



CIVIL

Self-Employment vs. Commercial Purpose: A Crucial Distinction in Consumer Rights

AUTHOR Rahul Sundaram

PUBLISHED 29 March 2025

Introduction

The Supreme Court of India recently delivered a landmark judgment in *Virender Singh v. M/S. Darshana Trading Co.* Special Leave to Appeal (C) No. 5510/2020, clarifying the boundaries between “commercial purpose” and “self-employment” under the Consumer Protection Act, 1986. This case highlights the nuanced interpretation of the term “consumer” and the importance of factual analysis in determining whether a purchase qualifies as self-employment or commercial activity. The judgment is a critical guide for consumers and businesses alike, emphasizing that the definition of “consumer” is not static but context-dependent.

Table of contents

- [Introduction](#)
- [Brief Facts of the Case](#)
- [Legal Provisions and Precedents](#)
- [Supreme Court's Analysis and Decision](#)
- [Conclusion](#)

Brief Facts of the Case

Virender Singh purchased a laser cutting and bending machine (Model MPS GD 1212-300W HSLC Series) to expand his manufacturing business. The machine, however, turned out to be defective and non-operational. Mr. Singh filed a complaint with the State Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission (Uttar Pradesh), arguing that he was a “consumer” under the Consumer Protection Act, 1986. The respondent, M/S. Darshana Trading Co., contested the claim, asserting that the machine was purchased for commercial purposes, thereby excluding Mr. Singh from the definition of a “consumer.”

The State Commission dismissed Mr. Singh’s complaint, holding that the machine was purchased for commercial purposes, which excluded him from the definition of a “consumer” under Section 2(1)(d) of the 1986 Act.

The National Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission upheld the State Commission’s order, reaffirming that the purchase was for commercial purposes and not self-employment.

Mr. Singh challenged the National Commission’s order before the Supreme Court, arguing that the machine was used for self-employment and not commercial activity. He relied on the Supreme Court’s earlier judgment in *Critical Digital Colour Lab v. Agfa India Private Limited* (2018), which clarified that goods purchased for self-employment do not fall under “commercial purpose.”

Legal Provisions and Precedents

Consumer Protection Act, 1986:

Section 2(1)(d): Defines a “consumer” as a person who purchases goods for consideration, excluding those who obtain goods for “commercial purpose.”

Explanation to Section 2(1)(d): Clarifies that “commercial purpose” does not include goods used exclusively for earning livelihood through self-employment.

Supreme Court’s Analysis and Decision

The Supreme Court carefully analysed the facts and distinguished the present case from *Critical Digital*. While *Critical Digital* involved two unemployed graduates who purchased a machine for self-employment, Mr. Singh was already running a commercial venture and purchased the machine to expand his business. The Court noted that Mr. Singh did not operate the machine himself but employed workers to run it, which indicated commercial activity rather than self-employment.

The Court emphasized that the distinction between “commercial purpose” and “self-employment” is a question of fact and must be evaluated in light of the specific circumstances. In this case, the Court concluded that the purchase was for commercial purposes, and thus, Mr. Singh did not qualify as a “consumer” under the Act. The Special Leave Petition was dismissed.

Conclusion

The judgment in Virender Singh v. M/S. Darshana Trading Co. reinforces the principle that the definition of a “consumer” under the 1986 Act is context-specific and hinges on the purpose of the purchase. While self-employment is protected under the Act, commercial ventures are excluded. This decision is a reminder to consumers and businesses to carefully evaluate the nature of their transactions to determine their rights and obligations. For those aggrieved by defective goods, the judgment emphasises the importance of factual clarity and legal precision in asserting consumer rights.

By striking a balance between protecting genuine consumers and preventing misuse of the Act, the Supreme Court has provided clarity on a critical aspect of consumer law, ensuring that justice is dispensed fairly and appropriately.

For further details write to contact@indialaw.in