

BEFORE THE HARYANA REAL ESTATE APPELLATE TRIBUNAL

Appeal No.915 of 2024 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 09.06.2026

Mapsko Builders Pvt. Ltd. through its Authorised Representative,
Baani, The Address Building, 1-6th Floor, Golf-Course Road, Sector
56, Gurugram Haryana

...Appellant

Versus

1. Anil Kumar resident of MG-76, Mapsko Garden Estate,
Sector 27, Sonipat, Haryana
2. Jai Krishna Hi Tech Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd. through its
Authorised Representative, A-26, Friends Colony West, New
Delhi

...Respondents

CORAM:

Justice Rajan Gupta
Shri Dinesh Singh Chauhan

Chairman
Member (Technical)

Present: Ms. Sandhya Gaur, Advocate,
for the appellant.

None for the respondents.

ORDER

Rajan Gupta, Chairman (Oral):

Challenge in the present appeal has been made to
order dated 21.10.2024 passed by the, HRERA¹, Panchkula.
Operative part thereof reads as under:

“4. The learned counsel for respondent No.1 stated that the previously cost of ₹10,000/- payable to the Authority has been paid by respondent No.1. Additionally, regarding ₹1,00,000/- cost imposed by the Authority during the last hearing on both the respondents, both respondents verbally the waiver request and instructed both respondents to pay the ₹1,00,000/- each as cost to the Authority before the

¹ Haryana Real Estate Regulatory Authority, Panchkula

next hearing date and submit proof payment in the registry of the Authority.

5. Office is directed to follow up the matter with concerned Government authorities/offices for an early reply. Case is adjourned to 20.01.2025 awaiting report from DTCP Haryana, DC Sonipat and DTP Sonipat.”

2. Learned counsel submits that costs imposed by the Authority are excessive in nature as Director(s) of the appellant-company appeared through virtual mode. They also gave response to the queries raised by the Authority. She submits that the costs imposed by the Authority on the Director(s) may be set aside as the same are not justifiable.

3. On due consideration of the matter, this Bench feels that as there was direction for personal appearance of the Director(s), they should have abided the order and appear physically. However, without taking any permission from the Authority, they chose to appear through the virtual mode.

4. Under these circumstances, the order passed by the Authority is upheld. However, costs imposed by the Authority are reduced. In view of the peculiar circumstances of this case, the appellant shall be liable to pay only ₹50,000/- as costs.

5. Appeal is disposed of in the aforesaid terms. Impugned order is set aside.

6. Copy of this order be sent to the parties/their counsel and the Secretary, HRERA.

7. File be consigned to the records.

Justice Rajan Gupta
Chairman
Haryana Real Estate Appellate Tribunal

Dinesh Singh Chauhan
Member (Technical)
(through VC)

09.06.2026
rana