

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

Date of decision: 14.11.2025

Roopali Raj
R/o: - H. No. 1008, Sector 31

Complainant

Versus

M/s Vatika Ltd.
Office address: Vatika Triangle, 4th Floor,
Sushant Lok Phase I, Block A, MG Road,
Gurugram - 122002.

Respondent

CORAM:
Shri Arun Kumar

Chairman

APPEARANCE:
Kanish Bangia
Ankur Berry

Advocate for the complainant
Advocate for the respondent

ORDER

1. The present complaint has been filed by the complainant/allottee 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 under the provisions of the Act or the Rules and regulations made there under or to the allottees as per the agreement for sale executed *inter se*.
- A. Unit and project related details**

2. The particulars of unit details, sale consideration, the amount paid by the complainants, date of proposed handing over the possession, date of buyer's agreement etc, have been detailed in the following tabular form:

S. N.	Particulars	Details
1.	Name of the project	Vatika India Next City Centre, Sector-83
2.	RERA Registered/ not registered	Un-registered
3.	License no. and validity	Not available
4.	Unit no.	109, 1 st floor, block-C [Page 25 of complaint]
5.	Unit area admeasuring	500 sq. ft. (super area)
6.	Date of allotment	Not available
7.	Date of Builder buyer agreement b/w original allottee i.e., Mahender Singh and respondent	30.04.2011
8.	Date of Sale agreement b/w original allottee and complainant	18.01.2018 [Page 25 of compliant]
9.	Assured Return Clause	Rs. 71.50/- till the completion Rs. 65/- post completion (as stated by complainant on page 11 of complaint)
10.	Possession clause	<i>Subject to the aforesaid and subject to timely payment by the buyer of the sale price, stamp duty and other charges due and payable according to the payment plan applicable to him or as demanded by the developer, the developer contemplates to complete construction of the said commercial</i>

		<i>unit within 48 months of execution of this agreement.</i>
11.	Due date of possession	30.04.2015 (as per possession clause)
12.	Total sale consideration	Rs.21,50,000/-
13.	Amount paid by the complainant	Rs.21,50,000/- (page 27 of complaint)
14.	Occupation certificate	Applied in 2017 & 2018 but not received yet [as per reply]
15.	Notice of possession	Not offered
16.	Intimation of execution of lease deed	20.03.2018 (page 35 of reply)
17.	Assured return paid by respondent	Rs.2,77,443/- w.e.f. 12.04.2018 till 15.05.2019 [Page 4 of reply and ledger at page 34 of reply]

B. Facts of the complaint

3. The complainant has submitted as under:

- i. That the complainants being the allottee of the unit no. 109 on 1st floor in Block C in the "Vatika India Next City Centre" project of the respondent situated in NH-8, Sector-83, Gurgaon is covered within the definition of "allottee" under Section 2 (d) of The Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016.
- ii. The respondent announced the launch of their project by the name of "Vatika Trade Centre", now "India Next City Centre" and thereby, invited applications from prospective buyers for the purchase of units in the said project. The unit was first allotted to Mr. Mahender Singh. According to builder buyers' agreement, signed on 30th April, 2011 between original allottee and Vatika limited, the allottee will receive by

- way of monthly commitment charges against the said unit at Rs 71.50 till completion and Rs 65/- post completion for 36 months or till leasing whichever is earlier.
- iii. That original allottee was confirmed the booking of apartment bearing unit No. 109 on 1st floor in Block C, Super area measuring 500 sq. ft at vatika India next city centre, Sector- 83, NH-8, Gurugram, Haryana.
 - iv. That the original allottee sell his above-mention unit in favour of the complainant, i.e., Mrs. Roopali Raj, W/ o Sh. Tilak Raj, R/o H.NO. 1008, sector 31, Gurugram-122003, at sum of Rs. 21,50,500.00/-.
 - v. The complainants having paid the entire sum of money towards the total sale consideration were hoping to get regular returns on their investment. However, they stopped receiving the returns. Hence, the complainants vide email dated 25.03.2021 which remained unpaid since April 2019.
 - vi. That the respondent deliberately and with a mischievous intent tricked the investors including the complainants through false promises and forced into paying up huge amounts to the respondent.
 - vii. The respondent is well aware that the project is over delayed and hence are liable to pay interest as per the provisions of the RERA 2016 and the provisions of Haryana Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Rules, 2017. According to Sections 18(1) and 19(7) of RERA 2016 read with Rule 15, the respondent is liable to pay the allottee interest for delaying the possession in violation of the terms of the agreement.
 - viii. It is submitted that the respondent did not care to keep the complainants informed about the delay in possession despite multiple attempts made by the complainants to obtain such information and

hence, the principle of equity does not favour the respondent. the respondent is required to offer the possession as required under law as the complainants have waited for a long time period of 9 years since the booking of the said unit.

ix. That the complainant now being the allottee is entitled to receive the assured return against the unit at 65/-per sq. ft. after the completion of the building. However, the respondent has failed to make these payments on timely basis and on a myriad occasion citing frivolous reasons has simply not paid the complainants, especially after 2016.

C. Relief sought by the complainant:

4. The complainant has sought following relief(s):
 - i. To direct the respondent to pay delay possession charges at the prescribed rate to the complainant for the period of delay accrued from the due date of possession to the date of offer of possession along with occupation certificate by respondent.
 - ii. To direct the respondent to deliver possession of the booked unit along with occupation certificate.
 - iii. Direct the respondent to pay the due amounts towards assured returns.
 - iv. To direct the respondent to execute and register the sale deed in the concerned sub registrar office in favour of complainant of the booked unit.
5. On the date of hearing, the authority explained to the respondent /promoters about the contraventions 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 by the respondent.

6. The respondent has contested the complaint on the following grounds:
- i. That the respondent is a company, registered under the Companies Act, 1956 having its office at unit no A-002, INXT City Centre ground floor, block A, Sector 83, Vatika India Next, Gurugram - 122012, Haryana India.
 - ii. That the complainant has got no locus standi or cause of action to file the present complaint. The present complaint is based on an erroneous interpretation of the provisions of the Act as well as an incorrect understanding of the terms and conditions of the builder buyer's agreement dated 30.04.2011. It is brought to notice that complainant is subsequent purchasers who bought the commercial unit from the erstwhile allottee on 29.03.2018.
 - iii. That at the very outset it is submitted that the present complaint is not maintainable or tenable in the eyes of law. The complainant has misdirected himself in filing the above captioned complaint before this Ld. Authority as the reliefs being claimed by the complainant cannot be said to fall within the realm of jurisdiction of this Ld. Authority. It is humbly submitted that upon the enactment of the Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes Act, 2019, the 'Assured Return' and/ or any "Committed Returns" on the deposit schemes have been banned. The respondent company having not taken registration from SEBI Board cannot run, operate, continue an assured return scheme. The implications of enactment of BUDS Act read with the Companies Act, 2013 and Companies (Acceptance of Deposits) Rules, 2014, resulted in making the assured return/committed return and similar schemes as unregulated schemes as being within the definition of "Deposit".

- iv. Thus the 'Assured Return Scheme proposed and floated by the respondent has become infructuous due to operation of law, thus the relief prayed for in the present complaint cannot survive due to operation of law. As a matter of fact, the respondent duly paid Rs.2,77,443.55/- as assured return.
- v. It is hereby submitted that on the 20th of March 2018, an email was issued to the erstwhile allottee, notifying them regarding the lease deed pertaining to the specified unit. The lease agreement's initiation date is recorded as the 24th of January 2019. Furthermore, it is crucial to note that the respondent has consistently fulfilled their obligation of remitting the lease payments to the complainant up until the 15th of December 2023.
- vi. That as per clause 32 of the BBA, it is asserted that the respondent possesses the authority to lease out the unit following the completion of construction. The aforementioned unit has already been leased out, and the complainant has been reaping the benefits of the lease rent up until the date of December 15, 2023.
- vii. That it is also relevant to mention here that the commercial unit of the complainant was not meant for physical possession as the said unit is only meant for leasing the said commercial space for earning rental income. Furthermore, as per the agreement, the said commercial space shall be deemed to be legally possessed by the complainant. Hence, the commercial space booked by the complainant' is not meant for physical possession.

7.

- viii. That further the relief of delayed possession charges, as claimed by the complainant cannot be allowed since the complainant has been enjoying the benefit of lease rental on the said property. The delayed possession charges could only be imposed if the possession as per the BBA was not handed whereas the BBA executed between the complainant and the respondent did not contain a possession clause and rather clause for leasing of the unit was made.
- ix. That the complainant has come before this Hon'ble Authority with unclean hands. The complaint has been filed by the complainant just to harass the respondent and to gain unjust enrichment. The actual reason for filing of the present complaint stems from the changed financial valuation of the real estate sector, in the past few years and the allottee malicious intention to earn some easy buck. The Covid pandemic has given people to think beyond the basic legal way and to attempt to gain financially at the cost of others. The complainant has instituted the present false and vexatious complaint against the respondent company who has already fulfilled its obligation as defined under the BBA dated 30.04.2011 and assignment dated 29.03.2018. It is pertinent to mention here that for the fair adjudication of grievance as alleged by the complainant, detailed deliberation by leading the evidence and cross-examination is required, thus only the Civil Court has jurisdiction to deal with the cases requiring detailed evidence for proper and fair adjudication.
- x. It is submitted that the erstwhile allottees entered into an agreement i.e., BBA dated 30.04.2011 with respondent company owing to the name, good will and reputation of the respondent company. That it is a matter

- of record and also admitted by the complainant that the respondent duly paid the assured return to the complainant till March, 2019. Further due to external circumstances which were not in control of the respondent, construction got deferred. That even though the respondent suffered from setback due to external circumstances, yet the respondent managed to complete the construction and sent letter of completion of construction dated 29.03.2016, copy of which admittedly attached with the complaint.
- xi. That since in October, 2018 the amendments being made in the laws were at ripe stage the respondent company could not engage in acts/omissions that may create criminal culpability upon the respondent itself thus in furtherance of the email dated 31.10.2018, the respondent company sent another email dated 30.11.2018 detailing therein the amendments in law regarding the SEBI Act, Bill No. 85 (Regarding the BUDS Act) and other statutory changes which led to stoppage of all return based/assured/committed return based sale. The email communication of 30.11.2018 also confirmed to the allottees that the project was ready and available for leasing. That the issue regarding stoppage of assured returns/committed return and reconciliation of all accounts as of July 2019 was also communicated with all the allottees of the concerned project since the respondent company did never intend to cheat or even leave its customer in lurch. Further vide email dated 30.12.2018 the respondent sent email to all its allottees including the complainant regarding the stoppage of monthly return and also gave option to the allottees to shift to alternate project with quarterly return benefits, yet the complainant chose to ignore the option and thereby

letting go of her rights to monthly assured returns. Further the respondent intimated to all its allottees that in view of the legal changes and formation of new laws the amendment to BBA vide Addendum would be shared with all the allottees to safeguard their interest.

8. Copies of all the relevant documents have been filed and placed on the record. Their authenticity is not in dispute. Hence, the complaint can be decided on the basis of those undisputed documents and submissions made by the parties.

E. Jurisdiction of the authority

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

E. I Territorial jurisdiction

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

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

Section 11(4) (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) *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.*

12. 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 complainants at a later stage.
- F. Relief sought by the respondent.**
- F.I. To direct the respondent to pay delay possession charges at the prescribed rate to the complainant for the period of delay accrued from the due date of possession to the date of offer of possession along with occupation certificate by respondent.**
- F.II. To direct the respondent to deliver possession of the booked unit along with occupation certificate.**
13. The complainant is seeking unpaid assured returns on monthly basis as per the application form at the rates mentioned therein. It is pleaded that the respondent has not complied with the terms and conditions of the said acknowledgement letter. Though for some time, the amount of assured returns was paid but later on, the respondent refused to pay the same by taking a plea that the same is not payable in view of enactment of the Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes Act, 2019 (hereinafter referred to as the Act of 2019), citing earlier decision of the authority (Brhimjeet & Anr. Vs. M/s Landmark Apartments Pvt. Ltd., complaint no 141 of 2018) whereby relief of assured return was declined by the authority. The authority has rejected the aforesaid objections raised by

the respondent in *CR/8001/2022 titled as Gaurav Kaushik and anr. Vs. Vatika Ltd.* wherein the authority has held that when payment of assured returns is part and parcel of builder buyer's agreement (maybe there is a clause in that document or by way of addendum, memorandum of understanding or terms and conditions of the allotment of a unit), then the builder is liable to pay that amount as agreed upon and the Act of 2019 does not create a bar for payment of assured returns even after coming into operation as the payments made in this regard are protected as per section 2(4)(I)(iii) of the Act of 2019. Thus, the plea advanced by the respondent is not sustainable in view of the aforesaid reasoning and case cited above.

14. The money was taken by the builder as deposit in advance against allotment of immovable property and its possession was to be offered within a certain period. However, in view of taking sale consideration by way of advance, the builder promised certain amount by way of assured returns for a certain period. So, on his failure to fulfil that commitment, the allottee has a right to approach the authority for redressal of his grievances by way of filing a complaint.
15. The builder is liable to pay that amount as agreed upon and can't take a plea that it is not liable to pay the amount of assured return. Moreover, an agreement defines the builder/buyer relationship. So, it can be said that the agreement for assured returns between the promoter and allottee arises out of the same relationship and is marked by the original agreement for sale.
16. It is not disputed that the respondent is a real estate developer, and it had not obtained registration under the Act of 2016 for the project in

question. However, the project in which the advance has been received by the developer from the allottee is an ongoing project as per section 3(1) of the Act of 2016 and, the same would fall within the jurisdiction of the authority for giving the desired relief to the complainant besides initiating penal proceedings. So, the amount paid by the complainants to the builder is a regulated deposit accepted by the later from the former against the immovable property to be transferred to the allottee later on. In view of the above, the respondent is liable to pay assured return to the complainant-allottee in terms of the BBA executed inter-se parties on 30.04.2011.

G.II. Delayed possession charges

17. In the present complaint, the complainant intends to continue with the project and are seeking possession of the subject unit and delay possession charges as provided under the provisions of section 18(1) of the Act which reads as under:

“Section 18: - Return of amount and compensation

18(1). If the promoter fails to complete or is unable to give possession of an apartment, plot, or building, —

*.....
Provided 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 the possession, at such rate as may be prescribed”*

18. As per clause 10 of the BBA dated 30.04.2011 the possession was to delivered within 48 months from the date of agreement. Therefore, the due date of possession comes out to be i.e., 30.04.2015.
19. **Admissibility of delay possession charges at prescribed rate of interest:** The complainant is seeking delay possession charges. 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]

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”

20. The legislature in its wisdom in the subordinate legislation under the rule 15 of the rules has determined the prescribed rate of interest. 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., 14.11.2025 is 8.85%. Accordingly, the prescribed rate of interest will be marginal cost of lending rate +2% i.e., 10.85%.
21. On consideration of documents available on record and submissions made by the complainant and the respondent, the authority is satisfied that the respondent is in contravention of the provisions of the Act. The possession of the subject unit was to be delivered within stipulated time i.e., 30.04.2015.
22. However now, the proposition before it is as to whether the allottee who is getting/entitled for assured return even after expiry of due date of possession, can claim both the assured return as well as delayed possession charges?
23. To answer the above proposition, it is worthwhile to consider that the assured return is payable to the allottees on account of application form and provisions in the BBA dated 30.04.2011. The assured return in this

case is payable as per "BBA" the promoter had agreed to pay to the complainants allottee ₹71.50/- per sq. ft. on monthly basis till completion and ₹65/- per sq. ft. on monthly basis after the completion of the building. If we compare this assured return with delayed possession charges payable under proviso to section 18(1) of the Act, 2016, the assured return is much better i.e., assured return in this case is payable as ₹35,750/- per month whereas the delayed possession charges are payable approximately ₹19,439/- per month. By way of assured return, the promoter has assured the allottee that he would be entitled for this specific amount till the said unit is put on lease. Moreover, the interest of the allottees is protected even after the completion of the building as the assured returns are payable till the date of said unit/space is put on lease. The purpose of delayed possession charges after due date of possession is served on payment of assured return after due date of possession as the same is to safeguard the interest of the allottees as their money is continued to be used by the promoter even after the promised due date and in return, they are to be paid either the assured return or delayed possession charges whichever is higher.

24. Accordingly, the authority decides that in cases where assured return is reasonable and comparable with the delayed possession charges under section 18 and assured return is payable even after the date of completion of the project, then the allottees shall be entitled to assured return or delayed possession charges, whichever is higher without prejudice to any other remedy including compensation. However, in the present matter, it is observed that, inadvertently, delay possession charges at the prescribed rate of 10.85% per annum, calculated from the

due date of possession until the valid offer of possession, along with a period of two months after obtaining the Occupation Certificate from the competent authority or the handing over of possession, whichever is earlier, were allowed in the proceedings dated 14.11.2025. The same is hereby being corrected in the present order, in light of the proper reasoning set out in the preceding paragraphs. Accordingly, assured returns, being higher in nature, are allowed in place thereof.

25. On consideration of the documents available on the record and submissions made by the parties, the complainants have sought the amount of unpaid amount of assured return as per the terms of BBA and addendum executed thereto along with interest on such unpaid assured return. As per BBA dated 30.04.2011, the promoter had agreed to pay to the complainants allottee ₹71.50/- per sq. ft. on monthly basis till completion and ₹65/- per sq. ft. on monthly basis after the completion of the building till the said unit is put on lease thereafter the lease rent as agreed between the parties. The said clause further provides that it is the obligation of the respondent promoter to pay the assured returns. It is matter of record that the amount of assured return was paid by the respondent promoter till 15.05.2019 but later on, the respondent refused to pay the same by taking a plea of the Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes Act, 2019. But that Act of 2019 does not create a bar for payment of assured returns even after coming into operation and the payments made in this regard are protected as per section 2(4)(iii) of the above-mentioned Act.
26. Admittedly, the respondent has paid an amount of ₹2,77,443/- to the complainant as assured return till 15.05.2019. Therefore, considering the

facts of the present case, the respondent is directed to pay the amount of assured return at the agreed rate i.e., @ ₹71.50/- per sq. ft. per month from the date the payment of assured return has not been paid i.e., 15.05.2019 till the date of completion of the project after obtaining occupation certificate from the competent authority and thereafter, ₹65/- per sq. ft. per month after the completion of the building till the date the said unit is put on lease or for the first 36 months after the completion of the project, whichever is earlier in terms of buyers agreement.

27. Accordingly, the respondent is directed to pay the outstanding accrued assured return amount till date at the agreed rate within 90 days from the date of this order after adjustment of outstanding dues, if any, from the complainant and failing which that amount would be payable with interest @ 8.85% p.a. till the date of actual realization.

G. III. Possession

28. From the bare perusal of the documents the authority observes that since there was a leasing arrangement between the parties therefore, the physical possession was not to be handed over to the complainant rather they are entitled for assured return and thereafter once the unit is put on lease, he shall be entitled for lease rent as agreed in BBA dated 30.04.2011.

G. IV. Conveyance deed

29. With respect to the conveyance deed, clause 6 of the BBA provides that the respondent shall sell the said unit to the allottee by executing and registering the conveyance deed and also do such other acts/deeds as

may be necessary for confirming upon the allottee a marketable title to the said unit free from all encumbrances.

30. Section 17 (1) of the Act deals with duties of promoter to get the conveyance deed executed and the same is reproduced below:

“17. Transfer of title.-

(1). The promoter shall execute a registered conveyance deed in favour of the allottee along with the undivided proportionate title in the common areas to the association of the allottees or the competent authority, as the case may be, and hand over the physical possession of the plot, apartment of building, as the case may be, to the allottees and the common areas to the association of the allottees or the competent authority, as the case may be, in a real estate project, and the other title documents pertaining thereto within specified period as per sanctioned plans as provided under the local laws:

Provided that, in the absence of any local law, conveyance deed in favour of the allottee or the association of the allottees or the competent authority, as the case may be, under this section shall be carried out by the promoter within three months from date of issue of occupancy certificate.”

31. The authority observes that OC in respect of the project where the subject unit is situated has not been obtained by the respondent promoter till date. As on date, conveyance deed cannot be executed in respect of the subject unit, however, the respondent promoter is contractually and legally obligated to execute the conveyance deed upon receipt of the occupation certificate/completion certificate from the competent authority. In view of above, the respondent shall execute the conveyance deed of the allotted unit within 3 months after the receipt of the OC from the concerned authority and upon payment of requisite stamp duty by the complainant as per norms of the state government.

G. Directions of the authority:

32. 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):

- i. The respondent is directed to pay the amount of assured return at the agreed rate i.e., @ ₹71.50/- per sq. ft. per month from the date the payment of assured return has not been paid till the date of completion of building i.e., the date of receipt of OC from the competent Authority and thereafter, ₹65/- per sq. ft. per month after the completion of the building till the date the said unit is put on lease or for the first 36 months after the completion of the project, whichever is earlier in terms of the BBA.
- ii. The respondent is directed to pay the outstanding accrued assured return amount till date at the agreed rate within 90 days from the date of this order after adjustment of outstanding dues, if any, from the complainant and failing which that amount would be payable with interest @ 8.85% p.a. till the date of actual realization.
- iii. The respondent shall not charge anything from the complainant which is not the part of the builder buyer agreement.
- iv. A period of 90 days is given to the respondent to comply with the directions given in this order and failing which legal consequences would follow.
- v. The respondent is directed to execute the conveyance deed of the allotted unit within 3 months after the receipt of the OC from the concerned authority and upon payment of requisite stamp duty by the complainant as per norms of the state government.

- vi. A period of 90 days is given to the respondent to comply with the directions given in this order and failing which legal consequences would follow.
33. Complaint stands disposed of.
34. Files be consigned to registry.

Dated: 14.11.2025



(Arun Kumar)
Chairman
Haryana Real Estate
Regulatory authority,
Gurugram

