



HARYANA REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY PANCHKULA
Website: www.haryanarera.gov.in

COMPLAINT NO. 230 OF 2024

Vidhya Devi

....COMPLAINANT

VERSUS

Santur Spaces Pvt Ltd.

....RESPONDENT

Date of Hearing: 03.02.2026

Hearing: 6th

Present: - Mr. Narinder Goyal, Son of the Complainant
None for the Respondent.

ORDER(DR. GEETA RATHEE SINGH- MEMBER)

1. Complainant through the captioned complaint is seeking possession of the unit booked in the project of the respondent's along with payment of delay interest along with other reliefs. As per record, in the captioned complaint no allotment letter has been issued to complainant qua the said unit nor a builder buyer agreement has been executed between the parties. Complainant claims to have paid amount of ₹7,44,245/-, in proof of which the complainants has attached a bank statement only for an amount of ₹4,70,895/-. Vide order dated 03.02.2025 Authority had directed the complainant to place on record proper receipts or an affidavit of paid amount and other relevant documents to prove his case. Even after a lapse of one

Geeta Rathee

year no documents have been filed by the complainant despite availing ample opportunities.

2. Mr. Narinder Goyal, complainant appeared before the Authority and submitted that due to some personal circumstances in the family he could not furnish the relevant documents to the counsel engaged in the captioned complaint. He sought time to file the same.
3. The Authority observes that today marks the sixth (6th) hearing in the present matter. Perusal of the case file reveals that explicit directions were issued to the complainant on 03.02.2025 regarding the deficiency in the captioned complaint. Thereafter, the case was next listed for hearing on 26.05.2025 and 28.10.2025 whereby the complainant was again reminded to comply with the directions issued vide order dated 03.02.2025. Till date time period of one year has lapsed granting opportunities to complainant to file relevant documents.
4. However, despite the passage of considerable time and multiple opportunities granted by the Authority, the complainant has failed to proceed with his matter. This prolonged delay on the part of the complainant is unjustified and reflects a lack of due diligence and cooperation in the proceedings. In light of the complainant's consistent failure to prosecute the matter, the Authority is left with no option but to dismiss the complaint for non prosecution for want of better particulars.



5. Hence, the complaint is accordingly **dismissed** with a liberty to file fresh complaint with better particulars in view of above terms. File be consigned to the record room after uploading of the order on the website of the Authority.



DR. GEETA RATHEE SINGH
[MEMBER]

