. Kareer)

Member

President

Announced in Open Commission.

Dated:03.12.2021.

Gurpreet Sharma