# HARYANA REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY PANCHKULA

Website: www.haryanarera.gov.in

**COMPLAINT NO. 3094 of 2022**

HRERA, Panchkula ...COMPLAINANT

VERSUS

Ansal Properties & Infrastructure Ltd. .....RESPONDENT

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **CORAM:** | **Parneet S Sachdev** | **Chairman** |
| | **Nadim Akhtar** | **Member** |
| | **Dr. Geeta Rathee Singh** | **Member** |
| | **Chander Shekhar** | **Member** |

**Date of Hearing:** 28.05.2025

**Hearing:** 7th

**Present:** Adv. Sheena Dahiya on behalf of RP

**ORDER [Parneet S Sachdev-Chairman]**

This suo-motu complaint was registered against the respondent for neither applying for further extension of registration of the project as required under Section-6 of Real Estate (Regulation & Development) Act, 2016 nor submitting any information/documents showing completion/part completion of the project issued by the competent Authority within time period of registration of the project "Anand Lok" an Affordable Residential Plotted Colony measuring 13.006 acres in Sector-24, Dharuhera, Rewari registered vide Registration No. HRERA-PKL-RWR-74-2018 dated 03.12.2018 and which was valid upto 31.12.2020. The Authority vide its order dated 26.05.2020 had granted six months general extension from 25.03.2020 to 24.09.2020 to all registered projects due to COVID-19.

Despite granting the above benefit of extension registration stands expired on 30.06.2021.

2. The Authority in exercise of the powers conferred under Section-35 of the Real Estate (Regulation & Development) Act, 2016, issued a show cause notice dated 23.11.2022 directing to furnish certain information along with documentary evidence in support thereof within 30 days.
3. On 09.01.2023, Authority directed the promoter not to sell any unsold inventory or create any third-party rights in the project till extension is granted.
4. On 12.06.2024, Authority imposed a penalty of ₹ 5 lacs and directed that Managing Director/one of the Directors be personally present on the next date of hearing failing which additional cost will be imposed.
5. On 06.11.2024, cost of ₹ one lac was imposed for non-appearance of the MD/one of the directo₹ The orders of the Authority dated 06.11.2024 were delivered to the promoter on 27.02.2025 and 25.02.2025 via registered post and mail respectively.
6. 05.03.2025, neither anyone appeared on behalf of the respondent nor has any reply been filed. Since, the MD/one of the directors was required to be present today, the Authority decides to impose an additional cost of ₹ one lakh and directed the respondent to deposit total penalty and cost amounting to ₹ 7 lacs in the registry before the next date of hearing.

Further, the Authority granted last opportunity to the promoter to submit the above said information/documents before the next date of hearing and directs the Managing Director/one of the Directors be personally present on the next date of hearing. The promoter should also show cause as to why their registration should not be revoked under section 7 of RERA Act, 2016 for not complying with the orders of the Authority.

2. Today, ld. Counsel informed that IRP has taken over the project in February 2025 and subsequently by RP in April 2025. The Counsel argued that when the moratorium is imposed, no penalty can be imposed on the promoter to which Authority reiterated its stance that filing of QPRs and applying for continuation of registration are statutory obligations of the promoter and that moratorium is on suits, not on statutory obligations. During the hearing, Ld. Counsel also submitted a letter to bring on record Corporate Insolvency Resolution Process.

3. The Authority directs the RP and respondent promoter to deposit the penalty and cost amounting to ₹ 7 lacs in the registry of the Authority atleast one week before the next date of hearing and file a written reply to the orders of the Authority dated 05.03.2025.

4. Adjourned to **08.10.2025**.

| Chander Shekhar | Dr. Geeta Rathee Singh | Nadim Akhtar | Parneet S Sachdev |
|---|---|---|---|
| Member | Member | Member | Chairman |