



HARYANA REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY PANCHKULA

Website: www.haryanarera.gov.in

SUO MOTU COMPLAINT NO. 1264 OF 2022

HRERA Panchkula

....COMPLAINANT(S)

VERSUS

1. Manish Kumar Jain & Sangeeta Jain

....RESPONDENT(S)

2. M/s Jindal Realty Pvt Ltd

CORAM: Dr. Geeta Rathee Singh

Member

Nadim Akhtar

Member

Dilbag Singh Sihag

Member

Date of Hearing: 21.09.2022

Hearing-2nd

Present through : - Mr. Manish Jain for respondent no. 1
Video Conferencing

ORDER (NADIM AKHTAR-MEMBER)

Captioned Suo-motu complaint has been filed against the respondents for recovery of Rs 7,000/- towards cost of appointment of Local Commissioner

who conducted site visit in project-Jindal Global City, Sonipat on 05.09.2020 and submitted his report on 04.01.2021. In compliance of order of the Authority dated 25.03.2021 in complaint no. 2712/2019 titled as Sumit Kumar vs Jindal Realty Pvt Ltd, Authority had disposed of the said complaint observing that both parties shall bear cost in equal proportion i.e. Rs 7,000/- to be paid by each party to the Authority towards appointment of Local Commissioner. Relevant part of the order dated 25.03.2021 is reproduced below for reference:-

It is pertinent to mention here that Local Commissioner was appointed in 3 complaints cases bearing no. 1000/2019 , 1576/2019 and 2712/2019 pertaining to same project-Jindal Global City Sonipat in order to resolve issue of increase in super area. Complaint no. 1000/2019 and 1576/2019 stands disposed of as mutually settled vide order dated 17.02.2021 and 25.11.2020 respectively. However, cost of Rs 42,000/- of local commissioner has not been recovered from the parties. In Complaint no. 1000/2019 and 1576/2019 parties could have avoided appointment of local commissioner by getting the issues settled prior to appointment of local commissioner so in these cases each party shall bear cost of local commissioner in equal proportion i.e. Rs 7,000/- to be paid to the Authority towards cost of local commissioner. In complaint no. 2712/2019, calculations made by local commissioner shows that actual area being offered by the respondent actually exists at ground as there was no discrepancy regarding calculations of super area. But the



area of various platforms and balconies was not explained in detail by the respondent to the complainant in order to satisfy him regarding increase in super area. So, in this case also both parties shall bear cost in equal proportion i.e. Rs 7,000/- to be paid by each party to the Authority towards cost of Local Commissioner.

2. Notice dated 20.05.2022 was issued to the respondents which got delivered successfully to respondent no. 1 on 27.05.2022 and respondent no. 2 on 23.05.2022. Respondent no.2 had already paid the cost of Rs 7,000/- vide demand draft bearing no. 500757 dated 17.06.2022 on last date of hearing. Today, case is fixed for recovery of cost of Rs 7,000/- from respondent no.1 i.e. Mr Manish Kumar Jain.

3. Mr. Manish Kumar Jain appearing through video conferencing has apprised the Authority that payment of Rs 7,000/- has already been made on 16.09.2022 by way of net banking. He has sent an email attaching proof of payment on official mail id of office.

4. As per office record, payment of Rs 7,000/- has been received from Manish Kumar Jain by way of net banking vide reference no. RERA-PKLC1663335444 dated 16.09.2022. In these circumstances, respondent no. 1 Manish Kumar Jain stands discharged when full amount of Rs 7,000/- has been recovered from him. Since amount of Rs 7,000/- each has been recovered from



respondent no.1 and 2, the case stands **disposed of**. File be consigned to record
room.



.....
DR. GEETA RATHEE SINGH
[MEMBER]



.....
NADIM AKHTAR
[MEMBER]



.....
DILBAG SINGH SIHAG
[MEMBER]

