



HARYANA REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY PANCHKULA

Website: www.haryanarera.gov.in

(Reopened for deciding application u/s 39 of RERA Act, 2016)

COMPLAINT NO. 63 of 2024

Rajni Rana

....COMPLAINANT

VERSUS

BPTP Parklands Pride Ltd.

....RESPONDENT

CORAM:	Parneet Singh Sachdev	Chairman
	Nadim Akhtar	Member
	Dr. Geeta Rathee Singh	Member

Date of Hearing: 12.02.2026

Hearing: 1st (re-open)

Present: None for the complainant
Mr. Tejeshwar Singh, counsel for the respondent, through VC.

ORDER (PARNEET S SACHDEV - CHAIRMAN)

1. The complainants have filed the present rectification application under Section 39 of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016, seeking rectification of the final order dated 14.10.2025. The sole ground urged is that a Settlement Deed dated 01.04.2025, executed between the parties during the pendency of the complaint, could not be placed on record due to inadvertence and communication gap.
2. Today, learned counsel for the respondent appeared and submitted that the settlement has already been substantially acted upon, the agreed compensation has been paid/adjusted, possession has been agreed to be taken by the complainant, and all further claims including delay possession interest (DPC) stand waived.
3. Before examining the rival contentions, it is apposite to refer to Section 39 of the Act, which empowers the Authority to rectify only a mistake apparent from the record, subject to the express bar that no rectification shall result in amendment of the substantive part of the order. It is pertinent to reproduce Section 39 of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016, which states as follows:

"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 expression "record" under Section 39 necessarily refers to the pleadings, documents, and material that were available before the Authority at the time of passing of the order. Once an order is pronounced, the Authority cannot enlarge the record by permitting introduction of fresh material which was not part of the proceedings.
5. In the present case, the entire basis of the rectification application is that the Settlement Deed dated 01.04.2025 was not brought on record.
6. The final order dated 14.10.2025 was passed after due consideration of the pleadings, documents, and submissions placed before the Authority at the relevant time. The non-placement of the alleged Settlement Deed on record by the parties does not render the order erroneous, nor does it constitute a mistake apparent on the face of the record.
7. In view of the above discussion, this Authority finds that the present application does not satisfy the statutory requirements of Section 39. No mistake apparent on the face of the record has been demonstrated.
8. Accordingly, the application seeking rectification of the final order dated 14.10.2025 is hereby **disposed of as dismissed**. File be



consigned to the record room after uploading this order on the website
of the Authority.



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



.....
NADIM AKHTAR
[MEMBER]



.....
PARNEET S SACHDEV
[CHAIRMAN]