

**BEFORE THE HARYANA REAL ESTATE REGULATORY  
AUTHORITY, GURUGRAM**

**Complaint no. :** 2425 of 2024  
**Order pronounced on:** 07.04.2026

Balbir Singh Dawett

**Address:** C-387, Defence Colony, New Delhi

**Complainant**

**Versus**

Ansal Housing & Construction Limited

**Address:** - 15 UGF Indra Prakash 12,  
Barakhamba Road, New Delhi.

**Respondent**

**CORAM:**

Shri Arun Kumar

**Chairman**

**APPEARANCE:**

None

None

None

Complainant  
Respondent no. 1  
Respondent no.2

  
**HARERA**  
**GURUGRAM**  
**ORDER**

1. The present complaint dated 24.05.2024 has been filed by the complainant/allottee in Form CRA under section 31 of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016 (in short, the Act) read with rule 28 of the Haryana Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Rules, 2017 (in short, the Rules) for violation of section 11(4)(a) of the

Act wherein it is inter alia prescribed that the promoter shall be responsible for all obligations, responsibilities and functions to the allottees as per the agreement for sale executed inter se them.

**A. Project and unit related details**

2. The particulars of the project, the details of sale consideration, the amount paid by the complainant, date of proposed handing over the possession, delay period, if any, have been detailed in the following tabular form:

S. No.	Particulars	Details
1.	Name of the project	Ansal Estella
2.	Location of project	Village-Dhanwapur-Tikampur ,Sector-103, Gurugram, Haryana.
3.	Nature of project	Group Housing
4.	DTCP License	License no. 17 of 2011 dated 08.03.2011
5.	RERA Registered	Not registered
6.	Flat Buyer Agreement	23.05.2013 (As on page no. 29 of complaint)
7.	Unit no.	O-0404, type-3BHK + Utility (As on page no. 33 of complaint)
8.	Unit area	1945 sq.ft [Sale Area] (As on page no. 33 of complaint)
9.	Possession clause	<b>30.</b> <i>The developer shall offer possession of the</i>

		<p><i>unit any time, within a period of 36 months from the date of execution of the agreement or within 36 months from the date of obtaining all the required sanctions and approval necessary for commencement of construction, whichever is later subject to timely payment of all dues by buyer and subject to force majeure circumstances as described in clause 31. Further, there shall be a grace period of 6 months allowed to the developer over and above the period of 36 months as above in offering the possession of the unit."</i></p> <p><i>(Emphasis supplied)</i></p>
10.	Date of start of construction	Not known
11.	Due date of possession	23.11.2016 (Calculated 36 months from the date of execution of Agreement i.e., 23.05.2016+6 months grace period)
12.	Payment plan	Construction linked (As on page no. 49 of complaint)
13.	Sale consideration	Rs.64,67,125 /- (As on page no. 33 of complaint)
14.	Total amount paid by the	Rs.74,70,711.80 /- (As per Customer Ledger dated

	complainant	23.06.2022 on page no. 64 of complaint)
15.	Occupation certificate	Not obtained
16.	Offer of Possession	Not offered

**B. Facts of the complaint**

3. The complainant has made following submissions:
- I. That the respondent is engaged in the business of real estate and is a land developer company which purchased the land from the landowners and after developing its, sell the developed unit in the form of commercial spaces, office space, shops, flat, apartment etc. to the purchasers.
  - II. That the respondent (s) had advertised itself as a very ethical business group that lives onto its commitments in delivering its constructed units projects as per promised and agreed timelines. The quality standards respondents while launching and advertising any new project always commits and promises to the targeted consumer that their booked units will be completed and delivered to them within the time agreed initially in the agreement while selling the unit to them.
  - III. They also assured to the consumers like complainant that they have secured all the necessary sanctions and approvals from the appropriate authorities for the construction and completion of the real estate project sold by them to the consumers in general.

- IV. That in the due course of their business, the respondents have launched a Group Housing project namely "Estella" situated within the Revenue Estate of Village Dhanwapur- Tikampur at Sector103, Gurugram.
- V. That the respondents have rights to exclusively develop, construct and build residential building, transfer or alienate the unit's/ floor/space and to carry out sale deed, agreement to sell, conveyance deeds, letters of allotments etc in favour of the allottee.
- VI. That in 2011 on impressive projections of the respondents and their broker, complainant had booked an Apartment in their aforesaid Residential Group Housing Project "Estella" situated within the Revenue Estate of Vilage Dhanwapur-Tikampur at Sector- 103, Gurugram.
- VII. That the respondents had allotted him a 3 BHK Apartment No. O-0404, Unit Type 3 BHK Apartment utility at their aforesaid residential Project "Estella" situated within the Revenue Estate of Village Dhanwapr-Tikampur at Sector- 103, Gurugram having the Carpet Area of 1945 sq. ft.
- VIII. That thereafter the respondents had entered into the Flat Buyer's Agreement dated 23.05.2013 with the complainant for the sale & transfer of above stated 3 BHK Apartment +utility No. 0-0404, Unit Type 3 BHK Apartment + utility at their aforesaid residential project. The agreed rate of the flat is Rs.37,674/- per sq.mt. The basic price of the unit is Rs.64,67,125/- Besides this the buyer has additionally to pay any amount of Rs.2,50,000/- to the



developer towards grant/allotment of exclusive right of using one covered Car Parking Space.

- IX. That the complainant believing the aforesaid offer to be true has entered into the aforesaid agreement dated 23.05.2013 with the respondents. In terms of the said agreement the respondent no. 1 being developer agreed to allot a unit.
- X. That the complainant has made almost entire payments as per the terms and conditions mentioned in the agreement dated 23.05.2013, despite that the possession of the flat could not be handed over to the complainant. The aforesaid act of the respondents is contrary to the terms and conditions mentioned in the agreement dated 23.05.2013. The complainant has paid total amount of Rs. 74,70,711.80/- to the respondents.
- XI. That the respondent even after such inordinate delay and receipt of payment from us has not given possession to us and the project is still in uninhabitable condition even today.
- XII. That in terms of clause 30 of the said agreement the developer is bound to offer possession of the unit any time, within a period 36 months from the date of execution of Agreement or within 36 months from the date of obtaining all required sanctions and approval necessary for commencement of construction whichever is later subject to timely payment of all dues by buyer. Clause 30 of the said Agreement dated 12.05.2012 is reproduced as under:

"30.

*The Developer shall offer possession of the Unit any time, within a period of 36 months from the date of execution of Agreement or within 36 months from the date of obtaining all the required sanctions and approval necessary for commencement of construction, whichever is later subject to timely payment of all the dues by Buyer and subject to force-majeure circumstances as described in clause 31. Further, there shall be a grace period of 6 months allowed to the Developer over and above the period of 36 months as above in offering the possession of the Unit. The agreement dated 12.05.2012 between the complainant and the respondents clearly stipulates the delivery of the flats/apartment to the complainant within 36 months from the date of the agreement.*

- XIII. However, despite the lapse of considerable time frame, the flats this remain uninhabitable, as evidenced by the pictures. It is imperative to note that the complainant entered into this agreement with the reasonable expectation of obtaining possession of habitable premises within the agreed-upon timeframe. The respondents are duty-bound by the terms of the agreement to ensure the timely delivery of the flats in good habitable condition. The failure to fulfil this obligation not only constitutes a breach of contract but also results in significant inconvenience and hardship to the complainant. It is evident that the respondents have failed to fulfil their contractual obligations, thereby depriving the complainant of the benefits they are entitled to under the agreement. Furthermore, the delay in delivering the flats has caused undue financial strain on the complainant, who may be incurring additional expenses such as rent alternative accommodation costs while awaiting possession of the promised premises.
- XIV. The respondents must ensure that the premises are delivered in good habitable condition, as originally agreed upon. Any further delay in

this matter would only exacerbate the prejudice suffered by the complainant and would constitute a continued breach of contract on the part of the respondents.

- XV. Despite making entire payments, the complainant is still deprived of allotment of the Flat/Apartment as agreed by the respondents. The complainant has sent letters to the respondents and has requested to handover possession of the flat, but the respondents did not take any proper action for the same which is contrary to the terms conditions as mentioned in aforesaid and agreement dated 23.05.2013.
- XVI. That there is delay in handing over the possession of the Flat/Apartment to the complainant which is deficiency of service on part of the respondents and contrary to the terms and conditions of the said agreement dated 23.05.2013. That the complainant has paid the total amount towards the consideration of the unit/flat, which amounts to the entire demand raised by the respondents till date. On the other hand, the respondents are enjoying the money collected by the buyers by using it for their own purposes.
- XVII. That complainant had booked the property in aforesaid Residential Project of the respondents to own a house for a standard living matching to his status and taste but he was cheated by the respondents as the respondents have failed in fulfilling their promise of giving the possession of the property on time and as per the specifications as well as according to the terms & conditions of the Apartment Buyer's Agreement Dated 23.05.2013.

XVIII. That further the respondents have also not performed their part according to the terms and conditions of the agreement as construction of the project had not been done by the respondents as per the agreed schedule and the respondents are also unable to handover the possession of the property to complainant within the fixed time period.

**C. Reliefs sought by the complainant**

4. The complainant is seeking the following relief:

- i. Direct the respondents to handover the vacant possession of the Flats/ Apartment as agreed in Agreement dated 23.05.2013 at earliest in good the habitable condition to the complainant. Which is sadly in uninhabitable still condition.
- ii. Direct the respondent to pay the delay possession charges along with interest.
- iii. Litigation cost of Rs.5,00,000/-.

5. On the date of hearing, the authority explained to the respondent/promoter about the contravention as alleged to have been committed in relation to section 11(4)(a) of the Act to plead guilty or not to plead guilty.

**D. Reply filed by the respondent no.1.**

6. The respondent no.1 has contended the complaint on the following grounds:

- i. That the respondent is a developer and has built multiple residential and commercial buildings within Delhi/NCR with a well-

established reputation earned over years of consistent customer satisfaction.

- II. That the complainants had approached the respondent for booking a flat no. 0401 in its upcoming project "Estella", Sector 103, Gurugram. Upon the satisfaction of the complainant regarding inspection of the site, title, location plans, etc. an agreement to sell dated 23.05.2013 was signed between the parties.
- III. That even if for the sake of argument the averments and the pleadings in the complaint are taken to be true, the said complaint has been preferred by the complainant belatedly. The complainant has admittedly filed the complaint in the year 2024 and the cause of action accrued in year 2017 as per the complaint itself. Therefore, it is submitted that the complaint cannot be filed before the HRERA Gurugram as the same is barred by limitation.
- IV. That even if the complaint is admitted to be true and correct, the agreement which was signed in the year 2013 without coercion or any duress cannot be called in question today. It is submitted that the builder buyer agreement provides for a penalty in the event of a delay in giving possession. It is submitted that clause 35 of the said agreement provides for Rs. 5/- sq foot per month on super area for any delay in offering possession of the unit as mentioned in Clause 30 of the agreement. Therefore, the complainant will be entitled to invoke the said clause and is barred from approaching the Hon'ble Commission in order to alter the penalty clause by virtue of this

complaint more than 10 years after it was agreed upon by both parties.

- V. That the respondent had in due course of time obtained all necessary approvals from the concerned authorities. It is submitted that the permit for environmental clearances for proposed group housing project for Sector 103, Gurugram, Haryana on 20.02.2015. Similarly, the approval for digging the foundation and basement was obtained and sanctions from the department of mines and geology were obtained in 2012. Thus, the respondents have in a timely and prompt manner ensured that the requisite compliances be obtained and cannot be faulted on giving delayed possession to the complainant.
- VI. That the respondent has adequately explained the delay. It is submitted that the delay has been occasioned on account of things beyond the control of the answering Respondent. It is further submitted that the builder buyer agreement provides for such eventualities and the cause for delay is completely covered in the said clause. The Respondent ought to have complied with the orders of the Hon'ble High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh in CWP No. 20032 of 2008, dated 16.07.2012, 31.07.2012. 21.08.2012. The said orders banned the extraction of water which is the backbone of the construction process.
- VII. Similarly, the complaint itself reveals that the correspondence from the respondent specifies force majeure, demonetization and the orders of the Hon'ble NGT prohibiting construction in and around

Delhi and the COVID -19 pandemic among others as the causes which contributed to the stalling of the project at crucial junctures for considerable spells.

VIII. That the respondent and the complainant admittedly have entered into a builder buyer agreement which provides for the event of delayed possession. It is submitted that clause 31 of the builder buyer agreement is clear that there is no compensation to be sought by the complainant/prospective owner in the event of delay in possession.

IX. That the respondent has clearly provided in clause 35 the consequences that follow from delayed possession. It is submitted that the complainant cannot alter the terms of the contract by preferring a complaint before the Authority.

7. Despite several opportunities, neither respondent no.2 i.e., Ishkripa Properties Private Limited put in appearance nor filed reply to the present complaint. Thus, vide proceedings dated 07.04.2026, the respondent no.2 was proceeded exparte.

**E. Jurisdiction of the authority**

8. The authority observed that it has territorial as well as subject matter jurisdiction to adjudicate the present complaint for the reasons given below.

**E.I Territorial jurisdiction**

9. As per notification no. 1/92/2017-1TCP dated 14.12.2017 issued by Town and Country Planning Department, the jurisdiction of Real Estate Regulatory Authority, Gurugram shall be entire Gurugram

district for all purpose with offices situated in Gurugram. In the present case, the project in question is situated within the planning area of Gurugram district, therefore this authority has complete territorial jurisdiction to deal with the present complaint.

### **E.II Subject-matter jurisdiction**

10. Section 11(4)(a) of the Act, 2016 provides that the promoter shall be responsible to the allottee as per agreement for sale. Section 11(4)(a) is reproduced as hereunder:

**Section 11(4)(a)**

**Section 11**

.....

(4) The promoter shall-

- (a) *be responsible for all obligations, responsibilities and functions under the provisions of this Act or the rules and regulations made thereunder or to the allottees as per the agreement for sale, or to the association of allottees, as the case may be, till the conveyance of all the apartments, plots or buildings, as the case may be, to the allottees, or the common areas to the association of allottees or the competent authority, as the case may be;*

**Section 34-Functions of the Authority:**

*34(f) of the Act provides to ensure compliance of the obligations cast upon the promoters, the allottees and the real estate agents under this Act and the rules and regulations made thereunder.*

11. So, in view of the provisions of the Act quoted above, the authority has complete jurisdiction to decide the complaint regarding non-compliance of obligations by the promoter leaving aside compensation which is to be decided by the adjudicating officer if pursued by the complainant at a later stage.

### **F. Findings on the objections raised by the respondent:**

#### **F.I Objections regarding force majeure circumstances.**

11. The respondent no. 1 has raised the contention that the construction of the tower in which the unit of the complainant is situated, has been delayed due to force majeure circumstances such as orders passed by Hon'ble High Court of Punjab and Haryana, orders of Hon'ble National Green Tribunal to stop construction, demonetization, and Covid- 19. The plea of the respondent no.1 regarding various orders of the NGT and demonetisation and all the pleas advanced in this regard are devoid of merit. The orders passed by NGT banning construction in the NCR region was for a very short period of time and thus, cannot be said to impact the respondent-builder leading to such a delay in the completion. Thus, the promoter-respondent cannot be given any leniency on based of aforesaid reasons and it is well settled principle that a person cannot take benefit of his own wrong.

**F. II. Objection regarding delay in completion of construction of project due to outbreak of Covid-19.**

12. The Hon'ble Delhi High Court in case titled as **M/s Halliburton Offshore Services Inc. V/S Vedanta Ltd. & Anr. bearing no. O.M.P (1) (Comm.) no. 88/2020 and LAS 3696-3697/2020 dated 29.05.2020 has observed as under:**

*69. The past non-performance of the Contractor cannot be condoned due to the COVID-19 lockdown in March 2020 in India. The Contractor was in breach since September 2019. Opportunities were given to the Contractor to cure the same repeatedly. Despite the same, the Contractor could not complete the Project. The outbreak of a pandemic*

*cannot be used as an excuse for non-performance of a contract for which the deadlines were much before the outbreak itself."*

13. In the present case also, the respondents were liable to complete the construction of the project and handover the possession of the said unit by 23.11.2016. It is claiming benefit of lockdown which came into effect on 23.03.2020 whereas the due date of handing over of possession was much prior to the event of outbreak of Covid-19 pandemic. Therefore, the Authority is of the view that outbreak of a pandemic cannot be used as an excuse for non-performance of a contract for which the deadlines were much before the outbreak itself and for the said reason, the said time period cannot be excluded while calculating the delay in handing over possession.

**G. Findings of the authority on relief sought by complainant.**

**G.I. Direct the respondents to handover the vacant possession of the Flats/ Apartment as agreed in Agreement dated 23.05.2013 at earliest in good the habitable condition to the complainant. Which is sadly in uninhabitable still condition.**

**G.II. Direct the respondent to pay the delay possession charges along with interest.**

14. In the present complaint, the complainant intends to continue with the project and is seeking delayed possession charges along with interest on the amount paid. Clause 30 of the flat buyer agreement (in short, agreement) provides for handing over of possession and is reproduced below: -

*"30. The developer shall offer possession of the unit any time, within a period of 36 months from the date of execution of the agreement or within 36 months from the date of obtaining all the required sanctions and approval necessary for commencement of construction, whichever is later subject to timely payment of all dues by buyer and subject to force majeure circumstances as described in clause 31. Further, there shall be a grace period of 6 months allowed to the developer over and above the period of 36 months as above in offering the possession of the unit."*

15. At the outset, it is relevant to comment on the present possession clause of the agreement wherein the possession has been subjected to all kinds of terms and conditions of this agreement and application, and the complainant not being in default under any provisions of this agreement and compliance with all provisions, formalities and documentation as prescribed by the promoters. The drafting of this clause and incorporation of such conditions are not only vague and uncertain but so heavily loaded in favor of the promoters and against the allottee that even a single default by the allottee in fulfilling formalities and documentations etc. as prescribed by the promoters may make the possession clause irrelevant for the purpose of allottee and the commitment date for handing over possession loses its meaning. The incorporation of such clause in the flat buyer agreement by the promoters are just to evade the liability towards timely delivery of subject unit and to deprive the allottee of his right accruing after delay in possession. This is just to comment as to how the builder has misused his dominant position and drafted such mischievous

clause in the agreement and the allottee is left with no option but to sign on the dotted lines.

**16. Admissibility of grace period:** The promoter has proposed to hand over the possession of the subject unit within a period of 36 months from date of agreement or the date of commencement of construction whichever is later plus grace period of 6 months. As no approval/sanction has been placed on record by the respondent therefore, the due date of possession has been calculated from date of execution of builder buyer agreement i.e., 23.05.2013. The period of 36 months expires on 23.05.2016. Since in the present matter the BBA incorporates unqualified reason for grace period/extended period in the possession clause. Accordingly, the Authority allows this grace period of 6 months to the promoter at this stage, accordingly the due date of possession comes out to be 23.11.2016.

**17. Admissibility of delay possession charges at prescribed rate of interest:** Proviso to section 18 provides that where an allottee does not intend to withdraw from the project, he shall be paid, by the promoter, interest for every month of delay, till the handing over of possession, at such rate as may be prescribed and it has been prescribed under rule 15 of the rules. Rule 15 has been reproduced as under:

**Rule 15. Prescribed rate of interest- [Proviso to section 12, section 18 and sub-section (4) and subsection (7) of section 19]**  
(1) For the purpose of proviso to section 12; section 18; and sub-sections (4) and (7) of section 19, the "interest at the rate prescribed" shall be the State Bank of India highest marginal cost of lending rate +2%.

*Provided that in case the State Bank of India marginal cost of lending rate (MCLR) is not in use, it shall be replaced by such benchmark lending rates which the State Bank of India may fix from time to time for lending to the general public.*

18. The legislature in its wisdom in the subordinate legislation under rule 15 of the rules has determined the prescribed rate of interest. The rate of interest so determined by the legislature, is reasonable and if the said rule is followed to award the interest, it will ensure uniform practice in all the cases.
19. Consequently, as per website of the State Bank of India i.e., <https://sbi.co.in>, the marginal cost of lending rate (in short, MCLR) as on date i.e., **07.04.2026** is 8.80%. Accordingly, the prescribed rate of interest will be MCLR +2% i.e., 10.80%.
20. The definition of term 'interest' as defined under section 2(za) of the Act provides that the rate of interest chargeable from the allottees by the promoter, in case of default, shall be equal to the rate of interest which the promoter shall be liable to pay the allottees, in case of default. The relevant section is reproduced below:

*"(za) "interest" means the rates of interest payable by the promoter or the allottees, as the case may be.*

*Explanation. —For the purpose of this clause—*

*(i) the rate of interest chargeable from the allottees by the promoter, in case of default, shall be equal to the rate of interest which the promoter shall be liable to pay the allottees, in case of default;*

*(ii) the interest payable by the promoter to the allottees shall be from the date the promoter received the amount or any part thereof till the date the amount or part thereof and interest thereon is refunded, and the interest payable by the allottees to the promoter shall be from the date the allottees defaults in payment to the promoter till the date it is paid;"*

21. Therefore, interest on the delay payments from the complainant shall be charged at the prescribed rate i.e., **10.80%** by the respondents which is the same as is being granted to the complainant in case of delayed possession charges.
22. On consideration of the documents available on record and submissions made regarding contravention of provisions of the Act, the Authority is satisfied that the respondent/promoter is in contravention of the section 11(4)(a) of the Act, by not handing over possession by the due date as per the Flat Buyer Agreement. That the FBA was executed between the parties on 23.05.2013, so the Authority calculated the due date from the date of Flat buyer agreement i.e., 23.05.2013. The period of 36 months expired on 23.05.2016. As far as grace period is concerned, the same is allowed for the reasons quoted above. Therefore, the due date of handing over possession is 23.11.2016. The respondent/promoter has not offered the possession of the subject unit till date. It is the failure of the respondent-promoter to fulfil its obligations and responsibilities as per the Flat buyer's agreement to hand over the possession within the stipulated period. Accordingly, the non-compliance of the mandate contained in section 11(4)(a) read with proviso to section 18(1) of the Act on the part of the respondent no.1 is established. As such the allottee shall be paid, by the promoter, interest for every month of delay from due date of possession i.e., 23.11.2016 till actual handing over of possession or offer of possession plus two months after obtaining occupation certificate from the competent authority

whichever is earlier, as per section 18(1) of the Act 2016 read with Rule 15 of the Rules.

**G.III. Litigation costs of Rs.5,00,000/-.**


23. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in civil appeal nos. 6745-6749 of 2021 titled as *M/s Newtech Promoters and Developers Pvt. Ltd. Vs. State of UP & Ors. (supra)* has held that an allottee is entitled to claim compensation & litigation charges under sections 12,14,18 and section 19 which is to be decided by the adjudicating officer as per section 71 and the quantum of compensation & litigation expense shall be adjudged by the adjudicating officer having due regard to the factors mentioned in section 72. The adjudicating officer has exclusive jurisdiction to deal with the complaints in respect of compensation & legal expenses.

**H. Directions of the authority**

24. Hence, the Authority hereby passes this order and issues the following directions under section 37 of the Act to ensure compliance of obligations cast upon the promoter as per the function entrusted to the authority under section 34(f):
- a. The respondent/promoter is directed to handover actual and vacant possession of the subject unit to the complainant after obtaining the Occupation Certificate from the concerned authorities within a period of 60 days from the date of offering possession of the unit to the complainant, subject to clearing of the outstanding dues by the complainant.

- b. The respondent/promoter is directed to provide an updated Statement of Accounts to the complainant within a period of 30 days, after obtaining the Occupation certificate from the competent authorities.
- c. The respondent/promoter is directed to pay interest at the prescribed rate of 10.80% p.a. for every month of delay from the due date of possession i.e., 23.11.2016 till offer of possession plus two months or actual handing over of possession, after obtaining occupation certificate from the competent authority whichever is earlier, as per section 18(1) of the Act 2016 read with Rule 15 of the Rules.
- d. The arrears of such interest accrued from 23.11.2016 till the date of order by the Authority shall be paid by the promoter to the allottee within a period of 90 days from date of this order and interest for every month of delay shall be paid by the promoter to the allottee before 10<sup>th</sup> of the subsequent month as per rule 16(2) of the rules.
- e. The complainant is directed to pay outstanding dues, if any, after adjustment of interest for the delayed period.
- f. The rate of interest chargeable from the complainant /allottee by the promoter, in case of default shall be charged at the prescribed rate i.e., 10.80% by the respondent/promoter which is the same rate of interest which the promoter shall be liable to pay the allottees, in case of default i.e., the delay possession charges as per section 2(za) of the Act.

- g. The respondent shall not charge anything from the complainant which is not the part of the buyer's agreement.
25. Complaint stands disposed of.
26. File be consigned to registry.

  
**(Arun Kumar)**  
Chairman

Haryana Real Estate Regulatory Authority, Gurugram  
Dated: 07.04.2026



**HARERA**  
**GURUGRAM**