



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

121

CWP-6029-2026

Date of Decision: 20.03.2026

SUSHMA BUILDTECH LIMITED

...Petitioners

Versus

STATE CONSUMER DISPUTES REDRESSAL COMMISSION
CHANDIGARH AND ORS.

...Respondents

And

Sr. No.	Case No.	Petitioner	Respondents
2.	CWP-6048-2026	Sushma Buildtech Limited	State Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission Chandigarh and Ors.
3.	CWP-6099-2026	Sushma Buildtech Limited	State Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission Chandigarh and Ors.
4.	CWP-6157-2026	Sushma Buildtech Limited	State Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission Chandigarh and Ors.
5.	CWP-6158-2026	Sushma Buildtech Limited	State Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission Chandigarh and Ors.
6.	CWP-6179-2026	Sushma Buildtech Limited	State Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission Chandigarh and Ors.
7.	CWP-6199-2026	Sushma Buildtech Limited	State Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission Chandigarh and Ors.
8.	CWP-6159-2026	Sushma Buildtech Limited	State Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission Chandigarh and Ors.

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present:- Mr. Anand Chibbar, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Vaibhav Sahni, Advocate,
Mr. Vishesh Jain, Advocate and
Ms. Aarzo Soni, Advocate
for the petitioners



Mr. Ankush Chowdhary, Advocate for
Mr. Satyaveer Singh, Advocate for respondent No.2

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. As common issues are involved in the captioned petitions, with the consent of both sides, the same are hereby disposed of by this common order. For the sake of brevity and convenience, facts are borrowed from **CWP-6029-2026**

2. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking setting aside of order dated 28.10.2025 (Annexure P-4) and order dated 04.02.2026 (Annexure P-5) whereby State Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission, Chandigarh (for short 'State Commission') in Execution Application has attached its entire project and bank accounts.

3. An agreement dated 07.03.2015 was executed between petitioner and respondent No.2-complainant for allotment of an apartment. The complainant filed an application under Section 35 of Consumer Protection Act, 2019 (for short '2019 Act') before State Commission. A bunch of complaints was allowed and petitioner vide order dated 18.10.2024 was directed to refund entire amount along with interest and compensation. The complainant filed execution application seeking enforcement of order dated 18.10.2024. The State Commission vide order dated 26.08.2025 ordered to send notice of execution application for 01.10.2025. The notice was received back with a report 'office shifted and left'. The State Commission did not issue fresh notice and assumed that service is complete. The State Commission proceeded



ex parte and attached entire project of the petitioner. The State Commission vide order dated 04.02.2026 has further ordered to attach petitioner's bank accounts.

4. Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner submits that to show its *bona fide*, the petitioner is ready to pay 50% of principal amount within four months in two equal installments. The State Commission has attached its project as well as bank account, thus, it cannot work and generate revenue to discharge liability arising out of orders passed by State Commission. There are 4000 people in the housing project maintained by petitioner.

5. On being confronted with aforesaid statement, learned counsel for the respondent No.2 submits that respondents have no objection to de-freezing of bank account if payments are actually made as offered.

6. In the wake of statement of both sides, the instant petitions stand disposed of in following terms:-

- i. The petitioner shall pay 25% of principal amount within two months from today;
- ii. The petitioner shall further pay 25% of principal amount making it 50% of principal amount within four months from today;
- iii. The petitioner would be free to deal with project under attachment;
- iv. The petitioner would be free to operate its bank accounts; and



- v. If the petitioner fails to comply with its commitment, its action would be treated as contempt of Court and proceedings under Article 215 of Constitution of India read with Contempt of Court Act would be initiated against Directors of the Company.
- vi. The parties with respect to remaining amount i.e. over and above 50% of principal amount would appear before State Commission on 06.05.2026 i.e. date already fixed by State Commission. The parties would be free to raise their grievance before State Commission.
7. Pending application(s), if any, also stands disposed of.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

March 20, 2026
Deepak DPA

Whether Speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether Reportable: Yes/No