

PROCEEDINGS OF THE DAY		90
Day and Date	Tuesday and 13.01.2026	
Complaint No.	MA NO. 567/2025 in CR/4051/2023 Case titled as Manju Gupta VS Ansal Housing Limited & Ish Krupa Properties Private Limited	
Complainant	Manju Gupta	
Represented through	None	
Respondent	Ansal Housing Limited & Ish Krupa Properties Private Limited	
Respondent Represented	Shri Karan proxy counsel	
Last date of hearing	Appl. u/s 39 of the Act/09.12.2025	
Proceeding Recorded by	Naresh Kumari and HR Mehta	

Proceedings-cum-order

1. An application dated 08.08.2025, has been filed by the complainant seeking rectification of the order dated 15.04.2025 under section 39 of the Act, 2016 passed by the Authority wherein it is stated that in the order dated 15.04.2025, it has been erroneously recorded that the total amount paid by the complainant is Rs.38,19,377/-. However, the actual amount is Rs.44,49,377/-. The Authority has failed to take into consideration Annexure-2, page no. 19-20 of the complaint i.e., the Endorsement Sheet alongwith the Transfer Letter issued by the builder as per which Rs.6,30,000/- was paid by the complainant to the original allottee for transfer of the unit.
2. Vide proceedings dated 09.12.2025, the respondent was directed to file reply to the abovesaid application within a period of 15 days with an advance copy to the complainant. No reply has been filed by the respondent till date.
3. Before proceeding with the matter, it would be appropriate to refer to the provisions of Section 39 of the Act, 2016 under which the present application has been preferred.



HARERA
GURUGRAM

HARYANA REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY
GURUGRAM

हरियाणा भू-संपदा विनियामक प्राधिकरण, गुरुग्राम
MANO 587/2025 in CA/4051/2023

New PWD Rest House, Civil Lines, Gurugram, Haryana

नया पी. डब्ल्यू. डी. विश्राम गृह, सिविल लाईंस, गुरुग्राम, हरियाणा

Section 39: Rectification of orders

"The Authority may, at any time within a period of two years from the date of the order made under this Act, with a view to rectifying any mistake apparent from the record, amend any order passed by it, and shall make such amendment, if the mistake is brought to its notice by the parties:

Provided that no such amendment shall be made in respect of any order against which an appeal has been preferred under this Act:

Provided further that the Authority shall not, while rectifying any mistake apparent from record, amend substantive part of its order passed under the provisions of this Act."

4. The Authority observes that the present complaint was disposed off vide order dated 15.04.2025. In the detailed order dated 15.04.2025, the amount paid by the complainant has been inadvertently mentioned as Rs.38,19,377/- . The actual amount paid by the complainant is Rs. Rs.44,49,377/-, the additional amount of Rs.6,30,000/- was paid by the complainant for transfer of the unit and the same was acknowledged by the respondent vide letter dated 27.07.2011 on page no. 19 of complaint.
5. The rectification sought is **allowed**, as the same is an error apparent from the record.
6. The application stands disposed of.
7. File be consigned to the registry.

Arun Kumar
Chairman
13.01.2026