



HARYANA REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY PANCHKULA

Website: www.haryanarera.gov.in

COMPLAINT NO. 471 OF 2024

Martin Minj

VERSUS

....COMPLAINANT

1. Asian Developers Ltd.

2. Seara Auto India Pvt. Ltd.

3. Corporation Bank Union Bank of India

4. Haryana State Industrial and Infrastructure Development Corporation
(HSIIDC)

....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: Parneet Singh Sachdev

Nadim Akhtar

Dr. Geeta Rathee Singh

Chander Shekhar

Chairman

Member

Member

Member

Date of Hearing: 21.08.2025

Hearing: 4th

Present: - Mr. Radhey Shyam Rohilla and Ms. Jyoti Verma, counsels for the complainants in all complaints through VC.

None for respondent no.1.

Mr. Pranav Proothi, Counsel for respondent no.2 through VC.

None for respondent no.3.

Dr. Neetu Gupta, proxy counsel for Mr. Tarun Gupta, counsel for respondent no. 4, through VC.


ORDER (PARNEET S SACHDEV – CHAIRMAN)

1. On last date of hearing, respondent no.2 was directed to submit the copy of the settlement agreement in the registry with an advance copy supplied to the complainant. Said settlement agreement has been placed on record on 21.08.2025.
2. Today, the counsel for complainant appeared and submitted that the agreement placed on record has not been signed by both parties. He pointed out that the signature of respondent no.2 is not reflected. On the other hand, counsel for respondent no.2 substantiated that his personal signatures have been reflected in the agreement and complainant has duly signed it.
3. On the basis of this submission, the Authority directed counsel to ensure the appearance of the complainant through VC so as to provide another opportunity to the complainant. However, complainant did not appear.
4. In view of the above facts and the assertion of the counsel for the complainant, the Authority observes that the complainant has admittedly signed the settlement agreement wherein the parties have mutually agreed to settle the dispute, and it is also borne out from the record that a settlement amount has been received by him. It is further clarified that once the parties have voluntarily entered into a settlement agreement, and the complainant has accepted consideration under the same the Authority cannot adjudicate over the terms or validity of such settlement. Any challenge to the enforceability, legality, or deficiency in the



execution of a settlement agreement does not fall within the scope of proceedings before this Authority, which is limited to adjudicating disputes under the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016. Therefore, no further adjudication is warranted in the present matter.

5. Accordingly, the present complaint is disposed of as settled in terms of the settlement agreement dated 31.07.2022 placed on record. File be consigned to record room after uploading of order on the website of the Authority.


CHANDER SHEKHAR
[MEMBER]


DR. GEETA RATHEE SINGH
[MEMBER]


NADIM AKHTAR
[MEMBER]


PARNEET S SACHDEV
[CHAIRMAN]