

HARYANA REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY GURUGRAM

हरियाणा भू-संपदा विनियामक प्राधिकरण, गुरुग्राम

New PWD Rest House, Civil Lines, Gurugram, Haryana

नया पी.डब्ल्यू.डी. विश्राम गृह, सिविल लाईस, गुरुग्राम, हरियाणा

PROCEEDINGS OF THE DAY	
Day and Date	Thursday and 29.07.2021
Complaint No.	CR/376/2021 Case titled as Goma Kalhia Vs. Emaar MGF Land Limited
Complainant	Goma Kalhia
Represented through	Complainant in person
Respondent	Emaar MGF Land Limited
Represented through	Shri J.K. Dang Advocate
Last date of hearing	13.05.2021
Proceeding Recorded by	Naresh Kumari and HR Mehta

Proceedings

The complainant has approached for seeking stilt parking in lieu of car parking allotted in MLCP without any additional cost.

The authority observed that the buyer's agreement was executed between the original allottees and the respondent on 03.11.2010. Thereafter, the respondent has acknowledged the complainant as an allottee vide nomination letter dated 14.05.2018 and has endorsed the buyer's agreement dated 03.11.2010 in favour of the complainant. As per clause 1.2(a) of the buyer's agreement, the complainant has agreed to pay Rs.4,00,000/- towards two covered car parking and the same is also reflected in the schedule of payment annexed with the buyer's agreement. Also, as per buyer's agreement, allotment of additional car parking shall be subject to the availability and shall be made available at an additional sum. The authority observes that in due compliance of its obligations under the buyer's agreement, the respondent has allotted two car parking space to the complainant. Vide email dated 16.06.2020 and 30.06.2020, the respondent had agreed to allot additional car parking to the complainant subject to payment of additional cost of Rs.2,36,000/-. As such, the complainant is



HARYANA REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY GURUGRAM

हरियाणा भू-संपदा विनियामक प्राधिकरण, गुरुग्राम

New PWD Rest House, Civil Lines, Gurugram, Haryana

नया पी.डब्ल्यू.डी. विश्राम गृह, सिविल लाईंस, गुरुग्राम, हरियाणा

entitled to additional car parking subject to payment of additional sum. As a matter of fact, the complainant has not remitted any additional cost towards the same, therefore, the complainant is not entitled to additional car parking.

In view of the above, no case is made out in favour of the complainant. The present complaint stands disposed of. File be consigned to the registry.

Samir Kumar Member V./ Vijay Kumar Goyal Member 29.07.2021