



HARYANA REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY, PANCHKULA.

Mini Secretariat (2nd and 3rd Floor), Sector-1, Panchkula.

Telephone No: 0172-2584232, 2585232

E-mail: officer.rera.hry@gmail.com, hrerapkl-hry@gov.in

Website: www.haryanarera.gov.in

Extract of the resolution passed by the Haryana Real Estate Regulatory Authority, Panchkula in its meeting held on 15.07.2026.

Item No. 325.32

Representation on behalf of the promoter, M/s Blissful Estates LLP, regarding rejection of applications for rejection of project namely "SLOTCO EXPERIA" vide orders dated 25.02.2026 passed in TEMP ID RERA-PKL-1997-2026 by the Ld. Authority, Panchkula.

1. The Promoter vide letter dated 06.05.2026 has submitted a representation which states that:

This document is a formal representation/appeal by The Blissfull Estates LLP (the "Promoter") regarding the repeated rejection of their registration applications for the project "SLOTCO EXPERIA," an affordable plotted colony in Karnal, Haryana, under the RERA Act, 2016.

The summary of the Promoter's grievances is as follows:

1. Procedural Irregularities in the First Application

Initial Submission: Filed on January 27, 2026.

Rejection: The Authority rejected it on February 25, 2026, citing unresolved observations.

Contention: The Promoter argues the rejection occurred just two days before the statutory 30-day deadline, depriving them of a fair opportunity to submit rectifications.

2. Issues with the Second Application & "Deemed Registration"

Timeline: A fresh application was filed on March 16, 2026. The Authority issued new observations on April 3, 2026 (a Friday evening), demanding a response by April 8, 2026—effectively giving only two working days to reply.

Delayed Communication: Although the rejection order is dated April 8, 2026, it was not uploaded until April 17, 2026 (32 days after submission).

Legal Argument: Under Section 5(2) of the RERA Act, if the Authority fails to approve or reject within 30 days, the project is "deemed registered." The Promoter contends the rejection is invalid as it was communicated after this statutory window.

3. Lack of "Opportunity of Being Heard"



1/2

* The Promoter asserts that during the April 8 hearing, the Authority claimed their reply was "not on record" and promised to review it later. Instead, they issued a rejection without further dialogue.

* This is alleged to be a violation of *Section 5(1)(b), which mandates that reasons for rejection must be recorded in writing and the applicant must be given a fair hearing.

4. Disputed Technical & Financial Observations

Registration Fees: The Authority claimed a deficit of ₹36,543. The Promoter argues this is inconsistent with previous calculations and that they had already settled a prior deficit of ₹25,896.

Other Queries: The Promoter claims they provided detailed clarifications regarding the payment plan, supplementary agreements (confirming none exist), and the engagement of technical professionals (architects/engineers) via group companies, all of which were ignored by the Authority.

5. Final Prayer

The Promoter requests the Hon'ble Authority to:

* Set aside* the rejection orders dated February 25 and April 8, 2026.

* Grant a personal hearing* to address any outstanding concerns.

Direct the registration of the project in accordance with the law.

2. The project application listed on 03.06.2026 has been granted registration vide Registration Number HRERA-PKL-KRL-915-2026 dated 23.06.2026.

3. Today Ld. Counsel Adv. Chitra Singh appeared & made submissions regarding the case. After hearing the counsel, the Authority directed Ld. Secretary (Acting) to conduct an internal inquiry regarding the scrutiny of the case and suggest if any improvements need to be done while scrutinizing such cases. Adjourned to **09.09.2026**.



True copy

Secretary (Acting),
HRERA, Panchkula

A copy of the above is forwarded to Advisor, HRERA Panchkula, for information and taking further action in the matter.

LA DHRVV

6/8/26

STP

06/08

1/11
08/08/26

(2/2)