

Complaint no.	:	5202 of 2021
First date of hear	08.03.2022	
Date of decision	:	11.10.2022

Gitika Duggal Through Sunil Duggal R/O : H.no. 110, Ashoka Enclave, Sector-34, Faridabad-121003

ARERA

Complainant

Versus

M/s Pivotal Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd. Office: 309, 3rd Floor, JMD Pacific Square, Sec-15, Part-II, Gurgaon-121001

Respondent

CORAM:

Shri Vijay Kumar Goyal Shri Ashok Sangwan Shri Sanjeey Kumar Arora Member Member Member

APPEARANCE:

Sh. Sant Garg(Advocate) Sh. Sweety Dalal (Advocate) Counsel for the complainant Proxy counsel for the Respondent

ORDER

1. The present complaint dated 31.12.2021 has been filed by the complainant/allottee under section 31 of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016 (in short, the Act) read with rule 28 of the Haryana Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Rules, 2017 (in short, the Rules) for violation of section 11(4)(a) of the Act wherein it is *inter alia* prescribed that the promoter shall be responsible for all obligations, responsibilities and functions under the provision of the Act or the Rules and regulations made there under or to the allottee as per the agreement for sale executed *inter se*.



A. Unit and project related details

2. The particulars of unit details, sale consideration, the amount paid by the complainant, date of proposed handing over the possession, delay period, if any, have been detailed in the following tabular form:

S. N.	Particulars	Details	
1.	Name and location of the	"Paradise" at sector 62, village Ullahawas,	
	project	Gurgaon, Haryana	
2.	Nature of the project	Affordable Group housing	
3.	Project area	Approx 5acres	
4.	RERA Registered/ not	Registered vide no. 178 of 2017 dated	
	registered	01.09.2017 valid upto 29.05.2021	
5.	Date of allotment	01.12.2016	
	1	(Annexure P4, page no. 37 of complaint)	
6.	Unit no.	T3-301, 3 rd floor	
	1-201	(Annexure P4, page no. 37 of complaint)	
7.	Unit area admeasuring	566 sq. ft. (Carpet area)	
	and the second second	(Annexure P4, page no. 37 of complaint)	
8.	Date of builder buyer	06.06.2017	
	agreement	(Page no. 14 of reply)	
9.	Date of building plan	25.07.2016 (page 49 of reply)	
	approval		
10.	Environmental clearance	28.07.2017 (page 22 of reply)	
	dated		
11.	Due date of possession	28.07.2021	
		[Due date of possession calculated from the	
		date of environmental clearance dated	
	· 18 8	28.07.2017]	
12.	Total sale consideration	Rs. 24,82,486/- (page 15 of reply)	
13.	Amount paid by the	Rs. 18,22,847/- (Page 15 of reply)	
	complainant		
14.	Legal notice	03.09.2020 (annexure P10, page 63 of	
		complaint)	
15.	Intimations of due	01.08.2017, 01.09.2017, 16.09.2017,	
	installment	01.05.2018, 18.03.2020, 30.07.2020	
	Reminder/final notice	01.09.2017, 29.03.2018, 17.03.2020	
16.	Letter of cancellation	16.09.2017, 01.05.2018, 16.05.2018	



Email	w.r.t cancellation	30.07.2020 (page 72 of reply) {In which it was mentioned that the allottee have to pay outstanding amount with interest till 1
		august 2020, else her unit would be cancelled}

B. Facts of the complaint

- 3. The complainant has made the following submissions in the complaint:
 - I. That the complainant herein is a law abiding citizen and is filing this present complaint though her father Sh. Sunil Duggal, who is duly authorised vide power of attorney dated 29.09.2021.
 - II. That in the year 2015-16, the respondent herein proposed to develop a residential project namely 'Paradise' in land admeasuring approx. 5 acres situated at Sector-62, Village Ullahawas, Gurgaon. The said housing project was proposed to be developed under the Affordable Housing Policy 2013, issued by the Government of Haryana, vide Town and Country Planning Department Notification dated 19.08.2013. The respondent herein as per the provisions of the Affordable Housing Policy, 2013 undertook and was obligated to hand over the physical possession of the said affordable housing project in four year as per clause 1(iv) of the policy.
 - III. That on such presentation of proposals/claims by the respondent, the complainant believing in the offer as genuine and trusting coupled with the fact that it is under the 'affordable housing scheme' within the control of Government of Haryana, applied for a residential apartment ad-measuring 566 sq. ft., accompanied with a two-wheeler parking space admeasuring approximately 0.8m x 2.5m at a total sale consideration of Rs. 23,09,500/- + taxes vide application no.2288 dated 11.09.2016 by submitting the prescribed 5% of the sale consideration amounting to Rs. 1,15,475/-.



- IV. That a draw was conducted on 28.11.2016 of the applications submitted for the allotment under the said affordable housing project, and the complainant turned out to be successful as one of the allottee in the said affordable housing project.
- V. That in furtherance to the selection in the above mentioned draw of allottees, adhering to the time linked payment schedule under the published policy, the complainant further paid to the respondent 20% of the total sale consideration amounting to Rs 4,61,900/- (Rs. 2,61,900/- on 19.12.2016 & Rs. 2,00,000/- on 23.12.2016. That after remitting of in total 25% or Rs. 5,77,375/- (5% at the time of the application + 20% after the selection in the draw) of the total sale consideration, the respondent herein issued an letter dated 01.12.2016 allotting the complainant above said residential apartment.
- VI. That as per the terms of allotment letter dated 01.12.2016, the respondent was liable to handover the possession of the unit on or before 30.12.2020. Further, the respondent was bound to serve letter intimating cancellation of the allotment at least 15 days prior to the publication of default list in the newspaper and it was bound to wait for another 15 days from the date of the publication. In the event the allottee failing to make due payments within 15 days from the date of the publication, the respondent was to initiate refund against such allotment after deduction of the prescribed earnest money.
- VII. That thereafter, the complainant with a desire to aware herself w.r.t the stage of construction, visited the project site, and she was in utter shock as the construction of the said project was not up to the claimed stage. On witnessing the same, she reached out to the respondent hoping to get some true intended assurances, but it paid no heads to the concerns of



her. On apprehending a possible foul play and to safe guard her interests, she decided to stop to make any payment to the respondent till the time it provided with plausible answer for such delay.

- VIII. That the respondent instead of attending the rightful concerns of the complainant, voluntarily issued a letter dated 16.09.2017 intimating cancellation of allotment of the complainant in the event of non-payment of dues w.r.t to the said residential apartment and asked her to make payments for the due amount within 15 days from the issuance of the said letter. Witnessing such unreasonable conduct from the respondent, the complainant made a last effort to seek satisfying assurances, to which it assured that the physical possession of the said project would be handed over to the allottee(s), within stipulated time as per terms of the policy.
 - IX. That after getting assurance from the respondent, the complainant agreed to restart the payments of instalment and upon instructions of the promoter made payments from 30.10.2017 to 12.06.2020. Therefore, till 12.06.2020, the complainant paid a total of Rs. 18,22,847.88/- i.e. approx. 79% of the total sale consideration. That in between the above mentioned payments, the complainant received regular correspondence from the respondent addressed to her as an allottee of the said residential apartment, showing that the she herein was rightful allottee.
 - X. That after the payment made in the month June 2020 of Rs. 2,00,000/-, the complainant contacted respondent to check the status of the project and date of possession along with detail for the next payment. The respondent unexpectedly denied to accept of any further payments towards the said residential apartment saying that the allotment of the complainant against the said residential apartment was long cancelled



and the residential apartment has been already been allotted to a different allottee. On enquiring that on to what grounds, the allotment was cancelled, the respondent herein supplied a copy of one defaulters list published in the newspaper namely "Tribune" and stated that as per the said published defaulter list the unit no. T3-301(residential unit allotted to complainant) was under default for non- payment and in the terms of the same published defaulter's list dated 14.09.2017, the allotment of the complainant was cancelled.

- XI. That the respondent in the said publication dated 14.09.2017 further stated that the said defaulters list includes allottees who have failed to pay till date despite issuance of reminder/notices. The complainant never received any intimation regarding cancellation of the allotment prior to the date of publication of the said defaulters list. The letter, the respondent claimed to have served upon the complainant prior to the publication, was in fact issued only on 16.09.2017, clearly establishing, that the respondent on intention, stated false and incorrect facts, claiming to have served her regarding the intimation of cancellation of the said claimed notice was not in existence at the time of the publication of the date 14.09.2020.
- XII. That as per the terms of allotment letter dated 01.12.2016, the respondent was liable to intimate the complainant 15 days prior to the publication of such notice wherein the same was done vide letter dated 16.09.2017 i.e. two days after the publication of the defaulter List.
- XIII. That the respondent by claiming the false and incorrect facts has breached the terms and provisions of the Affordable Housing Policy-2013, issued by Government of Haryana and allotment letter dated



01.12.2016 which is a document issued by it, hence admitted and binding document.

- XIV. That appalled on witnessing such great extent of foul play, the complainant rightfully demanded refund of the payments made by her vide demand letter dated 03.09.2020 which was duly served upon the respondent. But till date, no response has been received from it against the said demand letter dated 03.09.2020.
- XV. That after hearing no response from the respondent, the complainant had no other option and filed a complaint dated 20.07.2021 before SHO, EOW- Faridabad which was duly received under diary no. 128/Peshi.
- XVI. That on seeing no real effort placed in the perusal of the complaint dated 20.07.2021, the complainant moved an application u/s 156(3) bearing no. COMI/404/2021 before the Court of Ld. Magistrate Faridabad. He vide order dated 01.10.2021 directed the IO concerned to file the status report with respect to the complaint dated 20.07.2021. The IO filed its status report before LD. Magistrate Faridabad on 20.07.2021 which shows that how wrongfully, the respondent cancelled the allotment of the complainant.
- XVII. That the complainant has lost all faith in the respondent and has till date not received physical possession of the flat allotted to her. Neither, the respondent is willing to refund the amount paid along with rightful interest nor compensation. Therefore, after having no other remedy, the complainant herein has come before this authority to seek justice against the atrocity committed by the respondent. The respondent over the period accepted payments from the complainant and when confronted with default on its part, the respondent maliciously and wrongfully



cancelled the allotment of the complainant. Such illegal acts shall be penalized heavily by this authority.

- C. Relief sought by the complainant:
- 4. The complainant has sought following relief(s).
 - I. Direct the respondent to refund the payments made by the complainant along with interest at the prescribed rate from the date such payments were made.
 - II. Direct the respondent to award complainant compensation.
- 5. On the date of hearing, the authority explained to the respondent/promoter about the contraventions as alleged to have been committed in relation to section 11(4) (a) of the act to plead guilty or not to plead guilty.

D. Reply by the respondent

- 6. The respondent has contested the complaint on the following grounds.
 - a. That it is submitted that the project "Paradise" is registered under the authority vide registration certificate no. 178 of 2017 dated 01.09.2017. The said project is developed under the Scheme of Affordable Housing Policy Scheme 2013 (amended in year 2019), and on the basis of applicable laws, regulations, bye-laws or orders made pursuant thereto, the respondent company has invited application for allotment of project in the project.
 - b. That it is pertinent to mention here that the possession of the said project was proposed to be delivered by the respondent to the allottee by July 2021 i.e. as per clause 5 (iii) (b) of the affordable housing scheme and builder buyer agreement, the possession of flat was to be offered within validity period of 4 years from the date of sanctioning of building plan or from the date of issuance of environment clearance



certificate. Thus, according to the said terms, the environment clearance certificate was issued late on dated 28.07.2017 and the proposed possession was to be handed over by July 2021.

- That the completion of the building is delayed by reason due to highly С. spread of Corona virus in nation. The ministry of home affairs announced a complete lockdown from 24.03.2020. The nation was apparently under the clutches of Covid-19 and everybody was diligently trying to cope with that situation. All the workers /labor went back to their hometown and, For a Builder, now to resume the construction at that time, has to suffer a shortage of labor force to complete the project. Thus, the lockdown due to Corona virus pandemic has adversely affected the construction companies/promoters for which the central government and reserve bank of India, has made efficiently guidelines accordingly, to grow up the downfall for real estate market in the country. Even, then the respondent with all best efforts, completed the project and the respondent is in a position to hand over the possession of the said project in this year 2022. There was/is no malafide intention of the respondent company to get the delivery of project, delayed, to the allottees.
- d. That It is pertinent to mention here that NGT had passed the order dated 09.11.2017 completely prohibiting to carrying on construction by any person, private or government authority in the entire N.C.R. till 17.11.2017. Even the Haryana State Pollution Control Board, Panchkula had passed the order dated 29.10.2018 in furtherance of directions of Environment Pollution (Prevention and Control) Authority dated 27.10.2018, passed to ban construction activities



involving excavation, civil construction (excluding internal finishing work/work where no construction material was used) were directed to remain closed in Delhi and other NCR Region/Districts from 1.11.2018 till 10.11.2018. Even more, in year 2019, the Commissioner, Municipal Corporation Gurugram vide order dated 11.10.2019, issued notification for prohibiting to carry out construction work from 11.10.2019 till 21.12.2019. It is specifically mentioned in the said order that construction activities were to be completely stopped during that period. Thus, in view of aforesaid order/notifications, the construction has been stopped due to high rise in pollution in Delhi NCR including the state of Haryana. Even, the hon'ble. Additional Chief Secretary, Environment and Climate Change Department, vide its Memo no. 1 of 2021 dated 2.12.2021, has directed to stop carrying out construction activities due to high rise in pollution. There was completely ban on construction activities during the aforesaid period of time to complete the project from the year 2017 till year 2021. The respondent company never had any such intention to delay the construction of project. It is also to mention here that all the workers/labors went back to their hometown during the period of construction ban and, for a builder/promoter, to resume the same speed of construction at that time, has become difficult due to shortage of labor force to complete the project.

e. It is submitted that the complainant has filed the complaint before the Economic Offence Zone, NIT Faridabad, Haryana, wherein she has alleged false and frivolous allegations upon the respondent company. The complainant was given opportunity to pay the installments and various reminder dated 29.03.2018, 01.05.2018, 16.05.2018, and



newspaper publication dated 28.03.2018 was made against her. Again a last and final opportunity vide email dated 30.07.2020 was given to the complainant. But no response from her side ever received by the respondent company. In spite of giving so much so opportunities, the complainant failed to pay the outstanding dues and ultimately, leaving with no other option, the allotment of the complainant was cancelled on 02.08.2020 by the respondent company and has allotted the said flat to third party. It is also pertinent to mention here that the respondent company issued cheque for refund of the amount paid by the complainant. But she did not came forward to receive the cheque and is playing a forum shopping by filing such frivolous litigations with an malafide intention to cause harassment and malign image of the respondent company. The respondent company is still ready and willing to issue the cheque of refund of the amount paid after deducting the charges as per the Affordable Housing Scheme. The respondent company never has/had any malafide intention to cause harm to its valuable customers. Even the complainant has filed application under section- 156 (3) CR.P.C. before the Judicial Magistrate First Class, Faridabad, Haryana, taking all the frivolous and bogus pleas in the said complaint/application.

f. That it is pertinent to mention here that when the parties have contracted and limited their liabilities, they are bound by the same, and relief beyond the same could not be granted. There is no clause in the Affordable housing Scheme 2013 as well as in the flat buyer agreement to pay any delay possession charges or any compensation to any of successful allottee. Hence, as per aforesaid facts and



circumstances, the complainant is not entitled for any delayed compensation charges as prayed.

- 7. Copies of all the relevant documents have been filed and placed on record. Their authenticity is not in dispute. Hence, the complaint can be decided on the basis of these undisputed documents and submission made by the parties.
- E. Jurisdiction of the authority
- 8. The authority has complete territorial and subject matter jurisdiction to adjudicate the present complaint for the reasons given below.

E.I Territorial jurisdiction

9. As per notification no. 1/92/2017-1TCP dated 14.12.2017 issued by Town and Country Planning Department, Haryana, the jurisdiction of Haryana Real Estate Regulatory Authority, Gurugram shall be entire Gurugram district for all purposes. In the present case, the project in question is situated within the planning area of Gurugram district. Therefore, this authority has complete territorial jurisdiction to deal with the present complaint.

E.IISubject-matter jurisdiction

10. Section 11(4)(a) of the Act, 2016 provides that the promoter shall be responsible to the allottee as per agreement for sale. Section 11(4)(a) is reproduced as hereunder:

Section 11

(4) The promoter shall-

(a) be responsible for all obligations, responsibilities and functions under the provisions of this Act or the rules and regulations made thereunder or to the allottees as per the agreement for sale, or to the association of allottees, as the case may be, till the conveyance of all the apartments, plots or buildings, as the case may be, to the allottees, or the common areas to the association of allottees or the competent authority, as the case may be;



Section 34-Functions of the Authority:

34(f) of the Act provides to ensure compliance of the obligations cast upon the promoters, the allottees and the real estate agents under this Act and the rules and regulations made thereunder.

- 11. So, in view of the provisions of the Act quoted above, the authority has complete jurisdiction to decide the complaint regarding non-compliance of obligations by the promoter leaving aside compensation which is to be decided by the adjudicating officer if pursued by the complainant at a later stage.
- 12. Further, the authority has no hitch in proceeding with the complaint and to grant a relief of refund in the present matter in view of the judgement passed by the Hon'ble Apex Court in *Newtech Promoters and Developers Private Limited Vs State of U.P. and Ors. 2021-2022 (1) RCR (Civil), 357 and reiterated in case of M/s Sana Realtors Private Limited & other Vs Union of India & others SLP (Civil) No. 13005 of 2020 decided on 12.05.2022*, wherein it has been laid down as under:

"86. From the scheme of the Act of which a detailed reference has been made and taking note of power of adjudication delineated with the regulatory authority and adjudicating officer, what finally culls out is that although the Act indicates the distinct expressions like 'refund', 'interest', 'penalty' and 'compensation', a conjoint reading of Sections 18 and 19 clearly manifests that when it comes to refund of the amount, and interest on the refund amount, or directing payment of interest for delayed delivery of possession, or penalty and interest thereon, it is the regulatory authority which has the power to examine and determine the outcome of a complaint. At the same time, when it comes to a question of seeking the relief of adjudging compensation and interest thereon under Sections 12, 14, 18 and 19, the adjudicating officer exclusively has the power to determine, keeping in view the collective reading of Section 71 read with Section 72 of the Act. if the adjudication under Sections 12, 14, 18 and 19 other than compensation as envisaged, if extended to the adjudicating officer as prayed that, in our view, may intend to expand the ambit and scope of the powers and functions of the adjudicating officer under Section 71 and that would be against the mandate of the Act 2016."



- 13. Hence, in view of the authoritative pronouncement of the Hon'ble Supreme court in the cases mentioned above, the authority has the jurisdiction to entertain a complaint seeking refund of the amount and interest on the refund amount.
- F. Findings on the relief sought by the complainant.
 - F.I Direct the respondent to refund the payments made by the complainant along with interest at the prescribed rate from the date such payments were made.
- 14. The complainant was allotted a unit through draw. A unit bearing no. T3-301, 3rd floor admeasuring 566 sq. ft. was allotted to her vide allotment letter dated 01.12.2016 by the respondent in its project detailed above under the affordable housing policy, 2013. On 06.06.2017, a builder buyer agreement was executed between the parties in respect of said unit. The complainant started making payments against the allotted unit as per the schedule of payments and paid a sum of Rs. 18,22,847/- in all against the total sale price of Rs. 24,82,486/- to the respondent. As per the buyers' agreement, the allotted unit was to be handed over to her on 28.07.2021. The complainant visited the project site and she was in utter shock as the construction of the said project was not up to the claimed stage. Thereafter, the complainant decided to stop making payment to safeguard her money. The respondent instead of accommodating the rightful concerns of her, voluntarily issued a letter dated 16.09.2017, intimating cancellation of allotment of complainant. Further, the complainant made a last effort to seek satisfying assurances to which the respondent assured her that the physical possession of the said project would be handed over within the stipulated time. After getting assurance from the respondent, the complainant agreed to restart the payments of Installment from 30.11.2017. The complainant paid a total of Rs. 18,22,847/- i.e., 79% of the



total sale consideration till 12.06.2020. After the payment made in the month June 2020 of Rs. 2,00,000/-, the complainant contacted the respondent to check the status of the project and date of possession along with detail for the next payment The respondent, unexpectedly denied accepting of any further payment towards the said unit by saying that the unit was cancelled a long time ago and the same was allotted to the different allottee. The respondent also supplied a copy of one defaulters list published in the newspaper namely "Tribune" and stated that as per the said published defaulter list, the unit no. T3-301 was under default for nonpayment and in the terms of the same published defaulter's list dated 14.09.2017 (annexure P/9). On 03.09.2020, the complainant through her counsel sent a legal notice to the respondent and demanded refund of the payment made by her but the respondent did not reply the same. With no option the complainant filed a complaint dated 20.07.2021 before SHO, EOW-Faridabad. On seeing no real effort placed in the perusal of the complaint dated 20.07.2021, the complainant moved an application u/s 156(3) CR.P.C before the court of Ld. Magistrate Faridabad and was vide order dated 01.10.2021, directed the IO concerned to file the status report with respect to the complaint dated 20.07.2021. It was filed by IO on 20.07.2021 which shows that how wrongfully, the respondent cancelled the allotment of the complainant.

15. The respondent submitted that the complainant has no locus standi to file the present complaint. The complainant has already filed the complaint before the economic offence Zone, NIT Faridabad, Haryana, wherein she has alleged false and frivolous allegations against the respondent. It further submitted that the complainant was given opportunity to pay instalments and various reminders dated 29.03.2018, 01.05.2018, 16.05.2018 and



newspaper publication dated 28.03.2018 were made against the complainant. Again the last and final opportunity vide email dated 30.07.2020 was given to the complainant. In spite of giving many opportunities, the complainant failed to pay the outstanding dues and ultimately led to cancellation dated 02.08.2020, and the same unit was allotted to the third party.

16. Upon perusal of documents and submitted by both the parties, the authority is in view that the respondent has not completed the project till date and issued various demands/reminder letter to the complainant to clear outstanding dues and the same was not cleared by her which ultimately led to cancellation of unit. It is an admitted fact that the complainant paid a sum of Rs. 18,22,847/- in all against the allotted unit and failed to pay the remaining amount as per the policy of 2013, leading to cancellation of the allotment and refund her the above-mentioned amount after deducting 25,000/- as per policy 2013. The policy of 2013 under clause 5(iii))(i) provides a provision for cancellation of allotted unit and which runs as follow:

"if any successful applicant fails to deposit the installments within the time period as prescribed in the allotment letter issued by the colonizer, a reminder may be issued to him for depositing the due installments within a period of 15 days from the date of issue of such notice. If the allottee still defaults in making the payment, the list of such defaulters may be published in one regional Hindi news-paper having circulation of more than ten thousand in the State for payment of due amount within 15 Days from the date of publication of such notice, failing which allotment may be cancelled. In such cases also an amount of Rs. 25,000/- may be deducted by the coloniser and the balance amount shall be refunded to the applicant. Such flats may be considered by the committee for offer to those applicants falling in the waiting list".

17. Keeping in view of the aforesaid policy of 2013, the respondent is directed to refund the amount of Rs. 18,22,847/- paid by the complainant after deduction of Rs. 25,000/- as per clause 5(iii)(i) of the Affordable Housing



Policy, 2013 along with interest @10% per annum on the balance amount from the date of cancellation of the unit i.e. 02.08.2020 till the actual realization of the amount.

F II. Direct the respondent to award complainant compensation.

- 18. The complainant is also seeking relief w.r.t compensation. Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in case titled as M/s Newtech Promoters and Developers Pvt. Ltd. V/s State of Up & Ors. (supra), has held that an allottee is entitled to claim compensation & litigation charges under sections 12,14,18 and section 19 which is to be decided by the adjudicating officer as per section 71 and the quantum of compensation & litigation expense shall be adjudged by the adjudicating officer having due regard to the factors mentioned in section 72. The adjudicating officer has exclusive jurisdiction to deal with the complaints in respect of compensation & legal expenses. Therefore, the complainant is advised to approach the adjudicating officer for seeking the relief of litigation expenses.
- F. Directions of the authority
- 19. Hence, the authority hereby passes this order and issues the following directions under section 37 of the Act to ensure compliance of obligations cast upon the promoter as per the function entrusted to the authority under section 34(f):
 - i. The respondent is directed to refund the amount of Rs. 18,22,847/-paid by the complainant after deduction of Rs. 25,000/- as per clause 5(iii)(i) of the Affordable Housing Policy, 2013 along with interest @10% per annum on the balance amount from the date of cancellation of the unit i.e. 02.08.2020 till the actual realization of the amount.



- A period of 90 days is given to the respondent to comply with the directions given in this order and failing which legal consequences would follow.
- 20. Complaint stands disposed of.
- 21. File be consigned to registry.

(Sanjeev/Kumar Arora) (Ashok Sangwan) (Vijay Kumar Goval) Member Member Member

Haryana Real Estate Regulatory Authority, Gurugram

Dated: 11.10.2022