



HARYANA REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY PANCHKULA

Website: www.haryanarera.gov.in

COMPLAINT NO. 381 OF 2022

Pardeep Kharb

....COMPLAINANT

VERSUS

Ansal Housing Limited

(Ansal Town DDJAY SCH-1, Sec.- 36 Karnal)

....RESPONDENT

**CORAM: Nadim Akhtar
Chander Shekhar**

**Member
Member**

Date of Hearing: 05.08.2024

Hearing: 8th

Present: None present for complainant.

Mr. Gaurav Sharma, proxy counsel for Mr. Ashish Sharma,
counsel for respondent.

ORDER (NADIM AKHTAR-MEMBER)


1. Vide order dated 13.05.2024, respondent was directed to place on record the Settlement Deed or affidavit of settlement and provide proof of payments made to the complainant. Also, respondent was directed to deposit cost of ₹30,000/- not complying with the earlier orders of the

Authority dated 09.11.2023. Authority also burdened the respondent with cost of ₹10,000/- payable to Authority and ₹5000/- payable to complainant and directed to deposit the above cost of ₹10,000/- and ₹5000/- also before the next date of hearing. As per office record, neither cost nor settlement deed is placed on record.

2. Today, Mr. Gaurav Sharma, Id. counsel for the respondent during the course of hearing placed on record a copy of settlement deed executed between the parties.
3. In view of settlement arrived at between the parties, the captioned complaint stand **disposed off** as settled. The settlement arrived at between the parties shall be binding between them. File be consigned to the record room after uploading of this order on the website of the Authority.
4. It is pertinent to mention that vide order dated 24.11.2022, cost of ₹5000/- payable to the Authority and ₹2000/- payable to the complainant was imposed on respondent for not filing reply and respondent was again given opportunity to file reply. However, respondent failed to file reply and therefore, vide order dated 25.04.2023, respondent was burdened with cost of ₹10,000/- payable to the Authority and ₹5000/- payable to the complainant. Despite availing various opportunities to file reply and settlement deed, respondent failed to comply with the directions of the Authority. Thus, vide order dated 15.01.2024, cost of ₹30,000/- was



imposed on the respondent. Since the cost has still not been paid by the respondent Authority deems it fit to initiate suo motu proceedings against the respondent for recovery of cost. Office is directed to initiate suo motu proceedings against the respondent for not complying with the directions of the Authority on time.


.....
CHANDER SHEKHAR
[MEMBER]


.....
NADIM AKHTAR
[MEMBER]