

Date of Filing: 21.08.2025

Date of Order: 08.07.2026

DISTRICT CONSUMER DISPUTES REDRESSAL COMMISSION
RANGA REDDY
P r e s e n t

SMT.CHITNENI LATHA KUMARI, PRESIDENT
SMT.MADHAVI SASANAKOTA, MEMBER
SMT.KATHYAYANI KHANDAVILLI, MEMBER

WEDNESDAY, THE EIGHTH DAY OF JULY
TWO THOUSAND TWENTY-SIX

CC 477/2025

Between:

Jerin George, S/o George Jacob,
Aged 29 years, Occ: Student,
1-54/Gopanpally, Kanchi-Gachibowli Road,
Near University of Hyderabad South Gate,
P.C 500019 Hyderabad, Telangana,
Mob: 9745469972
Email: jerringeorg@gmail.com

.... Complainant

AND

HP India Sales Private Limited,
Through its Managing Director,
Ms. Ipsita Dasgupta,
24, Kothari Arena, 2nd Floor,
Hosur Main Road, Adugodi,
Bengaluru – 560 030, Karnataka

... Opposite party

Complainant : Party – In- Person
Opposite Party : Ex-Parte

*This complaint is filed by the complainant U/Sec.35 of
Consumer Protection Act, 2019 praying this Commission to direct*

the Opposite Party i) to accept the return of the product sold to the Complainant, on the grounds that it is (a) defective in respect of its display, and (b) sold by adopting unfair trade practices and unfair contract, and to refund the sum of Rs.60,564/- paid towards its purchase, together with applicable interest from the date of payment until realization. ii) Impose a penalty upon the Opposite Party for the use of misrepresentative advertisements to market the product under section 89 of the Act. iii) Award costs to the Complainant towards legal expenses incurred in pursuing this complaint. iv) Award compensation of Rs.20,000/- to the Complainant towards the mental agony, harassment, and loss of valuable time suffered in pursuing this matter.v) Issue appropriate directions or orders to restrain the Opposite Party from engaging in deceptive marketing practices and from imposing one-sided return policies and vi) grant such other and further reliefs as this Hon'ble Commission may deem fit in the interests of justice and to safeguard consumers from similar unfair practices in the future

ORDER

(PER SE. SMT.MADHAVI SASANAKOTA, MEMBER
ON BEHALF OF THE BENCH)

I. Brief Facts of the complaint:

1. Brief facts of the complaint as made out by the Complainant are that the Complainant purchased HP Laptop 35.6 (14) 14 ep0340TU, Silver along with a 2 year extended warranty and 3 year accidental protection coverage from Opposite party on 30.07.2025 and the purchase was done through Opposite party's website live chat and a phone call with the sales team of

the Opposite party and said product was delivered on 05.08.2025 but on delivery, found to be defective in its display rendering it unfit for proper use. Despite Complainant's immediate request for return and refund, the Opposite party rejected the same by invoking one-sided return policy.

2. As part of the purchase of the said product, a quote was emailed to the Complainant by the Opposite party specifying the product, price, terms and conditions and the price of the said product is quoted as Rs.74,364/-, of which Rs.58,065/- is the Price of the Laptop and Rs.16,299/- is for the extended warranty and accidental protection coverage. Complainant submitted that prior to receiving the email quote, it was mentioned on the website and confirmed by discussion with the executive of the Opposite party one Mr. MidhatMehmood that the extended warranty and accidental protection coverage were for Rs.4,499/-, although it was not updated in the quote. The executive of the Opposite party mentioned that on the payment page, the total amount will be Rs.62,564/- although in the quote the amount is Rs.14,364/-. Complainant received a discount of Rs.2,000/- for payment via UPI and by deducting it, he has paid Rs.60,564/- and received the Order confirmation email from the Opposite party shortly after paying the final amount but, the final amount paid of Rs.60,564/- and discount of Rs.2000/- obtained for payment via UPI were not updated in the order confirmation email and invoice.

3. The product was delivered on 05.08.2025, however, the invoice was generated by a distributor/supplier/vendor company, Savex Technologies Pvt. Ltd. about whom the Complainant got to know only on receiving the said Invoice.

Complainant unboxed the package and after complete setting up of the product, the Complainant noticed serious issues with the Product's display as it is unable to produce a proper white screen suitable for reading, and it naturally had an extreme amount of blueness in it. The display exhibited uneven lighting across different parts of the screen. The issue persisted even after display controls using Windows Night Light, display colour calibration and Intel Graphics Command Centre. Due to the display's extreme amount of blueness and weak lighting, the Complainant faced serious eye pain and headache while using the product. In order to verify whether the display problem he faced persist with others as well, he brought the product before three of his friends who confirmed that the product display appeared bluish, and was unable to produce a proper white screen, and that prolonged viewing caused them discomfort.

4. Complainant approached Opposite party on the same day i.e., 05.08.2025, after unboxing the courier and noticing the problem with the product, and explained the problem to Opposite party sales team via live chat and spoke on a phone call with the Sales Manager Mr. MidhatMehmood. Complainant claimed for return of the product and refund from the Opposite party on the date of receipt of the subject product and on following days but, Opposite party delayed the communication with the Complainant by directing him to contact different subsidiary teams of the Opposite party company for three days. Subsequently, on 07.08.2025, Complainant emailed the Service head of the Opposite party highlighting the product's defect in display and claimed for return and refund. Complainant received a call from a service team member that evening who

denied the defect in product's display but asked the Complainant to approach the dealer for an exchange or refund. When Complainant explained that he has purchased subject product from Opposite party's website, the service team member replied that an exchange or refund is not possible since it is purchased from the Opposite party's website and he has sent an email stating the same that exchange is not possible as it was purchased through website and to approach the dealer for exchange or refund. Finally, on 07.08.2025, Opposite party vide an email rejected Complainant's claim on the ground of the return policy of the Opposite party. Opposite party claimed that since the seal of the product was opened, the product cannot be returned and further stated that returns and replacements are possible only if the delivered laptop is in sealed condition or if a damaged/broken product is delivered to the customer.

5. Complainant submitted that the Product's display is unable to produce a proper white screen and exhibiting excessive blue tint and uneven lighting causing severe eye strain and headache to self and to his friends who verified the defect. It is further submitted that the said defect arises from the design of the display panel, manufactured and sold by the Opposite party under its brand and as per Section 84(1)(b) of the Act, manufacturer is liable in a product liability action if the product is defective in design.

6. Complainant alleged that the Opposite party while concealing the information regarding the display panel type of the product, a material specification that directly determines the display quality of the laptop, used deceptive images and

captions on its marketing webpage to sell the product and even after repeated requests also the Opposite party did not officially revealed what kind of display panel the product has and marketed the subject product with misleading advertisements by deliberately concealing important information regarding the product's display screen/panel type.

7. Complainant submitted some information regarding the different kinds of display panel types used by laptop companies that are categorized as TN (Twisted Nematic), VA (Vertical Alignment), SVA (Standard Viewing Angle), IPS (In-Plane Switching), OLED (Organic Light Emitting Diode), etc. Usually, in a laptop advertisement, either the panel type of the product is mentioned in the primary section where the main specifications of the laptop are detailed, or it is mentioned in the tech specifications/product information section. As a standard in the digital market, most laptops come with an IPS display panel type. Competitors of the Opposite party company, including Dell and Lenovo, had discontinued using TN panels due to its weak display capacity and in their websites we cannot find laptops with a TN Panel. However, they are rarely available in the market for earlier low-budget models. It is further submitted that though on Amazon India website a Lenovo laptop with a TN panel was found, but, for said laptop it is explicitly mentioned that the display panel type is TN and stated that such methods of specifying the display type is a standard followed in the laptop market from which the consumer can understand what kind of screen a laptop could produce. Whereas, the Opposite party involved in an unfair trade practice by selling the subject laptop by deliberately concealing the

details of its display type either in the main specification section or in the product information/tech specification section. It is further submitted that the Opposite party for its other models has explicitly mentioned the display panel type i.e., for HP Pavilion laptop – in tech specifications section, for HP Victus laptop – in tech specifications section as IPS, for HP laptop, HP-250R – in tech specifications section as SVA. Complainant alleged that said concealment is aggravated by contradictory statements of the Opposite party's own staff where on different occasions after purchase, he was told that the panel was IPS, FHD and SVA which reflect a deliberate marketing practice of keeping the panel type ambiguous which is detrimental u/s 2(9)(ii) of CP Act which guarantees consumers the right to be informed about the quality and standards of goods.

8. Complainant further submitted that after identifying the defect in the product purchased, he has spoken with the Opposite party's sales and support team, the HP sales store in Hyderabad and Kerala about the panel type of the product and got ambiguous and contradictory replies from each one of them regarding the display panel type. HP WhatsApp support team at first mentioned it as FHD panel, but on further questioning, mentioned it as IPS panel and later as SVA panel which is evident from the screen shot of the said chat. Similarly, in a live chat where the Complainant did not reveal his identity, the Opposite party's sales manager first mentioned it was antiglare, then shared the description on the website, but later confirmed it as IPS panel. In a phone call with an HP sales store in Hyderabad where said product is available, the store staff initially mentioned that the product has a Full HD anti-glare

panel, but when asked in detail, after verifying the product they mentioned it as IPS display panel and later he received a call back where they re-verified the panel and informed the Complainant that said product's panel is not an IPS panel. Further, the Complainant when verified with a HP store in Kerala on 11.08.2025 to find out the panel type of the said product, got a reply that it is a new PC and they do not know in detail about its panel type. It is generally marketed as FHD anti-glare panel. Thus, it is observed that the Opposite party marketing the subject product without giving information about the display panel type.

9. Complainant submitted that generally, people equate the resolution FHD (1920 x 1080 pixels) combined with anti-glare to mean an IPS display. As per Opposite party's WhatsApp Support team, the subject product's display panel is an SVA 250 Nits panel. As per a blog post by some of the HP customers it has been alleged that the SVA panel is a terminology used by the Opposite party in the past for deceptive marketing and under said label, it had sold low-quality TN panels. Complainant substantiated his stand that the Opposite party is selling laptops with systemic and deliberate concealment of the display panel types by quoting his observation with HP US website as well, where he found similar laptops where the display type is not specified, but only written as FHD anti-glare but, in a live chat with the US HP agent, he confirmed that display panel for such laptops where IPS is not mentioned, is a TN display panel type.

10. Complainant once again reiterated that the Opposite party had advertised on their website the using misleading images and captions about the product's display screen which features the product display, is misrepresentative and highly exaggerated. The webpage shows stock images edited into the product screen – such as paraglider photograph and a YouTube-like video frame. These images suggest that the laptop can display bright, vivid visuals with accurate colors. But in reality, when the same stock image was displayed on the actual product, it appeared bluish, dim, and caused strain while viewing. Opposite party never presented genuine photographs of the laptop screen in operation instead, they superimposed stock visuals onto the screen areas, thereby projecting an enhanced and misleading impression of the product's display quality which constitutes a misleading advertisement U/s 2(28)(i)-(iii) of the Act, since the laptop was falsely represented to be of a particular quality and standard. Further, Sec 89 penalizes manufacturers who cause misleading advertisements prejudicial to consumers. There are images of the product which feature its display on Pg.1, 4, 5, 6 and 7 of the webpage printout, where the pictures featuring the product display on pg.4 & 5 of the webpage are good quality images with good colour and lighting. However, the product in reality is unable to produce an image with such good colour and lighting. It is also submitted that the said images in pg.51 & 52 are used by multiple websites for advertisements on the internet with varying amounts of colour and lighting.

11. Complainant while quoting the image on Pg4 submitted that said image depicted a video screen with “Indie Lofi Beats. 10 hours”, which screen clearly resembles the YouTube architecture for playing videos, however, there are no such videos with said title with a 10hr duration. On Google Lens search, it was found that the image is used by multiple websites for advertising purposes, which is substantiated by the Google Lens search page and two websites where the image is used for marketing and as many marketing companies used the image, it is an image purchased by the Opposite party as Stock picture and used the image in an edited format, with the product screen looking like a video played on YouTube which conveys that the said device will have a quality, colour and lighting which is depicted using the image. Further, the image featured on Pg.5 of the webpage is the image of a paraglider passing through the mountains which is available for purchase on Shutterstock, a stock photography website for purchasing images. Opposite party generated a polished image of the one in Shutterstock to feature the display screen image quality but, when the said image presented on the product, it does not meet the quality, colour or lighting of the one advertised. Complainant alleged that the use of edited images into laptop’s display instead of actually taking a photo where the product is seen to play the image is highly misrepresentative and the use of such images is a deliberate attempt to manipulate the purchasing tendencies of the customers.

12. Complainant alleged that when he requested Opposite party for a return/refund, it by citing their “return policy” which prohibits returns once the product seal is broken which was

never conveyed to the Complainant before or during the purchase and it was not mentioned in the quotation shared by the sales team, order confirmation email, invoice, package or seal itself, but only came to know when his return and refund was rejected. Complainant alleged unfair contract by the Opposite party as defined u/s2(46)(vi) where any unreasonable condition that places the consumer at a disadvantage. He further alleged that the sales team did not inform him about the return policy while he was in discussion with them during the purchase and the return policy is not mentioned in any visible way on the page where the product is displayed for sale. Since the return policy was not communicated to the Complainant via any means before the purchase or opening of the product, the said return policy is one-sided which lacks mutuality imposed without meaningful consent or pre-purchase disclosure to the Complainant, which puts the Complainant at a grave disadvantage.

13. Complainant further alleged that the Opposite party deliberately concealed important information regarding the 'display type' of the product during the purchase and used misrepresentative images to feature the product display constituting a deceptive marketing mechanism falsely representing the subject product as of a particular quality amounts to Unfair trade practice as defined u/s 2(47)(i)(a) of the Act. Thus, the Complainant made allegations on Opposite party for selling a defective product, using misleading advertisement and imposing an unfair contract without disclosing return policy, whereby committing an unfair trade practice.

II. Written Version of Opposite Party:

Despite granting sufficient time, Opposite party failed to file their Written version within stipulated period of 30+15 days, hence, Opposite party is set ex-parte.

III. Findings & Conclusion:

During Trial, the Complainant got examined as PW1 and the documents filed are marked as Ex.A1 to A20. Despite granting sufficient time, Opposite party failed to file their Written version within stipulated period of 30+15 days, hence, Opposite party is set ex-parte. Complainant filed Written arguments and advanced Oral Submissions also. Reserved for orders.

IV. Based on the facts and material available on the record, the following points have emerged for consideration:

1. Whether there is any unfair trade practice or deficiency of service on the part of the Opposite Party as claimed under the complaint?
2. Whether the Complainant is entitled for the relief sought? If so, to what extent?

Point No.1:

1. It is the case of the Complainant wherein the Complainant purchased HP Laptop 35.6 (14) 14 ep0340TU, Silver along with a 2 year extended warranty and 3year accidental protection coverage from Opposite party on 30.07.2025 and the purchase was done through Opposite party's website live chat and a phone call with the sales team of the Opposite party. Subject product was delivered on 05.08.2025 but on delivery, it was

found to be defective in its display rendering it unfit for proper use. Despite Complainant's immediate request for return and refund, the Opposite party rejected the same by invoking one-sided return policy. Complainant alleged that the Opposite party deliberately concealed important information regarding the 'display type' of the product during the purchase and used misrepresentative images to feature the product display constituting a deceptive marketing mechanism falsely representing the subject product as of a particular quality amounting to Unfair trade practice. He reiterated his allegations on Opposite party for selling a defective product, using misleading advertisement and imposing an unfair contract without disclosing return policy, whereby committing an unfair trade practice. Opposite party chosen not to file written version and represent his matter and was set ex-party.

2. Upon perusal of the material placed on record by the Complainant, it is evident from the email dated 30.06.2025 (Ex.A1) that the Opposite party has given a quote for HP Laptop 35.6 (14) 14 ep0340TU, Silver for an amount of Rs.74,364/- with a breakup of Rs.16,299/- towards 2yr Extended Warranty + 3yr Anti-virus + 3yr Accidental Damage Protection and Rs.58,065/- for HP Laptop 35.6cm (14) 14-ep0340TU, Silver. Opposite party vide email dated 30.07.2025 (Ex.A2) confirmed the order of the Complainant where the 2yr Extended Warranty + 3yr Anti-virus + 3yr Accidental Damage Protection is quoted as Rs.4,499/- instead of Rs.16,299/- first quoted and a discount of Rs.11,800/- was given and final quote was given for Rs.62,564/- and the same is confirmed by the Invoice dated 30.07.2025 (Ex.A3).

3. Complainant has placed few comparative photographs (Ex.A4) of the advertisements given by the Opposite party and the screen shots showing the real display clarity of the same advertisement visible in the subject laptop screen alleging that the Opposite party has given misleading advertisements to sell its product by concealing the type of display it possess.

4. Complainant vide email dated 07.08.2025 raised the issue of the subject PC display being too blueish and with uneven lighting (some places its bright and some places its dim), and mentioned that due to low-quality screen, he is facing severe eye strain and requested to resolve the issue either to return or exchange the product or even to change the display panel and reported that the HP sales and support team is deliberately ignoring his concern. In reply to the said email, the Opposite party service head team on 07.08.2025 answered the Complainant (Ex.A5) stating that as per the update of its technical team there are no product quality issues with the subject laptop however, they have advised the Complainant to reach out to the dealer for a laptop exchange and also suggested to visit the nearest HP service center. Complainant immediately vide email asked the Opposite party service head to connect him with the dealer. Whereas, the Opposite party vide email dated 07.08.2025 (Ex.A6), informed the Complainant that returns and replacements are only permitted if the delivered laptop is either in sealed condition or has been damaged. Further, while informing the Complainant about the ticket details that was raised to address his concern, Opposite party vide email dated 08.08.2025 (Ex.A6) informed that return and replacement are possible if the shipment is in sealed condition or if the

damaged/broken product is delivered to the customer and since the Complainant has already opened the product, they cannot accept the open shipment and asked the Complainant to go through the link shared for terms and conditions and to contact their technical support team on toll free numbers shared.

5. Complainant placed on record the screenshots of the webpage of Amazon showing the details of Lenovo laptop available in the market (Ex.A7) with product display as Anti-Glare Coating and HP webpage (Ex.A8) where a detailed text on product specifications is available with product display shown as FHD display and flicker-free but, nowhere in the said website, specific terms regarding the return policy were mentioned as it has notified the product features. Complainant further placed on record the webpages of other models of the Opposite party (Ex.A9, A10 & A11) where it has explicitly mentioned the display panel type for each product viz., HP Pavilion laptop as IPS, for HP Victus laptop as IPS and for HP laptop, HP-250R as SVA in tech specifications section. Complainant alleged that said concealment is aggravated by contradictory statements of the Opposite party's own staff where on different occasions after purchase, he was told that the panel was IPS, FHD and SVA which reflect a deliberate marketing practice of keeping the panel type ambiguous which is detrimental u/s 2(9)(ii) of CP Act which guarantees consumers the right to be informed about the quality and standards of goods.

6. From the WhatsApp screen shot (Ex.A12), it is evident that when the Complainant conversed with Opposite party

WhatsApp support team on 08.08.2025 and enquired about the panel type of the subject product, he received contradictory replies wherein at first they have mentioned it as FHD panel, later as IPS panel and again as SVA panel giving rise to ambiguity. Similarly, from alive chat (Ex.A13) also where the Complainant's identity is not visible, it is noted that the Opposite party's sales personnel first mentioned the display type of the subject product as antiglare, but later confirmed it as IPS panel. Complainant clarified that generally, people equate the resolution FHD (1920 x 1080 pixels) combined with anti-glare to mean an IPS display. As per Opposite party's WhatsApp Support team, the subject product's display panel is an SVA 250 Nits panel. Whereas, in the blog post (Ex.A14) by some of the HP customers it was alleged that the SVA panel is a terminology used by the Opposite party in the past for deceptive marketing and under said label, it had sold low-quality TN panels. Complainant filed few reviews on Opposite party's deceptive marketing (Ex.A14). In the Live chat of the Complainant with US agent of the Opposite party (Ex.A16), the agent has clarified that the subject product will have a default display as HD and again confirmed that the 15.6' diagonal HD(1366x768), micro-edge, anti-glare, 250 nits display uses a TN (Twisted Nematic) panel. Further, the agent double checked whether it has IPS display and notified that the default display of the laptop does not have IPS but assured that they can customize it to have IPS display. When the Complainant specifically asked is it a TN panel itself like the HD one where IPS is not mentioned, the agent confirmed that those that has no IPS are having TN panel proving that the subject product

sold to the Complainant which has no mention of IPS must be having TN panel as confirmed by Opposite party US agent.

7. Complainant in Ex.A17, A18, A19& A20 has portrayed some photographs from internet and shutterstock which look bright, vivid and with accurate colours and alleged that said photographs are stock images that can be purchased by anyone including Opposite party to suggest subject laptop can display bright, vivid visuals with accurate colours. But, in fact, the said pictures are looking bluish, dim in the subject laptop (Ex.A4) evidencing that the Opposite party has used said photographs in its advertisements to mislead its customers about the display type.

8. With the given observations, it is evident that the Complainant is not provided any clarity about the display the subject product has and when purchased he found it to be blueish and dim causing strain while viewing. Further, Opposite party in the first instance while advising the Complainant to reach out to the dealer for laptop exchange (Ex.A5), later denied the same and informed that returns and replacements are only permitted if the delivered laptop is either in sealed condition or has been damaged (Ex.A6). Opposite party despite receiving notice, chosen not to appear and prosecute their case proving their indifferent attitude in settling the issues raised by its customers. It is obvious to note from the said email that the Opposite party has framed such condition unilaterally as no defect in the product can be identified without opening the seal and put the product to use. It is still more evident from the material placed on record by the

Complainant that the Opposite party has not clearly notified the display specifications in neither of their webpages all over the world as the Complainant through web live chat has gathered information from different sources. It is far more clear from the evidences places on record that the Opposite party by not providing the terms and conditions regarding the return and replacement policy during the purchase, has sold the subject product to the Complainant causing inconvenience in viewing, as the display specification did not match his requirement. When the Complainant asked for return or refund or even exchange of the product, the Opposite party deliberately denied leaving no scope for the Complainant for any alternative, amounting to deficiency in service. Hence, point no.1 is answered in favour of the Complainant.

Point No.2:

In the result, the complaint is allowed in part directing the Opposite party;

1. To refund Rs.60,564/- (Rupees Sixty Thousand Five Hundred and Sixty Four only) with interest @ 9% p.a. from 30.07.2025 till realization.
2. The complainant is directed to handover the subject laptop to the Opposite Party immediately upon receipt of the said refund from them.
3. To pay Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) towards compensation for the mental agony caused and
4. To pay Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) towards costs to the complainant.

5. Time for compliance is 45 days from the date of receiving this order. In default, the refund amount will attract additional interest @ 12% p.a. from the date of default till realization.

Dictated to the Steno-typist, transcribed by her, corrected by me and pronounced by us in the Open Commission on this the 08th day of July, 2026.

Sd/-
MEMBER

Sd/-
PRESIDENT

APPENDIX OF EVIDENCE
WITNESSES EXAMINED

For Complainant
Affidavit Filed

For Opposite Party
Nil

EXHIBITS MARKED

Exhibits filed by the Complainant

- Ex.A1 – Copy of Quote emailed to the Complainant
- Ex.A2 – Copy of Order confirmation Email, dt:30.07.2025
- Ex.A3 – Copy of Product Invoice, dt:30.07.2025
- Ex.A4 – Copy of Photos exhibiting the product defect (Photos taken on 15 August 2025)
- Ex.A5 – Copy of Email with HP Service Team Head, dt: 07.08.2025
- Ex.A6 – Copy of Email rejecting return and refund, dt: 08.08.2025
- Ex.A7 – Copy of Lenovo IdeaPad 1 Amazon marketing page
- Ex.A8 – Copy of Product Webpage Printout
- Ex.A9 – Copy of HP Pavilion Webpage Printout
- Ex.A10 – Copy of HP Victus Webpage Printout
- Ex.A11 – Copy of HP 250R Webpage Printout
- Ex.A12 – Copy of HP WhatsApp support chat screenshots
- Ex.A13 – Copy of HP Website live chat screenshots
- Ex.A14 – Copy of Webpage Printout of Digit Forum Blog
- Ex.A15 – Copy of HP US Laptop screenshot
- Ex.A16 – Copy of HP US Live chat screenshots
- Ex.A17 – Copy of Google Lens search printout of the display image featured for the product

Ex.A18 – Copy of Image found in other Marketing Website 1
Ex.A19 – Copy of Image found in other Marketing Website 2
Ex.A20 – Copy of Webpage print of Shutterstock where the
image featured as product display is sold

Exhibits filed by the Opposite Party

Nil

Sd/-
MEMBER

Sd/-
PRESIDENT

