



HARYANA REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY PANCHKULA

Website: www.haryanarera.gov.in

Complaint no.:	2142 of 2023
Date of filing:	20.09.2023
First date of hearing:	18.10.2023
Date of decision:	05.05.2025

RWA Whitelily
Mr. Anil Pahal (President)
Mr. Sunit Kumar (Secretary)
Ground Floor, L Tower, White Lily Apartments,
Sector-8, Main Road, Sonipat, Haryana, 131021.

....COMPLAINANT

VERSUS

M/s Parker VRC Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd
Through its Managing Director and other directors,
Corporate office: 410, 4th floor, D Mall, Netaji Subhash Palace
Pitampura, Delhi-110034.

....RESPONDENT

CORAM: Nadim Akhtar

Member

Chander Shekhar

Member

Present: Adv. Gaurav Gupta, , counsel for the respondent through VC.

None for the complainant.

ORDER (NADIM AKHTAR-MEMBER)

1. As per office record, notice dated 22.09.2023, was successfully delivered to the respondent on 26.09.2023. On **18.10.2023** (first date of hearing), respondent was directed to file reply. In compliance of said order, respondent had filed preliminary objections to the present complaint on 07.12.2023 in the registry of the Authority.
2. Thereafter on **19.02.2024**, captioned complaint could not be taken up due to suspension of work passed by the local bar association.
3. On **20.05.2024** (2nd hearing), Mr. Ramesh Malik, Id counsel for complainant stated that he intends to file rebuttal to the objections filed by the respondent. Therefore, complainant was granted time to file rebuttal to objections raised by the respondent and case was adjourned to 30.09.2024.
4. On **30.09.2024**, Id counsel for complainant requested for some time to file rebuttal as due to some health problems he could not file the same. Case was adjourned to 16.12.2024.
5. On **16.12.2024**, Id counsel again requested to for some more time to comply with the orders dated 20.05.2024. His request was accepted and case was adjourned to **05.05.2025**.
6. As per office record, no rebuttal has been filed by the complainant till 05.05.2025. Today, during the course of hearing, no one appeared on behalf of complainant. On the other hand, Id counsel for respondent stated that various opportunities have been granted to the complainant to file the




rebuttals to the objections filed by the respondent, therefore, no further opportunity be granted to the complainant.

7. Authority observes that the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016, is a beneficial legislation aimed at providing speedy and efficacious redressal to grievances of allottees and other stakeholders. In furtherance of this objective, the proceedings before the Authority have been made summary in nature. Such expeditious adjudication is achievable only if the parties especially the complainant proactively pursue his case in a time-bound manner. Despite the passage of considerable time and multiple opportunities granted by the Authority, the complainant has failed to comply with the said directions. This prolonged delay on the part of the complainant is unjustified and reflects lack of due diligence and cooperation in the proceedings.
8. Furthermore, instead of ensuring compliance with previous directions, the learned counsel for the complainant once again sought an adjournment during today's hearing. This conduct has contributed to an inordinate delay of 350 days (from 20.05.2024 to 05.05.2025), which is not only unwarranted but also obstructs the timely dispensation of justice.
9. In light of complainant's consistent failure to prosecute the matter, the Authority is left with no option but to **dismiss the complaint for non-prosecution.**
10. Authority decides to dispose of the captioned complaint as dismissed for non prosecution. Hence, the complaint is accordingly **disposed of** in view of



above terms. File be consigned to the record room after uploading of the order on the website of the Authority.


CHANDER SHEKHAR
[MEMBER]


NADIM AKHTAR
[MEMBER]

