



HARYANA REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY PANCHKULA

Website: www.haryanarera.gov.in

COMPLAINT NO. 1277 OF 2022 ✓

Parvesh Jain

....COMPLAINANT

VERSUS

TDI Infracorp (India) Ltd.

....RESPONDENT

Date of Hearing: 25.08.2026

Hearing- 15th

Present: - Adv. Arjun Kundra, Learned Counsel for the Complainant
None for the Respondent

ORDER (DR. GEETA RATHEE SINGH – MEMBER)

1. The complainant in his complaint has alleged that he had booked a plot measuring 350 sq.yds. in the project of the respondent namely 'TDI City' situated at Panipat, on 31.01.2006 by paying a booking amount of ₹4,37,500/-. Thereafter, complainant visited the office of the respondent numerous times asking them to allot a specific plot in his name. Despite repeated requests, respondent neither allotted any plot to the complainant nor raised any further demand in this regard. It has been further alleged that in the year 2011, the

Dr. Geeta Rathee

respondent cancelled the registration of the plot and verbally informed the complainant that cancellation is being done on account of non-payment of dues. The amount of ₹4,37,500/- was forfeited by the respondent. Complainant requested the respondent many times to either give possession or refund the amount of ₹4,37,500/- but received no response from the respondent. Aggrieved by the act of the respondent, complainant approached the Ld. District Consumer Dispute Redressal Forum, Sonapat, vide Complaint no. 130 of 2014 seeking refund of ₹4,37,500/-. Said complaint was decided in favour of the complainant vide order dated 06.04.2015. Respondent then approached Ld. State Consumer Dispute Redressal Forum, Haryana, challenging the aforesaid order vide appeal no. 456-2015. The said appeal was dismissed by Hon'ble SCDRC on 18.11.2015. Respondent then filed Revision Petition no. RP/233/2016 against order dated 18.11.2015 passed by Hon'ble SCDRC before Ld. National Consumer Dispute Redressal Forum, New Delhi. Ld. NCDRC allowed the revision petition vide order dated 03.05.2016 and the complaint filed by complainant was dismissed with liberty to approach appropriate court. Complainant filed Review application No. 14 of 2017 before Ld. NCDRC which was dismissed vide order dated 14.08.2018.. Thereafter, the complainant approached the Authority seeking valid possession of the plot booked by him along with interest.

2. The respondent in his reply and written submissions has challenged the veracity of the complaint contending that the present complaint filed by the



complainant through alleged power of attorney is not maintainable. It has been submitted that the complaint has been filed by the complainant through Mr. Amit alleging that a power of attorney has been executed in his favour. However, it is clear that no valid power of attorney has been executed by the complainant, and the alleged power of attorney annexed with the complaint is not valid, illegal on account of following reasons:-

- (i) No witness on the alleged GPA
- (ii) GPA not registered- Registration of General Power of Attorney involving immovable property is mandatory as per the provisions of Indian Registration Act, 1908. Contents of the alleged power of attorney shows that the complainant has assigned all rights relating to the plot including power to manage, transfer or sell, to sign and execute the documents of sale to appear before Sub-Registrar, to receive sale consideration and to do all other acts in favour of Amit.
- (iii) No authority under the alleged GPA which authorizes filing of complaint before RERA Authority.
- (iv) It has been mentioned in the alleged GPA that the same relates to plot situated in Kundli, Sonapat whereas the present complaint is filed regarding registration of plot situated in Panipat. Also it mentions the name of company as TDI Infrastructure Ltd, which is a separate entity and address of the said entity is mentioned in the alleged GPA



and the authority is given to file the complaint against the said company.

(v) The GPA is undated however it has shown to be attested by Notary on 26.4.2016, however neither the serial number has been mentioned nor the person who identified the deponent has been mentioned. Also the fact that it has been mentioned that the same conveys all rights to the GPA holder and authorizes Mr. Amit to deal with the property in any manner whereas at that time the matter was pending before National Commission and decided on 03.05.2016 and also the fact that that review was filed by Mr Parvesh Jain against the order dated 03.05.2016 on 2/2/2017 and same decided on 14.8.2018 causes suspicion considering the facts that the complainant has not signed the Vakalatnama and complaint etc and even the supporting affidavit has been signed by Mr. Amit and not the complainant himself.

3. Therefore, vide order dated 07.07.2026 complainant was directed to file legal and valid power of attorney executed in favour of Mr. Amit to file the present complaint. However, a valid power of attorney has not been filed till date.

4. In view of above, it is observed that the Authority has given ample time to the complainant to place on record the valid power of attorney executed in favour of Mr. Amit to file the present complaint. The Authority is of the considered view that proceedings under the Real Estate (Regulation and



Development) Act, 2016 are summary in nature, intended for expeditious adjudication of disputes. In the present case, sufficient opportunity has already been extended to the complainant for compliance with the directions of the Authority.

5. Despite ample time and liberty being granted, the complainant has failed to demonstrate any bona fide intent to pursue the matter diligently or to support his claim by filing even the most basic document such as valid power of attorney.

6. In view of the above circumstances, and considering the continued non-compliance of directions issued by the Authority, the present complaint is hereby **dismissed for want of proper authorisation**, with liberty to the complainant to file a fresh complaint in accordance with law, with better particulars, proper authorisation and all requisite documents.

7. In view of the aforesaid observation, the present case is hereby dismissed and accordingly stands **disposed of**. File be consigned to the record room after uploading of this order on the website of the Authority.


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