

PROCEEDINGS OF THE DAY		89
Day and Date	Tuesday and 27.01.2026	
Complaint No.	MA NO. 845/2025 in CR/5894/2023 Case titled as Sunil Kumar Yadav VS Ansal Housing Limited	
Complainant	Sunil Kumar Yadav	
Represented through	Complainant in person	
Respondent	Ansal Housing Limited	
Respondent Represented through	Shri Karan proxy counsel for R1 Ms. Sanya Arora Adv. for R2	
Last date of hearing	Application u/s 39 of the Act	
Proceeding Recorded by	Naresh Kumari and HR Mehta	

Proceedings-cum-order

1. An application dated 15.12.2025, has been filed by M/s. Samyak Projects Pvt Ltd 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 the order dated 15.04.2025 contains various clerical errors. The present complaint only concerns respondent i.e., M/s Ansal Housing Ltd and the applicant i.e., M/s Samyak Projects Pvt Ltd was never a party to the complaint at any stage of the proceedings. The same was neither impleaded nor issued any notice and had no involvement or concern with the subject matter of the case.
2. The order dated 15.04.2025, contains findings and directions against M/s. Samyak Projects Pvt Ltd despite the fact that the said entity is not a respondent in the complaint and was never involved in the proceedings.
3. The order also records that Advocate Ms. Sanya Arora has appeared in the matter, but it is submitted that Ms. Sanya Arora has never appeared in the present matter and no such appearance is reflected in any of the proceedings or daily orders on record.



HARERA
GURUGRAM

HARYANA REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY
GURUGRAM

हरियाणा भू-संपदा विनियामक प्राधिकरण, गुरुग्राम

MANO-845/2025 In CA/5894/2023

New PWD Rest House, Civil Lines, Gurugram, Haryana

नया पी. डब्ल्यू. डी. विश्राम गृह, मित्रलि लाईन्स, गुरुग्राम, हरियाणा

4. It is further incorrectly mentioned in the order that a reply has been filed by respondent no.2 , Samyak project Pvt Ltd, however, no respondent no.2 exists and no reply was ever filed by any such party.
5. 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.

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."

6. The Authority is of the view that the aforesaid rectification would lead to amendment in the substantive part of the order. Thus, the same cannot be allowed.
7. In view of the provisions of section 39 of the Act, the present application stands dismissed.
8. File be consigned to the registry.


P.S. Saini
Member



Arun Kumar
Chairman
27.01.2026