HARYANA REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY PANCHKULA

Website: www.haryanarera.gov.in

COMPLAINT NO. 717 OF 2024

HRERA, Panchkula ....COMPLAINANT

VERSUS

Aarcity Builders Private Limited ....RESPONDENT

CORAM:	**Parneet S Sachdev**	**Chairman**
	Nadim Akhtar	**Member**
	Chander Shekhar	**Member**

Date of Hearing: 09.04.2025
Hearing: 5th
Present: - Adv. Tarun Ranga on behalf of the respondent.

ORDER (PARNEET S SACHDEV - CHAIRMAN)

This Suo-motu complaint relates to the project namely, 'Regency Park' - a group housing colony on land measuring 8.181 acres situated in Village Satrod Khurd, Sector 11A and 17, Tehsil and District Hisar, Haryana registered vide Registration No. 295 of 2017 dated 13.10.2017 valid upto 31.12.2021.

2. The Authority in its meeting held on 24.01.2024 vide item no. 239.50 decided that the project be monitored on quarterly basis. In view of above, show cause notice dated 27.05.2024 u/s-35 of the RERA Act, 2016 was issued to the promoter.

3. On 04.12.2024, Adv. Venkata Rao appeared on behalf of the promoter requested for some more time to submit detailed tower wise quarterly resolution plan along with the present status of registration of all the towers and whether Occupation Certificate/Completion Certificate has been received or not. The Authority further imposed a cost of ₹ 1 Lac for non-appearance of the Directors.

4. On the last date of hearing i.e. 29.01.2025, Adv. Venkata Rao appearing on behalf of respondent apprised the Authority that application dated 24.01.2025 has been filed by the respondent under Section 39 of the Act seeking rectification of order dated 04.12.2024 passed by the Authority informing that Managing Director of the Company Mr. Rajender Prasad Mittal could not appear physically but was appearing through Virtual Conference mode before the Authority on 04.12.2024. He further submitted that the Authority considered the request regarding the appearance of the Director, however, order of the hearing dated 04.12.2024 mentions that a cost of ₹ 1 Lac is being imposed on the Respondent. The Respondent requested to rectify the order dated 04.12.2024 in the interest of justice.

5. The request of the promoter to rectify the order dated 04.12.2024 is hereby rejected since the Authority after consideration of the fact that Director was to be physically present had passed the order imposing a cost of ₹ 1 Lac, which should be deposited before the next date of hearing. Further, Adv. Venkata Rao informed that Quarterly Resolution Plan has been submitted in the agenda items which is listed today before the Authority. However, since the present Suo Motu Complaint has been registered against the respondent for monitoring the progress of the project, the Authority directs the respondent to submit reply in the present case also informing the latest status of the project, percentage of works completed, the cash flows in the project along with the latest photographs, at least 10 days before the next date of hearing.

6Today, Adv. Tarun Ranga appeared on behalf of the promoter and informed that they do not have sufficient data regarding A to H form. Further he stated that an appeal with regarding the same has been filed before the Hon'ble Appellate Tribunal i.e. appeal no. 276 of 2025 and 277 of 2025.

7. Adjourned to **16.07.2025**.

Chander Shekhar
Member

Nadim Akhtar
Member

Parneet S Sachdev
Chairman