



HARYANA REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY PANCHKULA

Website: www.haryanarera.gov.in

COMPLAINT NO. 606 OF 2024

Mrs. Saru Lata

....COMPLAINANT

VERSUS

1. Aegis Value Homes Ltd

2. Divey Dhamija

3. Executive Officer

4. Director, Town & Country Planning , HaryanaRESPONDENTS

CORAM:	Parneet S Sachdev	Chairman
	NadimAkhtar	Member
	Dr. Geeta Rathee Singh	Member
	Chander Shekhar	Member

Date of Hearing: 30.10.2025

Hearing: 5th

Present: - Adv. Ashwarya Bajaj, Counsel for complainant.

Adv. Neeraj Goel, Counsel for the respondents through VC

ORDER (PARNEET SINGH SACHDEV - CHAIRMAN)

1. As per last order dated 18.08.2025, respondent was directed to file reply along with earlier imposed cost of 5000/- payable to Authority and ₹ 2000/- payable to complainant. Complainant was also directed to file receipts or an affidavit of paid amount alongwith bank statement.
2. Mr. Neeraj Goel appeared for respondent and stated that reply was filed on 12.09.2025 in registry along with payment proof of imposed cost. He argued that present case is not maintainable since complainant has no locus standi to file the present Complaint. As per respondent records, unit in question i.e. A5-908 on 9th floor, in Tower-A5 was allotted to Ms. Richa Arora D/o Sh. Madan Lal through application dated 07.06.2017 through draw of lots held on 07.07.2017. Builder buyer agreement dated 22.09.2017 annexed at (Annexure R-1/5) was also executed between Ms. Richa and respondent for total consideration of ₹ 19,04,540/- out of which an amount of 9,99,884/- stands paid by Ms. Richa till year 2018. Counsel for respondent also referred



to the various demand letters issued from year 2018 to 2025 issued in name of Ms. Richa (Annexure R-1/7, 1/8) only. Counsel for respondent also argued that as per Section 31(1) of the RERA Act, 2016, complainant must establish that he/she is an aggrieved person having direct contractual relationship with the promoter. Concluding his arguments, he stated that bare perusal of above stated relevant documents clearly shows that till date allotment is in the name of Ms. Richa Arora. Hence, present complaint is not maintainable and is liable to be dismissed.

3. On the other hand, Mr. Ashwarya Bajaj appeared for the complainant and stated that he had already filed an application on 13.08.2025 in registry under Order1Rule10 r/w Section 151 CPC for impleading the applicant as complainant in the present complaint. He stated that the content of the application states that the original allottee is a resident of Canada and at time when present complaint was filed she was not in India, therefore, present complaint was filed in name of Smt. Saru Lata who is a subsequently made joint allottee in the flat in question.
4. During hearing, Authority asked the complainant to clarify his stand as allottee as per provisions of RERA Act, 2016. Counsel for complainant referred to a letter dated 01.10.2024 annexed at page no. 45 of complaint (Annexure C-2) which was sent to respondent by Ms. Richa Arora to make



Saru Lata as second applicant in the unit in question. However, no postal receipt or receiving by respondent has been placed on record till date.

5. After hearing both the parties and going through records, Authority observes that present complaint was filed before Authority on 17.05.2024 by Ms. Saru Lata through counsel Sh. Ashwarya Bajaj for seeking relief of refund of paid amount in respect to unit no. A5-908 allotted by present respondent in name of Ms. Richa Arora in project namely, "Smart Homes Karnal". Total sale consideration of the flat was 19,04,540/- out of which an amount of ₹9,99,884/- stands paid by Ms. Richa. It is important to mention that even during hearing counsel for complainant has failed to prove that how Mrs. Saru Lata herself has stated her an "allottee" of respondent when none of the required documents which proves the entitlement of any aggrieved person as allottee under RERA Act, 2016 is not executed in favour of Mrs. Saru Lata. Furthermore, the letter annexed at page 45 of complaint as referred by complaint counsel neither have any receiving by respondent nor supported by any postal receipt. Hence, Authority safely concludes that present complaint suffers from legal defect and is liable to be dismissed in limine for lack of locus standi. In view of the above and considering the lack of essential documents required to establish locus standi and entitlement under



the RERA framework, the Authority finds no merit in proceeding further. Accordingly, the complaint stands **disposed of**.

However, since complaint is not heard on merits and taking into consideration the object of RERA Act, 2016 in letter and spirit. Authority decides to **dispose of** the complaint with liberty to file a fresh complaint with better particulars, if available.

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


CHANDER SHEKHAR
[MEMBER]


DR. GEETA RATHEE SINGH
[MEMBER]


NADIM AKHTAR
[MEMBER]


PARNEET S SACHDEV
[CHAIRMAN]