

**DISTRICT CONSUMER DISPUTES REDRESSAL COMMISSION  
SOUTH II  
CONSUMER COMPLAINT NO. DC/AB1/670/CC/187/2023**

A. K. PANDA

PRESENT ADDRESS - R/O/DI/198, SATYA MARG, CHANAKYAPURI, NEW DELHI-110021.SOUTH EAST,DELHI.

.....Complainant(s)

Versus

TVS ELECTRONICS LTD.

PRESENT ADDRESS - A-39, 2nd FLOOR, FIEE COMPLEX, OKHLA INDUSTRIAL AREA, PHASE-2, DELHI-110020.SOUTH EAST,DELHI.

.....Opposite Party(s)

**BEFORE:**

**MONIKA AGGARWAL SRIVASTAVA , PRESIDENT  
DR. RAJENDER DHAR , MEMBER  
RITU GARODIA , MEMBER**

**FOR THE COMPLAINANT:**

NEMO

**FOR THE OPPOSITE PARTY:**

NEMO

**DATED: 22/05/2026**

**ORDER**

**CONSUMER DISPUTES REDRESSAL COMMISSION – X**

**GOVERNMENT OF N.C.T. OF DELHI**

**Udyog Sadan, C – 22 & 23, Institutional Area**

**(Behind Qutub Hotel)**

**New Delhi – 110016**

**Case No.:187/2023**

**A. K. Panda**

**S/o Late A C Panda**

**R/o DI/198, Satya Marg, Chanakyapuri,  
New Delhi – 110021**

**.....Complainant**

**VERSUS**

**1. TVS Electronics, Greenways Towers No 119**

**2<sup>nd</sup> Floor St. Marys Road**

**Abhiramapuram Teynampet Chennai**

**Chennai TN 600018 IN**

**2. HP computing and Printing Systems India Private Limited**

**Akash Block, 5F, Salarpuria GR Tech Park,**

**Khatha No 69/3, Mahadevapura**

**CMC 5 & 9 FL, Whitefield Road, Bangalore,**

**Karnataka 560066**

**.....Opposite Parties**

**Date of Institution-02.06.2023**

**Date of Order- 22.05.2026**

**ORDER**

-

**RITU GARODIA-MEMBER**

-

1. The Complaints pertains to deficiency in service on the part of OP.

2. Facts as stated in the complaint are that the complainant purchased a HP laptop *HP Pro Book 440 G2 s.N.INA5435JWT* in the premium range in February, 2016. The complainant

faced some problems with the Window Software and Camera in October/November, 2020. The complainant has explained that software was not getting updated, Web Camera was malfunctioning and antivirus and Windows Software were not working.

3. It is stated that the complainant took the laptop to the authorized service centre, OP1, on 06.02.2021. The complainant paid Rs.350/- to OP1 who failed to address the issue. It is alleged that the complainant used *twitter* to reach out to OP and Microsoft on 07.02.2021. He was contacted by HP Social Media Team on 08.02.2021. He also received the laptop back without any service from OP1 on 08.02.2021. The complainant paid Rs.1,534/- to OP1 towards advance payment.
4. It is alleged that the complainant received the quotation from OP1 on 05.04.2021 for advance payment of service charge. The complainant sent an e-mail to HP on 23.04.2021 informing them about the advance payment of Rs.1,534/-.
5. It is alleged that the complainant repaired the software himself after studying the methods in HP and Microsoft Support Groups. It is alleged that the complainant suffered for many months due to improper functioning of the said laptop.
6. It is alleged that an unskilled technician visited the complainant on 04.12.2021 after several months. The said technician found a cable of Web Cam rusted and promised to return with the new cable. The technician also conveyed his inability to address any software issues. The technician never returned.
7. The complainant states that the Web Camera is still malfunctioning. He visited the service centre of OP-1 on 04.04.2022 but to no avail.
8. The complainants pray for repair of Web Cam, payment of compensation of Rs.2,50,000/- for his work disruption and Rs.50,000/- towards litigation expenses.

9. Notice was issued to OPs who failed to appear. The right to file reply by OPs were closed as being time barred vide Order dated 08.10.2024.

10. The complainant has filed his evidence. The complainant has placed on record bank statement and jobsheets of the service centre.

11. The Commission has considered the documents and correspondence on record.

12. The bank statement of the complainant reflects that Rs.1,534/- was paid to OP1 on 23.04.2021 through mobile banking.

13. Relevant portion of the job sheet by OP1 dated 06.02.2021 is as follows:

*Issue reported: Games not working as per customer 260cl W/A drive not working.*

*Demo Engineer Diagnosis: all issue write in Notepad.*

*Repair remarks: All UEFI test pass, need to install Os Post and it will be done by use after data backup.*

The complainant received the laptop and wrote the following remarks:

*Received without asp service. Not sure what is done. Dissatisfied.*

14. The job sheet by OP1 dated 04.12.2021 is as follows:

*Issue description: Web Cam Service.*

*Resolution summary: Cable Refix and Camera Wiring*

*Customer Issue Reported – Software Issue and give suggest to Window formatting.*

*Customer comments: Did not run diagnosis to see cam issues such as 26 OC W/A driver, wireless IRQ test, wireless ROM test informed me that camera cable is ruined. He is clueless about restore window service office already loaded from my MS.*

15. The job sheet by OP1 dated 04.04.2022 is as follows:

*Issue reported: Webcam not working.*

*Demo Engineer Diagnosis: HP customer care provide quotation of webcam cable.*

.....

*Repair remarks: The agent told that Sumit Kumar placed order when I reminded that engineer told that cable is faulty. I told this issue when the agent told the Rajeev there is no problem. Now done .....*

16. It is an admitted position that the complainant purchased the laptop in question in February, 2016. Subsequently, the complainant began experiencing issues with the said laptop during October and November, 2020. Thereafter, the complainant approached the service centre of OP1 on 06.02.2021, where it was recorded that the games and W/A drive were not functioning properly. However, being dissatisfied with the services rendered by OP1, the complainant retrieved the laptop without obtaining any satisfactory resolution of the defects.
17. That, on 23.04.2021, the complainant paid a sum of 1,534/- to OP1 towards service charges.
18. Thereafter, the complainant again encountered defects in the laptop and once more approached OP1 for repairs. The job sheet dated 04.12.2021 records that the webcam was not functioning, and it was stated by OP1 that the issue had been resolved through cable prefix and camera wiring. However, the complainant specifically recorded in the said job sheet that no proper diagnosis had been conducted regarding the camera issue and that the camera cable had been damaged/ruined.
19. The job sheet dated 04.04.2022 issued by OP1 clearly reflects that the webcam issue persisted and that a quotation for repair/replacement was provided to the complainant.
20. Thus, it is evident that the complainant was compelled to repeatedly approach the service centre of OP1 for rectification of defects in the laptop, particularly concerning the malfunctioning webcam. Despite levying service charges and claiming to have undertaken repairs, OP1 failed to effectively rectify the defect in the camera.
21. Hence, we find OP1 guilty of deficiency in service and direct OP1 as follows:
  - i. To pay a sum of Rs.25,000/- to the complainant as compensation for mental harassment and physical inconvenience; and
  - ii. To pay a sum of Rs.5,000/- towards litigation expenses.

22. OP1 to make the payment to complainant within 60 days from the date of the Order failing which the amount will carry an interest of 7% from date of Order till payment. Copy of Order be sent to parties free of cost and file be consigned to record room. Order to be uploaded.

.....  
**MONIKA AGGARWAL SRIVASTAVA**  
**PRESIDENT**

.....  
**DR. RAJENDER DHAR**  
**MEMBER**

.....  
**RITU GARODIA**  
**MEMBER**