

<b>PROCEEDINGS OF THE DAY</b>		<b>53</b>
Day and Date	Thursday and 22.01.2026	
Complaint No.	MA NO. 663/2025 in CR/1281/2022 Case titled as Lt. Ashok Bansal Sh. Rajiv Bansal VS Anjali Promoters Developers Private Limited	
Complainant	Lt. Ashok Bansal Sh. Rajiv Bansal	
Represented through	Ms. Yashima Sharma Advocate	
Respondent	Anjali Promoters Developers Private Limited	
Respondent Represented	Shri Harshit Batra and Ms. Tanya Advocates	
Last date of hearing	Application u/s 39 of the Act/04.12.2025	
Proceeding Recorded by	Naresh Kumari and HR Mehta	

### Proceedings-cum-Order

The present complaint was finally disposed of vide order dated 15.05.2025 in favour of complainants namely Rajeev Bansal, Karan Bansal and Chetan Bansal whereby this Authority directed the respondent to refund a sum of Rs.65,73,634/- paid by the complainants along with interest @ 11.10% per annum from the date of each payment till the actual date of realization.

Thereafter, respondent has filed the present application dated 12.09.2025 under section 39 of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016 seeking rectification of the order dated 15.05.2025. The respondent has contended that there are three surviving legal heirs of the original allottee, namely Mr. Chetan Bansal, Mr. Karan Bansal and Mr. Rajeev Bansal, and therefore, the directions issued in the final order require rectification in favour of Rajeev Bansal only.

It is an admitted position that during the proceedings held on 15.05.2025, the learned counsel for the complainants had placed on record a Memorandum of



HARERA  
GURUGRAM

HARYANA REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY  
GURUGRAM

हरियाणा भू-संपदा विनियामक प्राधिकरण, गुरुग्राम

MANO-663/2025 IN CK/28/2022

New PWD Rest House, Civil Lines, Gurugram, Haryana

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

Partition dated 14.05.2025. As per the said Memorandum of Partition, the third party, i.e., Mr. Rajeev Bansal, has been vested with the sole and exclusive right to receive the refund/compensation from Anjali Promoters and Developers Pvt. Ltd.

The counsel for the complainant appears and states that she has no objection to the application filed by the respondent. Further pressed that the complainant has also no objection if the order is executed in favour of Mr. Rajeev Bansal instead of all other legal heirs.

Arguments heard.

This Authority has considered the submissions made and perused the record available. It is observed as under:

- Limited scope of section 39:** The jurisdiction of this Authority under Section 39 of the Act is confined to rectification of clerical or arithmetical errors or errors apparent on the face of the record. The respondent, by way of the present application, is seeking re-consideration of issues already adjudicated, which is beyond the scope of Section 39 of the Act.
- Issue already considered at the time of final order:** The existence of legal heirs as well as the Memorandum of Partition dated 14.05.2025 were duly brought to the notice of this Authority and were part of the record at the time of passing of the final order dated 15.05.2025. Hence, no error apparent on the face of the record is made out.

In view of the above, such issue does not fall under the purview of the Section 39 of the Act of 2016. As the Authority finds no clerical, arithmetical or apparent error in the order dated 15.05.2025. The present application is an attempt to seek review of the final order dated 15.05.2025 which is impermissible under section 39 of the Act of 2016. Accordingly, the application filed by the respondent is hereby dismissed.

P.S. Saini

Member

22.01.2026