

**BEFORE THE HARYANA REAL ESTATE APPELLATE  
TRIBUNAL**

---

**Appeal No. 587 of 2022  
Date of Decision: 10.08.2023**

Silverglades Infrastructure Private Limited, Registered Office:  
404, Nirmal Tower, 26 Barakhamba Road, New Delhi-110001  
Coporate Office: 5<sup>th</sup> floor, Times Square Building, B-Block,  
Sushant Lok Phase-1, Gurugram, Haryana through its  
authorised representative Mr. Harsh Kumar Gupta.

Appellant

Versus

1. Ms. Vibha Jain
2. Ms. Ritika Jain

Sub-042, The Summit, DLF City Phase-V, Sector-54,  
Gurugram, Haryana.

Respondents

**CORAM:**

Justice Rajan Gupta	Chairman
Shri Anil Kumar Gupta,	Member (Technical)

Present: Mr. Ashwarya Sinha, Advocate,  
for the appellant.

Mr. Satyendra Kumar, Advocate,  
for the respondents.

**ORDER:**

**RAJAN GUPTA, CHAIRMAN (Oral):**

Appellant has posed challenge to order dated  
28.09.2021 passed by the Haryana Real Estate Regulatory  
Authority, Gurugram (hereinafter referred to as 'the  
Authority'). The order passed reads as under:-

*“Proceedings**Arguments heard.*

*In this case, a Builder Buyer Agreement has been signed inter-se both the parties on 29.07.2016. The cancellation letter too has been issued to the respondent-allotee. As such, there is no option left with the complainant-builder but to refund the balance amount after deducting 10% of the total sale consideration, as per the provisions of RERA Regulation No.11/RERA GGM Regulations 2018 dated 5<sup>th</sup> December, 2018. As such, the matter stands disposed of. File be consigned to the registry.*

*Samir Kumar  
Member*

*Vijay Kumar Goyal  
Member  
28.09.2021”*

2. The appellant has assailed the order inter alia on the ground that the Authority has granted relief to the respondents/allottees while complaint was filed by the promoter. According to him, this could not have been done as no complaint was preferred by the allottees before the Authority. Besides, the order is non-speaking and not reasoned one.

3. Learned counsel for the respondents, however, submits that the order is sustainable in nature. He claims to have filed reply to the complaint as well as counter claim and the impugned order was passed after considering the same.

## Appeal No. 587 of 2022

3. We have heard learned counsel for the parties and given careful thoughts to the facts of the case.

4. A bare perusal of the order shows that same is cryptic in nature and not informed by elaborate reasoning. The facts of the case are not reflected anywhere in the order. A perusal of the order conveys the impression that the same is nature of "proceedings". There is nothing to show that the final order/decreed was to be passed on the said date.

5. We do not intend to express any opinion on the pleas raised by either counsel on merits of the case as we find that the order is unsustainable being short, non-speaking and cryptic. Under these circumstances, we set aside the impugned order dated 28.09.2021 and remit the matter to the Authority for decision afresh at the earliest, in any case, not later than two months after affording opportunity of hearing to both the parties. The appeal is allowed.

6. The amount of Rs.9,82,572/- deposited by the appellant/promoter with this Tribunal in view of proviso to Section 43(5) of the Act, along with interest accrued thereon, be sent to the Authority for disbursement to the appellant/promoter subject to tax liability, if any, as per law.

## Appeal No. 587 of 2022

7. Copy of this order be communicated to the parties/learned counsel for the parties and the learned Authority for compliance.
8. File be consigned to the record.

Justice Rajan Gupta  
Chairman  
Haryana Real Estate Appellate Tribunal

Anil Kumar Gupta  
Member (Technical)

10.08.2023  
CL

Judgment-Haryana Real Estate Appellate Tribunal