

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

Date of filing : 26.09.2025

Date of Order: 08.09.2026

Ajai Jain

R/o: - Abinandan Farmhouse, New Palam Vihar,
Gurgaon-122001.

Complainant

Versus

Lotus Realtech Private Limited

Office at: 501, Block C, Nirvana Courtyard,
Nirvana Country, Sector-50, Gurugram

Respondent

CORAM:

Shri Arun Kumar

Chairman

APPEARANCE:

Shri Ajai Jain (In Person)

Ms. Shriya Thakkar

Complainant

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 provision of the Act or the Rules and regulations made there under or to the allottee 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, delay period, if any, have been detailed in the following tabular form:

S.N.	Particulars	Details
1.	Name of the project	"Lotus Homes", Sector- 111, Gurgaon
2.	Nature of project	Affordable Group Housing
3.	RERA registered/not registered	Registered vide registration no. 214 of 2017 dated 18.09.2017
4.	Validity status	30.06.2020
5.	Licensed area	5.09375 acres
6.	DTPC License no.	47 of 2014 dated 18.06.2014
7.	Validity status	31.05.2021
8.		
9.	Licensed area	5.09 acres
10.	Booking Dated	24.06.2019 [Page 27 of complaint]
11.	Allotment letter	N/A
12.	Unit no.	N/A
13.	Unit area admeasuring	N/A
14.	Date of execution of buyer's agreement	N/A
15.	Possession clause	N/A
16.	Possession clause as per Affordable Housing Policy, 2013	1 (iv) <i>All such projects shall be required to be necessarily completed within 4 years from the date of approval of building plans or grant of environmental clearance, whichever is later. This date shall be referred to as the "date of commencement of project" for the purpose of the policy.</i>
17.	Building plan approved on	22.10.2014 [Page 95 of complaint]
18.	Environment clearance	01.07.2016 [Page 101 of complaint]
19.	Due date of possession	01.07.2020

		[calculated as 4 years from date of environmental clearance i.e., 01.07.2016 as the same is later]
20.	Total sale consideration	N/A
21.	Amount paid by the complainant	N/A
22.	Occupation certificate	01.06.2021 (As per HARERA official website)
23.	Offer of possession	N/A

B. Facts of the complaint

3. The complainant has made the following submissions in the complaint:

- i. The present complaint is being filed by the complainant, who is an aggrieved person within the meaning of the Act, as his residential house has been fraudulently shown as “demolished” by the promoter in order to procure licence and subsequent approvals for the project “Lotus Homz, Sector 111, Gurugram”.
- ii. The complainant has been continuously residing in this house (“Abhinandan Farmhouse”), and his possession has been upheld and protected by multiple judicial orders.
- iii. Respondent applied to the Department of Town & Country Planning for grant of License. The Director General Town & Country Planning, Government of Haryana, Chandigarh vide his letter Memo No.LC-2997-Je(VA)2013/55673 dated 29.10.2013 addressed to Ashok Kumar Jain son of P.C. Jain, Smt. Jaishree Jain wife of Ashok Kumar Jain, c/o Lotus Realtech Pvt. Ltd., 501, Block C, Nirvana Courtyard, Nirvana Country, Sector 50, Gurgaon intimated that their request has been accepted and it is proposed to grant license to them. The Director General, Town & Country Planning, Government of Haryana called upon Lotus Realtech

Pvt. Ltd./owners to fulfill certain requirements/pre-requisites as laid down in Rule 11 of the Haryana Development and Regulation of Urban Area Rules 1976 within a period of 60 days from the date of issuance of this notice failing which the grant of license shall be refused.

- iv. The LOI dated 29.10.2013 was issued purposing to issue License with rider that the existing construction – “Abhinandan Farm House” (the only existing construction) on LOI land be demolished. The respondents in connivance with the Director, Town & Country Planning, Gurugram got issued a forged document dated 16.6.2014 to the effect that whole of the construction on LOI land has been demolished.
- v. The promoter Lotus Realtech Pvt Ltd and collaborator Ashok Kumar Jain submitted a false affidavit dated 16.06.2014 stating that all existing construction on the land had been demolished.
- vi. This claim is demonstrably false, as the said structure — the Abhinandan Farmhouse — continues to stand and remains occupied by the complainant and his family. This fact has been acknowledged and protected through multiple judicial pronouncements:
 - *Civil Judge (Senior Division), Gurugram, vide order dated 17.02.2018, granted status quo regarding possession and construction of the said farmhouse.*
 - *Hon’ble High Court of Punjab & Haryana, vide order dated 09.11.2020, stayed an adverse order passed by the ADJ Gurugram against the complainant and implicitly upheld the complainant’s possession.*
 - *Furthermore, in CWP No. 19682 of 2020, the Hon’ble High Court, vide order dated 19.11.2020, explicitly permitted reconstruction of a demolished portion, holding that no justification was offered*

for the demolition despite court protection (high court stay dated 9th November 2020) on an attempt to demolish the complainant's house on 9th November 2020 and that authorities were restrained and directed to protect the complainant and his property.

- That the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court in CWP No. 31534 of 2019 challenging a eviction order. Vide order dated 23.04.2022, after taking into consideration the facts surrounding the ownership and possession of the property, stayed the operation of the impugned eviction order and directed that status quo be maintained regarding the possession of the property.*
- Furthermore, the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court in CR No. 2487 of 2020, vide its final order dated 23.04.2022 has expressly held that the complainant is in lawful possession of the subject premises and granted protection against dispossession, thereby reinforcing the complainant's continuous and legitimate occupation of the property in dispute.*

- vii. These judicial observations conclusively rebut the respondents' false representation of demolition and establish the fraudulent nature of the demolition certification dated 16.06.2014. Consequently, all licences, permissions, and environmental clearances obtained based on said forged certification are liable to be declared void ab initio.
- viii. Based on this forged affidavit, Licence No. 47 of 2014 was issued on 18.06.2014. Subsequently authorities approved the building plans of the said project vide Memo No. 24739 dated 22.10.2014 and granted permission for the construction of the same with respect to the

provisions of the Punjab Schedule Roads and Controlled Areas Restriction of Unregulated Development Act, 1963.

- ix. On the basis of forged document, the State Environment Impact Assessment Authority, in its meeting held on 15.6.2016 also agreed to accord necessary environmental clearance for the said project under category 8(a) of the E.I.A. Notification 2006 subject to strict compliance with the specified conditions which was received by the applicant via letter No.545 dated 1.7.2016.
- x. Based on forged document, the said project was also granted a registration certificate (Regn. No.214 of 2017) by the Haryana Real Estate Regulatory Authority, on 18.9.2017.
- xi. The complainant came to know that Occupation Certificate (hereinafter referred to as "OC") dated 01.06.2021, was fraudulently obtained by deliberate misrepresentation of facts and suppression of material non-compliances with mandatory statutory requirements. The respondents failed to disclose critical deviations from the sanctioned plan, which render the project ineligible for grant of OC under Clause 4.14 and Clause 5.13 of the Haryana Building Code, 2017.
- xii. At the time of OC issuance to till date, multiple essential components of the project remain either incomplete or entirely missing, including:
 - *Non-construction of boundary walls on the South, South-East, and East periphery, in violation of Rule 11 of the Haryana Development and Regulation of Urban Areas Rules, 1976, which mandates enclosure of licensed colonies.*
 - *Absence of a designated Sewage Treatment Plant (STP), as required under Clause 4.14(ii) of the Haryana Building Code, 2017, which makes STP installation mandatory for group housing colonies.*

- *Undeveloped green areas (specifically, G8, G9, and G10 as shown in the sanctioned layout plan), contravening Clause 3(iv) of the Affordable Housing Policy, 2013, which mandates minimum open green spaces for such colonies.*
 - *Non-construction of the commercial block and main entrance gate, violating Clause 3.2.2(c) of the Haryana Building Code, 2017, which requires all infrastructure and community facilities to be completed prior to grant of final OC.*
- xiii. The above omissions constitute a direct breach of the terms and conditions of Licence No. 47 of 2014, and render the OC dated 01.06.2021 void ab initio. A detailed tabulation of these statutory violations, along with references to plans, photographs, and site documentation, and forms an integral part of this complaint. That till date these defects remain intact.
- xiv. The complainant filed appeal No.21 of 2021 before the Ld. Additional Chief Secretary, Government of Haryana, Department of Town and Country Planning against the Occupation Certificate granted. This appeal was allowed vide order dated 19.5.2022 whereby the Occupation Certificate dated 1.6.2021 was set aside and the Director of Town & Country Planning was directed to decide the matter of Occupation Certificate afresh after providing effective opportunity of personal hearing to all the affected parties including the complainant, which stands pending till date as confirmed by RTI order dated 8th May 2024 thus rendering the OC set aside till date.
- xv. Even after setting aside of the occupation certificate, the respondents are continuing with the execution of the sale deeds which amounts to fraud being played by the respondents. The sale deeds which can

enquired into by the authorities. They have also misled the hon'ble department of HRERA by referring to the quashed OC.

- xvi. The perusal of the above said sale deeds would reveal that the respondents are referring to the occupation certificate dated 1.6.2021 which already stands quashed. This fact is in the knowledge of the respondents as they have appeared in different litigations after the passing of the order dated 19.5.2022 wherein this fact has been disclosed by the complainant.
- xvii. A separate proceeding for cancellation of Licence No. 47 of 2014 is pending before the Director, TCP, Haryana. The grounds are that despite the OC being set aside, the builder has continued to execute sale deeds and mislead buyers. This demonstrates wilful defiance of statutory orders and strengthens the present complaint before HRERA for *revocation of project registration* and penal action under RERA. The last date of hearing was 6th June 2025, wherein the Director heard my plea and instructed for an onsite report. Proceedings pending before Director, TCP demonstrate parallel statutory concern, strengthening the prayer under Section 7 RERA for cancellation of registration.
- xviii. The promoter has adopted a consistent strategy of misleading statutory authorities by diverting the dispute towards HSVP, while concealing the admitted fact that my house is not acquired from any corner — as already clarified by the Tehsildar, Deputy Commissioner, and State of Haryana in their written statements before the Hon'ble High Court of Punjab & Haryana.
- xix. Even before HRERA in its 19.07.2022 proceedings, the builder projected that the OC could not be granted due to "dispute with HSVP" over acquired land. However, in multiple judicial proceedings, including

Reply dated 05.03.2024 before Sh. Mahavir Singh, Additional District Judge, Gurugram in Case No. ARB/28/2024 (Annexure D18), the builder has itself admitted that it has not been able to complete the project, construct the main gate, and boundary wall due to Ajai Jain's occupation of the farmhouse land. This contradictory stance exposes that the builder is deliberately misleading HRERA, a statutory regulatory body, by suppressing the truth of my lawful possession and instead diverting the issue as a tussle with HSVP. Such conduct amounts to fraudulent suppression of facts and is a fit case for strict action under Sections 60-72 of the RERA Act, 2016. This constitutes perjury-like conduct and violates the principle laid down in K.D. Sharma vs SAIL (2008) 12 SCC 481 where suppression of material facts disentitles the promoter to any relief.

- xx. The promotor has failed to disclose Civil Suits for declaration & cancellation along with injunction of entire project land) is pending before Civil Court, Gurugram; issues are framed and the matter is at evidence stage. This litigation has never been disclosed in HRERA records or to the 812 allottees, violating Section 4(2)(I)(B) of RERA.
- xxi. In HRERA proceedings dated 19.07.2022 the promoter through its authorised representative misled the Authority by submitting that *"only the front entry gate and part of the front boundary wall could not be completed due to dispute with HSVP"*. This submission is false and contradicted by site conditions and statutory records. As on date:
- South, South-East and East boundary walls remain incomplete.
 - No main entrance gate has been constructed.
 - The commercial block is incomplete, with only RCC structure raised and no finishing or functional readiness.

- xxii. The promoter thus attempted to trivialise major structural and statutory deficiencies as a minor gate issue, which is a clear case of misrepresentation before a statutory body.
- xxiii. In the same HRERA proceedings, the promoter claimed that an SLP was pending before the Hon'ble Supreme Court to justify non-completion. This is factually false. The said SLP (C) No. 13582/2022 was dismissed on 08.08.2022 (Annexure D20) by the Hon'ble Supreme Court. Thus, there is no sub judice protection available to the promoter. Suppression of the SLP dismissal amounts to a fraudulent statement under Sections 60-72 of RERA.
- xxiv. The promoter M/s Lotus Realtech Pvt. Ltd. is also in serious litigation with its own collaborators (Ashok Kumar Jain & Jaishree Jain). Arbitration proceedings have been invoked under Section 11 of the Arbitration & Conciliation Act, 1996, and an application under Section 9 for interim measures has already been partly allowed by the Ld. Additional District Judge, Commercial Court, Gurugram in *ARB-28/2024* (Ashok Kumar Jain & Anr. v. M/s Lotus Realtech Pvt. Ltd.) vide judgment dated 12.09.2024. In the said proceedings, the Court recorded allegations that the promoter has:
- Failed to deposit receipts from 812 allottees into the escrow account, despite mandatory requirement under the collaboration agreement.
 - Misappropriated over ₹73.83 crores along with additional amounts of ~₹16 crores (interest, penalty, parking, other charges) by depositing them into its own accounts instead of the Escrow.
 - Retained ₹5.76 crores admittedly payable to collaborators.

- Forced collaborators to even approach the Economic Offences Wing (EOW), Gurugram with a criminal complaint under Sections 403, 405, 406, 415, 418 & 420 IPC for cheating, breach of trust, and misappropriation.

- xxv. Apart from defrauding buyers and misrepresenting facts to HRERA, the promoter stands accused of embezzlement and diversion of buyer funds by its own collaborators. This fact goes to the very root of financial integrity under the RERA framework, where escrow management and transparent use of buyer monies are non-negotiable. These pending arbitration and criminal proceedings further establish the promoter's pattern of fraud, suppression, and misappropriation, making it wholly unfit to continue as a registered promoter under RERA.
- xxvi. The promoter, through its authorised representative, has submitted a false affidavit before HRERA claiming compliance and completion of mandatory requirements, including demolition of existing structures and lawful possession of land. This affidavit is demonstrably false considering multiple High Court orders protecting the complainant's possession of *Abhinandan Farmhouse*. Submitting such a false affidavit before the regulatory authority amounts to perjury-like conduct and squarely attracts penal consequences under Sections 60-72 of the RERA Act, 2016. That the promoter has falsely declared before HRERA and the licensing authorities that the project land is free from all encumbrances, litigations, and adverse claims. This declaration is patently untrue.
- xxvii. The official GIS/topographical image available on the DTCP website clearly demarcates the licensed area of Licence No. 47 of 2014 and

visibly includes the complainant's house (*Abhinandan Farmhouse*) within the colony boundary. Despite (i) the complainant's continuous residence, (ii) repeated High Court stay orders, and (iii) judicial recognition of his lawful possession, the DTCP has proceeded to grant and sustain the licence. This demonstrates gross suppression and collusion, as the Department itself had contemporaneous records showing the standing construction within the licensed project area.

C. Relief sought by the complainant:

4. The complainant has sought following relief(s):

- i. Take sue motu cognizance under Section 35 of RERA, 2016 of the fraudulent and misleading acts of the promoter.
- ii. Revoke or suspend the project registration of Lotus Homes, Sector 111, Gurugram (Regn. No. 214/2017) under Section 7 RERA, as the same was obtained by fraud and suppression.
- iii. Impose strict penalties under Sections 60-72 of RERA, 2016 upon the promoter and its directors for false affidavits, misrepresentations, suppression of material facts, and diversion of funds.
- iv. Order mandatory public disclosure on HRERA's official portal that: The OC dated 01.06.2021 stands set aside by the Additional Chief Secretary, Haryana; SLP (C) No. 13582/2022 has been dismissed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court; A civil suit for declaration of entire project land is sub judice at evidence stage; Major defects (boundary walls, gate, commercial block, STP, green areas remain unrectified on site; green areas remain unrectified on site.
- v. Direct an immediate on-site inspection by HRERA engineers to verify persisting statutory non-compliances.

5. The Authority issued a notice dated 03.11.2025 and 10.02.2026 to the respondent by speed post and on the given email address at info@lotusrealtech.com, lotusrealtech@gmail.com, lotusrecords@gmail.com for filing of reply and putting up appearance on the date fixed for hearing. The delivery reports have been placed in the file. The counsel for the respondent has placed on record memo of appearance on 17.09.2025. Despite given ample opportunities vide hearings dated 16.10.2025, 13.11.2025 and 09.12.2025 the counsel for the respondent neither put in appearance nor did not file any reply to the complaint within the stipulated period. Accordingly, the Authority is left with no other option but to struck off the defence of the respondent and decide the complaint based on documents and pleadings filed by the complainant which are not disputed.

6. Copies of all the relevant documents have been filed and placed on record. Their authenticity is not in dispute. Hence, the complaint can be decided based on these undisputed documents and submissions made by the complainant.

D. Jurisdiction of the Authority

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

D.1 Territorial jurisdiction

8. As per notification no. 1/92/2017-1TCP dated 14.12.2017 issued by The Town and Country Planning Department, Haryana 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.

D.II Subject matter jurisdiction

9. 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)

.....

(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;

(Emphasis Supplied)

10. 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.

E. Findings on the relief sought by the complainant

- E.I** Take sue motu cognizance under Section 35 of RERA, 2016 of the fraudulent and misleading acts of the promoter.
- E.II** Revoke or suspend the project registration of Lotus Homes, Sector 111, Gurugram (Regn. No. 214/2017) under Section 7 RERA, as the same was obtained by fraud and suppression.

E.III Impose strict penalties under Sections 60-72 of RERA, 2016 upon the promoter and its directors for false affidavits, misrepresentations, suppression of material facts, and diversion of funds.

E.IV Order mandatory public disclosure on HRERA's official portal that: The OC dated 01.06.2021 stands set aside by the Additional Chief Secretary, Haryana; SLP (C) No. 13582/2022 has been dismissed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court; A civil suit for declaration of entire project land is sub judice at evidence stage; Major defects (boundary walls, gate, commercial block, STP, green areas remain unrectified on site; green areas remain unrectified on site.

E.V Direct an immediate on-site inspection by HRERA engineers to verify persisting statutory non-compliances.

13. The aforesaid reliefs are being taken up and adjudicated conjointly, in as much as the same are interlinked and arise out of a common set of facts and cause of action.
14. The Authority has carefully considered the complaint, the documents placed on record and the proceedings conducted in the matter.
15. The complaint in the present matter is substantially founded upon allegations concerning the alleged continued existence and possession of the complainant's farmhouse, the alleged demolition certification, validity of the development licence, approvals granted by the Directorate of Town and Country Planning, environmental clearance, occupation certificate, execution of sale deeds, pending civil litigation concerning the project land and other proceedings before competent statutory authorities and courts.
16. The complainant seeks to establish, in substance, that the project itself was proceeded with based on allegedly incorrect representations concerning

the status of his property and that the statutory approvals granted in favour of the project are consequently liable to be questioned. These issues cannot be examined in isolation from the proceedings and orders passed by the competent authorities and courts having jurisdiction over the same.

17. A substantial part of the grievance raised by the complainant concerns the status of "Abhinandan Farmhouse", including its alleged demolition, the complainant's possession thereof and the legality of the construction existing upon the property. The determination of such questions necessarily involves examination of title, possession, nature and status of the property, validity of documents relating to demolition, and the effect of orders passed by the competent civil and constitutional courts.
18. Such questions are not matters which can be conclusively determined by this Authority in the present proceedings under the Act. The Authority cannot, in exercise of its jurisdiction under the RERA Act, assume the jurisdiction of the competent civil court or the statutory authorities vested with power to grant, cancel or otherwise adjudicate upon the validity of development licences, environmental clearances or other statutory approvals.
19. The complainant has also questioned the validity of Licence No. 47 of 2014 dated 18.06.2014 and has alleged that the same was obtained based on incorrect or false representations regarding demolition of the existing construction. However, the power to grant, modify, suspend or cancel the development licence lies with the competent authority under the applicable town and country planning regime. The complaint itself records

that proceedings concerning the said licence were pending before the competent authority.

20. Therefore, this Authority cannot, in the present proceedings, undertake an adjudication into the validity of the licence itself or substitute its determination for that of the statutory authority competent to deal with the said licence. The complainant has further questioned the occupation certificate stated to have been issued on 01.06.2021 and has placed on record the subsequent proceedings whereby the said occupation certificate was challenged and, according to the complainant, set aside by the appellate authority with the matter being remanded for fresh consideration.
21. Once the validity/status of the occupation certificate itself is the subject matter of proceedings before the competent authority, and the matter has been remanded for fresh consideration, this Authority cannot conclusively determine the legality or otherwise of the occupation certificate in the present complaint.
22. The alleged deficiencies at site, including boundary walls, STP, green areas, commercial block and entrance gate, may have implications under the applicable building and planning regulations. However, the determination of compliance with those statutory requirements, particularly where the same is already under consideration before the competent planning authority, has to be made by the authority vested with such jurisdiction.
23. The record placed before the Authority itself demonstrates that various issues forming the foundation of the present complaint are already the

subject matter of proceedings before different courts and statutory authorities. The complainant has referred to civil proceedings relating to the property/project land, proceedings concerning the occupation certificate, proceedings relating to the development licence and other litigation arising from the development of the project.

24. The Authority cannot render findings which may have the effect of deciding, directly or indirectly, issues pending adjudication before such competent forums. The remedy under the RERA Act is intended to address violations falling within the statutory scheme of the Act and cannot be converted into a forum for determination of disputes which principally relate to title, possession, validity of development permissions or other matters falling within the jurisdiction of specialised statutory authorities or competent courts.
25. In the present case, the foundational issues raised by the complainant are not confined to a violation of any obligation owed to an allottee under the Act. Rather, the principal controversy relates to the complainant's own property and possession, the alleged demolition thereof, the validity of the development licence and other statutory approvals, the legality/status of the occupation certificate and proceedings pending before other competent forums.
26. Having regard to the nature of the grievances raised, the documents relied upon by the complainant, the pendency of proceedings before competent courts and authorities and the statutory limits of the jurisdiction of this Authority, it is held that the present complaint substantially raises

questions relating to title, ownership and possession of the complainant's property, validity of the development licence and statutory approvals, status of the occupation certificate and other matters pending before the competent forums.

27. The present complaint, in its present form, does not appear to be maintainable before the Authority, as the principal disputes raised by the complainant are pending adjudication before the respective competent forums and cannot be conclusively determined in proceedings under RERA. The complaint does not relate to the usual allottee-promoter dispute concerning possession, refund or delayed possession charges; rather, it seeks regulatory and punitive action based on disputed questions of title, validity of statutory permissions and alleged acts of fraud.
28. The project is stated to have obtained occupation certificate on 01.06.2021, though the complainant has challenged the same and has placed on record the subsequent appellate proceedings. The status of the said proceedings is a matter for determination by the competent authority. Consequently, the Authority is of the considered view that the present complaint, in its existing form and on the issues raised therein, cannot be adjudicated upon by this Authority as a complaint under Section 31 of the Act.
29. Nothing contained in this order shall be construed as an adjudication upon the title, ownership, possession, validity of the development licence, environmental clearance, occupation certificate or any other issue pending before the competent court or statutory authority.

30. The reliefs sought by the complainant for initiation of proceedings under Section 35, revocation/suspension of project registration, imposition of penalties, disclosure of the alleged status of statutory approvals and site inspection cannot be granted.


(Arun Kumar)**Chairman**

Haryana Real Estate Regulatory Authority, Gurugram

Dated: 08.09.2026

**HARERA**
GURUGRAM