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Abstract
This Study aims to find out the level of Satisfaction of consumers on Redressal Machinery under the Consumer Protection Act 1986. To conduct this study the data was collected by formulating a questionnaire and by interviewing the consumer. The Project was conducted to find out the level of Satisfaction of consumers on Redressal Machinery.
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1. Introduction
Business always starts and closes with customers and hence the customers must be treated as the King of the market. All the business enhancements, profit, status, image etc of the organization depends on customers. Hence it is important for all the organizations to meet all the customers’ expectations and identify that they are satisfied customer. Customer satisfaction is the measure of how the needs and responses are collaborated and delivered to excel customer expectation. It can only be attained if the customer has an overall good relationship with the supplier. Redressal machinery helps to protect the interest of Consumer.

2. Need for the Study
The Consumer Protection Act 1986 in India is one of the most advanced information legislation in the world. The Act is based on the principle that all government information is the property of people. The basic object of the Consumer Protection Act 1986 is to the right to be protected against the marketing of goods and services which are hazardous to life and property, the right to be informed about the quality, quantity, potency, purity, standard and price of goods or services, as the case may be so as to protect the consumer against unfair trade practices It goes without saying that an informed citizen is better equipped to keep necessary vigil on the instruments and make the government more accountable to the governed. The Act is a big step towards making protect consumers. The Redressal Machinery provides the solution to consumer grievance. The study helps to find out the Satisfaction of consumer of redresal machinery.

3. Objective S of the Study
➢ To identify the level of satisfaction on Redressal machinery under the Act.

4. Research Methodology
4.1 Research Design
Descriptive type of research is used. This research design deals with describing the characteristics of a particular individual or of groups. Descriptive research describes the state of affairs as it exit at present. Descriptive research includes surveys and fact finding inquires of different kind. In this study the research is analyzing the public Satisfaction on Redressal Machinery under the Consumer protection Act 1986(COPRA) with reference to Coimbatore City.
4.2. Sampling Design
Sampling Size
The sample size of this study consists of 150 respondents.

Sampling Method
The simple random sampling method is used for collecting data in this study.

4.3. Data Collection
Both the primary and secondary data is used to collect the details from the respondents.

Primary Data
Primary data are collected from 150 sample respondents with the help of well-structured questionnaire, which is pre-tested.

Secondary Data
The primary data are supplemented by spat of secondary sources of data. The secondary sources being the published research and articles collected from various journals, books and internet etc…

5. Redressal Agencies under the Consumer Protection Act, 1986 and Their Jurisdiction
Three Tier Consumer Grievances Machinery under the Consumer Protection Act

1. District Forum
District forum consists of a president and two other members. The president can be a retired or working judge of District Court. They are appointed by state government. The complaints for goods or services worth Rs 20 lakhs or less can be filed in this agency.

The agency sends the goods for testing in laboratory if required and gives decisions on the basis of facts and laboratory report. If the aggrieved party is not satisfied by the jurisdiction of the district forum then they can file an appeal against the judgment in State Commission within 30 days by depositing Rs 25000 or 50% of the penalty amount whichever is less.

2. State Commission
It consists of a president and two other members. The president must be a retired or working judge of high court. They all are appointed by state government. The complaints for the goods worth more than Rs 20 lakhs and less than Rs 1 crore can be filed in State Commission on receiving complaint the State commission contacts the party against whom the complaint is filed and sends the goods for testing in laboratory if required. In case the aggrieved party is not satisfied with the judgment then they can file a complaint in Supreme Court within 30 days.

3. National Commission
The national commission consists of a president and four members one of whom shall be a woman. They are appointed by Central Government. The complaint can be filed in National Commission if the value of goods exceeds Rs 1 crore. On receiving the complaint the National Commission informs the party against whom complaint is filed and sends the goods for testing if required and gives judgment? f aggrieved party is not satisfied with the judgment then they can file a complaint in Supreme Court within 30 days.

6. Data Analysis and Interpretation
Satisfaction towards location of district forum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Highly Satisfied</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Highly Dissatisfied</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data

Interpretation
The above table reveals that maximum (38%) of the respondents had neutral satisfaction towards location of district forum, 21% of the respondents are satisfied, 20% of the respondents are dissatisfied, 12% of the respondents are highly dissatisfied and 9% of the respondents are highly satisfied towards information provided.

Satisfaction towards jurisdiction of district forum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Highly Satisfied</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Highly Dissatisfied</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data

Interpretation
It is observed from the above table that less than half (46%) of the respondents had neutral satisfaction towards jurisdiction of district forum, 24% of the respondents are satisfied, 14% of the respondents are dissatisfied, 10% of the respondents are highly satisfied and 6% of the respondents are highly dissatisfied towards the facilities. Less than half (46%) of the respondents had neutral satisfaction towards jurisdiction of district forum.

Satisfaction towards jurisdiction of state commission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Highly Satisfied</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Highly Dissatisfied</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data

Interpretation
The above table reveals that less than half (38%) of the respondents had neutral satisfaction towards jurisdiction of state commission, 21% of the respondents are satisfied, 20% of the respondents are dissatisfied, 12% of the respondents are highly dissatisfied and 9% of the respondents are highly satisfied towards jurisdiction of state commission.
Less than half (46%) of the respondents had neutral satisfaction towards jurisdiction of state commission.

**Satisfaction towards jurisdiction of national commission**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Highly Satisfied</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Highly Dissatisfied</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data

**Interpretation**

It is understood from the above table that less than half (34%) of the respondents had neutral satisfaction towards jurisdiction of national commission, 24% of the respondents are satisfied, 12% of the respondents are highly satisfied and 10% of the respondents are highly dissatisfied towards online mode. Less than half (34%) of the respondents had neutral satisfaction towards jurisdiction of national commission.

**Findings**

- More than half (54%) of the respondents are male
- Less than half (46%) of the respondents had neutral satisfaction towards jurisdiction of district forum
- Less than half (46%) of the respondents had neutral satisfaction towards jurisdiction of state commission.
- Less than half (34%) of the respondents had neutral satisfaction towards jurisdiction of national commission

**Suggestions**

- Few respondents not know about the location of consumer forum so the appropriate government wants to clarify the location clearly and make some advertisement for location.
- Most of the respondents are not aware of central and state commission, so awareness programmes can be conducted.

**Conclusion**

The need for empowerment of consumers as a class cannot be over emphasized and is already well recognized all over the world. The advancement of technology and advent of sophisticated gadgets in the market and aggressive marketing strategies in the era of globalization have not only thrown open a wide choice for the consumer, but all the same also rendered the consumer vulnerable to a plethora of problems concomitant to such rapid changes. There is an urgent and increasing necessity to educate and motivate the consumer to be wary of the quality of the products, and also the possible deficiencies in the services of the growing sector of public utilities. In short, the consumer should be empowered with respect to his rights as a consumer.
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