



HARYANA REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY PANCHKULA

Website: www.haryanarera.gov.in

1. COMPLAINT NO. 104 OF 2021

Radha Gupta alias Radha Rani

....COMPLAINANT

VERSUS

Samar Estates Pvt Ltd.

....RESPONDENT

2. COMPLAINT NO. 110 OF 2021

Ramesh Garg and Kamlesh Garg

....COMPLAINANT

VERSUS

Samar Estate Pvt Ltd.

....RESPONDENT

3. COMPLAINT NO. 116 OF 2021

Rajinder Kumar and Neelam

....COMPLAINANT

VERSUS

Samar Estate Pvt Ltd.

....RESPONDENT

4. COMPLAINT NO. 1369 OF 2020

Santosh Garg

....COMPLAINANT

VERSUS

Samar Estate Pvt Ltd.

....RESPONDENT

4

5. COMPLAINT NO. 238 OF 2021

Deepika Prashar And Rajinder SharmaCOMPLAINANT(S)

VERSUS

M/s Samar Estate Pvt. Ltd.RESPONDENT

6. COMPLAINT NO. 240 OF 2021

Kiran Lata And Sh Sunder Lal BansalCOMPLAINANT(S)

VERSUS

M/s Samar Estate Pvt. Ltd.RESPONDENT

7. COMPLAINT NO. 456 OF 2021

Anita Goel and Sanjeev GoelCOMPLAINANT

VERSUS

Samar Estates Pvt Ltd.RESPONDENT

8. COMPLAINT NO. 564 OF 2021

Rajesh KhuranaCOMPLAINANT

VERSUS

Samar Estates Pvt Ltd.RESPONDENT

9. COMPLAINT NO. 565 OF 2021

Subhash Miglani and Sanjay KumarCOMPLAINANT

VERSUS

Samar Estates Pvt Ltd.RESPONDENT



10. COMPLAINT NO. 566 OF 2021

Rajeev Goel and Subhash MiglaniCOMPLAINANT

VERSUS

Samar Estates Pvt Ltd.RESPONDENT

11. COMPLAINT NO. 552 OF 2021

Manoj KumarCOMPLAINANT

VERSUS

Samar Estates Pvt Ltd.RESPONDENT

12. COMPLAINT NO. 646 OF 2021

Manjeet KarhanaCOMPLAINANT

VERSUS

Samar Estates Pvt Ltd.RESPONDENT

13. COMPLAINT NO. 821 OF 2021

Rajesh GuptaCOMPLAINANT

VERSUS

Samar Estates Pvt Ltd.RESPONDENT

14. COMPLAINT NO. 822 OF 2021

Mohinder Pal GulatiCOMPLAINANT

VERSUS

Samar Estates Pvt Ltd.RESPONDENT



15. COMPLAINT NO. 823 OF 2021

Atam Parkash Lakhina

....COMPLAINANT

VERSUS

Samar Estates Pvt Ltd.

....RESPONDENT

16. COMPLAINT NO. 975 OF 2021

Rajinder Bhadana

....COMPLAINANT

VERSUS

Samar Estates Pvt Ltd.

....RESPONDENT

17. COMPLAINT NO. 631 OF 2020

Jasvinder Kaur Nakai

...COMPLAINANT(S)

VERSUS

M/s Samar Estate Pvt. Ltd.

....RESPONDENT(S)

18.COMPLAINT NO. 1224 OF 2021

Manish Narula

....COMPLAINANT(S)

VERSUS

M/s Samar Estates Pvt Ltd.

....RESPONDENT(S)

19. COMPLAINT NO. 1040 OF 2021

Gurlal Bhattoa and Santosh Bhattoa

....COMPLAINANT(S)

VERSUS

M/s Samar Estates Pvt Ltd.

....RESPONDENT(S)

20. COMPLAINT NO. 1258 OF 2020

Anita RanaCOMPLAINANT

VERSUS

Samar Estate Pvt Ltd.RESPONDENT

21. COMPLAINT NO. 2742 OF 2019

Harish Kumar AroraCOMPLAINANT(S)

VERSUS

M/s Samar Estate Pvt. Ltd.RESPONDENT(S)

22. COMPLAINT NO. 2746 OF 2019

Meera DeviCOMPLAINANT(S)

VERSUS

M/s Samar Estate Pvt. Ltd.RESPONDENT(S)

23. COMPLAINT NO. 792 OF 2021

Nagender Ram and othersCOMPLAINANT

VERSUS

Samar Estates Pvt Ltd.RESPONDENT (1)

State Of Haryana through Deputy Commissioner Panchkula
.....RESPONDENT (2)

Housing Board Haryana through its Chief Administrator
.....RESPONDENT (3)

24.COMPLAINT NO. 784 of 2020

Atul Sundra ...Complainant.

Versus



M/s Samar Estate Pvt. Ltd.

...Respondent.

25.COMPLAINT NO. 785 of 2020

Arnav Sundra

...Complainant.

Versus

M/s Samar Estate Pvt. Ltd.

...Respondent.

26. COMPLAINT NO. 173 OF 2022

Vijay Bhatt and Rashmi Bhatt

....COMPLAINANT

VERSUS

M/s Samar Estate Pvt. Ltd.

....RESPONDENT

CORAM:

**Rajan Gupta
Dilbag Singh Sihag**

**Chairman
Member**

Date of Hearing: 04.05.2022

Present: -

Ms. Navneet, Counsel for complainants (in complaint nos. 784,785 of 2020) through VC
Mr. Jarnail Thakur, counsel for complainant (in complaint no.1258 of 2020) through VC
Mr. Ramnik Gupta, counsel for complainant (in complaint no.3051 of 2019) through VC
Mr. Ashok Malhotra, counsel for complainant (in complaint no.631 of 2020)
Mr. Santosh Garg, complainant in person (in complaint no.1369 of 2020)
Ms. Sidhi Bansal, Counsel for complainant (in complaint nos. 173 of 2022) through VC
Mr. Vishal Madan, Counsel for the complainants (in all other complaints)
Mr. Kamal Chaudhary, Counsel for the respondent

ORDER: (RAJAN GUPTA-CHAIRMAN)

1. These matters had come up for hearing on 24.02.2022. Authority had observed that this is a stuck project. Construction activities at the site have not taken place for more than 5-6 years. The project is badly delayed. Initially the project was registered vide Registration No. HRERA-PKL-PKL-54 of 2018 dated 05.10.2018 but on account of the repeated defaults by respondent company the said registration was cancelled and the certificate of registration was withdrawn. On the basis of these findings, Authority has already allowed refund in a bunch of 33 complaints with lead complaint No.865 of 2019 vide order dated 09.10.2019. Detailed speaking orders had been passed in the said lead complaint No.865 of 2019 dated 09.10.2019.
2. The facts and circumstances of the captioned bunch of 26 complaints are exactly similar to the matters already disposed of vide order dated 09.10.2019.
3. Accordingly, Authority disposes of the captioned complaints also in the same terms. Refund, therefore, is allowed in each of the cases.
4. The principal amount will be refunded to the complainants along with interest payable at the rate of MCLR plus 2% as was on the date of passing this order. The respondents shall refund the principal amount along with interest to each of the complainant as calculated by Accounts Department



of the Authority and shown in the table below:

Sr. No.	COMPLAINT NO.	TOTAL AMOUNT PAID BY THE COMPLAINANT	INTEREST TO BE PAID BY RESPONDENT	TOTAL PAYABLE AMOUNT
1.	104 of 2021	₹65,35,018/-	₹53,62,808/-	₹1,18,97,826/-
2.	110 of 2021	₹39,21,500/-	₹44,83,049/-	₹84,04,549/-
3.	116 of 2021	₹37,68,784/-	₹43,99,324/-	₹81,68,108/-
4.	238 of 2021	₹35,00,000/-	₹36,12,948/-	₹71,12,948/-
5.	240 of 2021	₹32,68,800/-	₹41,65,729/-	₹74,34,529/-
6.	456 of 2021	₹33,00,000/-	₹35,61,992/-	₹68,61,992/-
7.	552 of 2021	₹55,92,636/-	₹50,08,042/-	₹1,06,00,678/-
8.	564 of 2021	₹47,04,562/-	₹42,90,622/-	₹89,95,244/-
9.	565 of 2021	₹24,36,286/-	₹24,79,732/-	₹49,16,018/-
10.	566 of 2021	₹24,36,285/-	₹24,79,729/-	₹49,16,014/-
11.	631 of 2020	₹38,11,604/-	₹35,21,915/-	₹73,33,519/-
12.	646 of 2021	₹63,09,863/-	₹50,54,548/-	₹1,13,64,411/-
13.	784 of 2020	₹49,78,195/-	₹41,10,443/-	₹90,88,638/-
14.	785 of 2020	₹48,54,000/-	₹38,60,940/-	₹87,14,940/-
15.	821 of 2021	₹30,72,672/-	₹41,68,044/-	₹72,40,716/-
16.	822 of 2021	₹30,72,672/-	₹41,71,110/-	₹72,43,782/-
17.	823 of 2021	₹33,40,000/-	₹35,04,497/-	₹68,44,497/-
18.	975 of 2021	₹58,18,963/-	₹52,21,892/-	₹1,10,40,855/-
19.	1040 of 2021	₹73,20,910/-	₹64,47,410/-	₹1,37,68,320/-
20.	1224 of 2021	₹79,78,574/-	₹43,60,226/-	₹1,23,38,800/-
21.	1258 of 2020	₹16,92,500/-	₹17,45,935/-	₹34,37,935/-
22.	1369 of 2020	₹57,60,902/-	₹49,23,114/-	₹1,06,84,016/-
23.	2742 of 2019	₹42,00,000/-	₹43,21,965/-	₹85,21,965/-
24.	2746 of 2019	₹35,00,000/-	₹35,97,367/-	₹70,97,367/-
25.	173 of 2022	₹85,00,000/-	₹74,80,494/-	₹1,59,80,494/-


Complaint no.792 of 2021:

Sr. No.	COMPLAINANT NAME	TOTAL AMOUNT PAID BY THE COMPLAINANT	INTEREST TO BE PAID BY RESPONDENT	TOTAL PAYABLE AMOUNT
1.	Nagender Ram	₹1,27,500/-	₹1,29,847/-	₹2,57,347/-
2.	Nagina Kumar	₹1,27,500/-	₹1,29,888/-	₹2,57,388/-
3.	Ashok Shah	₹1,27,500/-	₹1,29,794/-	₹2,57,294/-

4

4.	Gian Chand	₹1,27,500/-	₹1,27,437/-	₹2,54,937/-
5.	Bhagwan Bhagat	₹1,27,500/-	₹1,29,803/-	₹2,57,303/-
6.	Krishna Kaur	₹1,27,500/-	₹1,29,746/-	₹2,57,246/-
7.	Raj Rani	₹1,27,500/-	₹1,27,850/-	₹2,55,350/-
8.	Naveen Kumar Mandal	₹1,27,500/-	₹1,29,730/-	₹2,57,230/-
9.	Palo Devi	₹1,27,500/-	₹1,29,871/-	₹2,57,371/-
10.	Harvinder Singh	₹1,27,500/-	₹1,29,859/-	₹2,57,359/-
11.	Mohinder Kaur	₹1,27,500/-	₹1,29,871/-	₹2,57,371/-
12.	Shiv Nandan Ram	₹1,27,500/-	₹1,28,098/-	₹2,55,598/-
13.	Deepak Kumar	₹1,27,500/-	₹1,20,159/-	₹2,47,659/-
14.	Kanti Devi	₹1,27,500/-	₹1,28,561/-	₹2,56,061/-

5. **Disposed of.** Files be consigned to record room after uploading order on the website of the Authority.



.....
(RAJAN GUPTA)
CHAIRMAN



.....
(DILBAG SINGH SIHAG)
MEMBER