



# HARYANA REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY PANCHKULA

Website: www.haryanarera.gov.in

COMPLAINT NO. 211 OF 2026

Bir Singh Kaushik & Virender Singh

....COMPLAINANTS

VERSUS

Shrishti Infradevelopers Pvt. Ltd.

....RESPONDENT

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

**Chairman  
Member  
Member  
Member**

**Date of Hearing: 19.02.2026**

**Hearing: 1<sup>st</sup>**

**Present: - Mr. Divesh, counsel for the complainant, in person.  
None for the respondent.**

## **ORDER (PARNEET S SACHDEV - CHAIRMAN)**

1. The present complaint has been filed by the complainant seeking various reliefs against the respondents. The reliefs claimed in the complaint are reproduced as under:

- i. *Direction to conduct transparent draw of lots in presence of HRERA Officers.*
- ii. *Declaration that mortgage of society land/flats is illegal and void, with direction to cancel the same.*
- iii. *Direction to hand over fully completed flats, including kitchens, wooden work and fittings.*

4

- iv. *Direction to allot flats strictly to society members first, as per HRERA resolution.*
- v. *Conduct forensic audit of all actions of the developer & society management.*
- vi. *Impose penalties under RERA for violations.*
- vii. *Bar respondents from alienating any flat until compliance is ensured."*

2. Upon perusal of the complaint and the reliefs sought, it is observed that the grievances raised pertain to internal management of the society, alleged illegality of mortgage, conduct of draw of lots, forensic audit of the developer and society management, and disputes regarding allotment amongst society members. The jurisdiction of this Authority is confined strictly to matters arising under the provisions of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016. The reliefs claimed in the present complaint neither arise from nor are founded upon any specific provision of the said Act and, therefore, fall outside the statutory mandate and adjudicatory competence of this Authority.
3. During the course of hearing, learned counsel for the complainant was specifically asked to indicate the provision(s) of the RERD Act, 2016 under which the aforesaid reliefs are maintainable before this Authority. He was further queried as to whether the complainant qualifies as an "allottee" under the Act and whether any specific statutory violation under the RERD Act has been pleaded. Learned counsel submitted that the complainant is a shareholder and was unable to point out any provision of the Act under

which the present reliefs could be granted. No satisfactory explanation was furnished to establish the maintainability of the complaint before this Authority.

4. In view of the foregoing, this Authority is of the considered opinion that the present complaint is not maintainable under the provisions of the RERD Act, 2016.
5. Accordingly, the complaint stands **dismissed** as non-maintainable. File be consigned to the record room after uploading of this order on the website of the Authority.

  
.....  
CHANDER SHEKHAR  
[MEMBER]

  
.....  
DR. GEETA RATHEE SINGH  
[MEMBER]

  
.....  
NADIM AKHTAR  
[MEMBER]

  
.....  
PARNEET S SACHDEV  
[CHAIRMAN]