HARYANA REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY PANCHKULA

Website: www.haryanarera.gov.in

COMPLAINT NO. 1034 OF 2020

RP Uniyal and Others ....COMPLAINANTS

VERSUS

BPTP Ltd. ....RESPONDENT

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

Date of Hearing: 21.08.2025

Hearing: 18TH

Present: - Mr. Gaurav Gupta, Counsel for complainant through VC

Mr. Hemant Saini, Counsel for respondent

ORDER: (PARNEET S. SACHDEV-CHAIRMAN)

1. On the last date of hearing ,i.e. 01.05.2025, following order was passed:-

"Today, no one has put in appearance on behalf of complainant.

It is observed that no one was appearing on behalf of complainant on last hearing dated 19.12.2024 and even today also, it seems that complainant is not interested in prosecuting his case. Last opportunity is granted to the complainant to pursue his case, otherwise case will be dismissed for want of prosecution on next date of hearing.

Perusal of file reveals that complainant has sought the reliefs which are common in nature and as such cannot be granted to the individual-allottee. Complainant is directed to argue on issue of relief sought on next date of hearing. This is the last opportunity.

Case is adjourned to 21.08.2025 for arguments."

2. Today, ld. Counsel for complainant relied upon report of local commissioner dated 21.09.2021 which was duly taken into consideration by the Authority in its order dated 19.12.2024 passed in similar complaint (filed by Association for the same project) bearing no. 2042/2019.

3. Ld. Counsel for respondent requested that the present complaint be dealt with along with complaint no. 2042/2019 (filed by Association) as relief sought in present complaint gets duly covered in the relief sought by the Association.

4. At this stage, query was raised to ld. Counsel for complainant as to whether the complainants herein are part of RWA in complaint no. 2042/2019 or not? Whether there is any difference in both cases in

respect of relief sought or not? Ld. Counsel for complainant replied that relief sought are identical in nature and as per his instructions, Mr. R.P Uniyal is member of RWA but no clarity is available with him for rest of the complainants.

5. Perusal of record reveals that there are total 5 complainants in present case. Details of their names along with flat nos. as per list provided by Association in complaint no. 2042/2019 are as follows:-

Sr. No.	Name of allottee	Flat no.	Serial no. of list of members placed on record by Association in complaint no. 2042/2019
1.	R.P.Uniyal	G-004	1.
2.	Upkar Singh	502	119.
3.	Jai Bhagwan	304	9.
4.	Harish Tantia	202	41.
5.	Sandeep Pant	002	002.

6. Aforesaid table clearly establishes that complainants-allottees are already members of Association and are being duly represented in complaint no. 2042/2019 for all the reliefs. As stated by ld. Counsel for complainant, relief sought/grievances in captioned complaint gets duly covered in complaint no. 2042/2019.

7. In view of aforesaid observations, the present complaint stands **disposed of**. File be consigned to the record room after uploading of order on the website.

CHANDER SHEKHAR
[MEMBER]

NADIM AKHTAR
[MEMBER]

DR. GEETA RATHEE SINGH
[MEMBER]

PARNEET S. SACHDEV
[CHAIRMAN]