HARYANA REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY PANCHKULA

Website: www.haryanarera.gov.in

Complaint No.:	**1007 of 2025**
Date of Filing:	**07.07.2025**
First Date of Hearing:	**12.08.2025**
Date of Decision:	**16.10.2026**

Vikrant Kapoor
2, Kunjpura Road, Opposite Officers Colony,
District Karnal, Haryana - 132001. ....COMPLAINANTS(S)

VERSUS

M S Ultratech Township Developers Private Limited.
Hotel New World, 120 Miles Stone,
NH-1, G.T. Road, Karnal - 132001. ....RESPONDENT(S)

CORAM: **Sh. Chander Shekhar** **Member**

Hearing: 6th
Present: - Mr. Himanshu Jain, Counsel for the Complainant through VC.
Ms. Rameet Bakshi, Counsel for the Respondent through VC.

ORDER

Present complaint has been filed by the complainant under Section 31 of The Real Estate (Regulation & Development) Act, 2016 (for short Act of 2016) read with Rule 28 of The Haryana Real Estate (Regulation & Development) Rules, 2017 for violation or contravention of the provisions of

the Act of 2016 or the Rules and Regulations made thereunder, wherein it is inter-alia prescribed that the promoter shall be responsible to fulfil all the obligations, responsibilities and functions towards the allottee as per the terms agreed between them.

A. UNIT AND PROJECT RELATED DETAILS

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

S.No.	Particulars	Details
1.	Name of the project	The Royal Residency (New World Residency), Karnal
2.	Nature of the project.	Residential
3.	RERA Registered/Not Registered	Unregistered (As per Performa-B) Registered till 30.04.2026 (As per Reply)
4.	Details of the unit	Flat/Unit No. 904/T-2, 6 BHK.
5.	Date of Builder Buyer Agreement	Not mentioned in the complaint.
6.	Due Date of Possession	Not mentioned in the complaint.
7.	Basic Sale Consideration	₹1,34,30,001/- (As mentioned in pleadings)

8.	Amount paid by the Complainant(s)	₹14,00,000/- (As mentioned in pleadings)
9.	Offer of Possession	None

B. FACTS OF THE COMPLAINT AS MENTIONED IN THE COMPLAINT

3. Facts of the complaint are that the father of the complainant, who booked the unit in question, expired on 19.12.2021 due to mouth cancer. The copy of the death certificate is annexed as Annexure C-1 along with medical certificates at Annexure C-2. While searching for some documents, the complainant came across some receipts issued by the respondent, the copies of which are annexed at Annexure C-3 and Annexure C-4.

4. The said documents related to a "*6 BHK Penthouse (904) Kiskindha*" which was booked with the respondent by the deceased father of the complainant. Copies of the original demand notices pertaining to the said apartment are annexed as Annexure C-5 to C-10 along with brochure of the respondent's project annexed at Annexure C-11 and photographs at Annexure C-12.

5. The complainant made various enquiries with the respondent but the same were not entertained. The complainant came to know that the project

was not complete and only a few towers have been built. The complainant also met some of the occupants and came to know that the respondent has not been able to obtain the completion certificate and is also delaying the execution of the conveyance deed. The respondent obtained the license no. 46 of 2011 dated 23.05.2011 and a copy of the same along with renewals has been annexed as Annexure C-13 Colly and Annexure C-14.

6. RERA registration for the project was also provisionally granted on 26.09.2017, a copy of which is annexed at Annexure C-16. The said registration was valid till 31.07.2022, but no further renewal information is available. Vide order dated 22.05.2024 in suo-moto Complaint No. 1760 of 2022, a penalty of ₹5,00,000/- was imposed upon the respondent on for non compliance and a penalty of ₹5,000/- w.e.f 01.05.2023 was also imposed for not furnishing a Quarterly Progress Report (QPR). A copy of the order dated 22.05.2024 is annexed as Annexure C-17. Building plans and revised building plans for towers T1, T5, T6, T9 and T10 were also approved on 03.03.2020 and 23.12.2022 respectively, a copy of which has been annexed as Annexure C-19.

7. The respondent applied for the Occupation Certificate and certain clarifications were called for the same. A copy of the relevant documents is annexed at Annexure C-20 and C-21. The respondent is also a defaulter in VAT liability arising out of the said project. The relevant assessment orders and orders in appeal are annexed at Annexure C-22 to C-25.

8. The project is delayed and there is no communication from the respondent regarding the progress of the project. However, the respondent has been sending demand letters to the allottees and threatening them to cancel the allotment in an illegal and arbitrary manner. Despite a delay of more than 12 years, the project is nowhere near completion and no offer of possession has ever been made to the complainant. The respondent has acted in a malicious manner and has mis-represented and cheated the complainant qua the flat which was booked by the complainant's father.

9. Therefore, the complainant has approached this Authority seeking appropriate relief.

C. RELIEF SOUGHT

10. In view of the facts mentioned above, the complainant has prayed for the following relief(s):-

i. The respondent be directed to deliver possession of 6 BHK Penthouse (904) Kiskindha bearing Apartment No. 904 at 9th Floor in Tower T-2 which has been booked with respondent herein by the deceased father of the complainant.

ii. Respondent be directed to pay delayed compensation in the form of interest @ 18% for every month of delay, from the date it fell due to until the handing over of the actual physical possession of the 6 BHK

Penthouse (904) Kiskindha bearing Apartment No. 904 at 9th Floor in Tower T-2 to the complainant.

And in the alternative, in case, the project is not likely to be accomplished in near future, then the

iii. Respondent be directed to refund an amount of ₹14,00,000/- paid by the complainant towards 6BHK Penthouse (904) Kiskindha bearing Apartment No. 904 at 9th Floor in Tower T-2.

iv. Respondent be directed to pay the interest @MCLR+2% on ₹14,00,000/- from the date of respective payments till the date of refund/realisation of the same.

v. Appropriate punitive proceedings may kindly be initiated against the developer as envisaged under Section 61 and 69 of the RERA Act 2016.

vi. Any other or further relief this Hon'ble Authority deems fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the present case.

D. REPLY SUBMITTED ON BEHALF OF RESPONDENT

11. The respondent filed its reply on 02.01.2026, wherein it was stated that the present complaint is not maintainable and is liable to be dismissed on the ground that the complainant has no locus standi to institute the present

complaint. The complainant is a stranger to the respondent and there is no privity of contract between the parties. The complainant has concealed this material fact from this Hon'ble Authority and, therefore, the present complaint is liable to be dismissed. It was further stated that the complaint has been filed at a highly belated stage and is barred by limitation. The complaint is also liable to be dismissed on account of non-joinder of necessary parties.

12. In the year 2011, Mr. Vinod Kapoor and Mr. Ashok Kapoor invested in the project of the respondent, namely, "New World Residency", situated at Sector 32, adjoining Hotel Noor Mahal, Karnal. The first applicant, namely, Mr. Vinod Kapoor, paid an amount of ₹4,50,000/- vide cheque no. 393273 dated 30.12.2011, drawn in favour of "New World Residency". A photocopy of the said cheque is annexed as Annexure R-2.

13. The second applicant, namely, Mr. Ashok Kapoor, also paid an amount of ₹4,50,000/- vide cheque no. 396625 dated 30.12.2011, drawn in favour of "New World Residency". A photocopy of the said cheque is annexed as Annexure R-3.

14. Thereafter, a signed provisional application form, incorporating the details of the aforesaid payments, the details of the unit applied for by the applicants, the payment plan and the applicable terms and conditions, was submitted to the respondent. A copy of the said form is annexed as Annexure R-4. The said form specifically mentions the name of the first applicant as "Mr.

Vinod Kapoor, S/o Late Sh. Bishansroop Kapoor" and the name of the second applicant as "Mr. Ashok Kapoor, S/o Late Sh. Bishansroop Kapoor." The unit applied for was a 6 BHK Penthouse, Tower Kishkinda, having a sellable area of 4,551 sq. ft., at a Basic Sale Price of ₹2,951/- per sq. ft., along with other charges. The Basic Sale Price of the said Penthouse was ₹1,34,30,001/-, and the earnest money, calculated at 10% of the Basic Sale Price plus 10% of the parking lot charges, amounted to ₹14,01,353/-. The payment plan opted for by the applicants was Plan-2 (Construction Linked Plan).

15. The respondent issued receipt no. 1026 dated 09.01.2012 in respect of the two cheques received for a total amount of ₹9,00,000/-, in the names of "Mr. Ashok Kapoor/Mr. Vinod Kapoor". A copy of the said receipt is annexed as Annexure R-5. Thereafter, Mr. Ashok Kapoor, issued cheque No. 396627 dated 10.01.2012 for an amount of ₹5,00,000/- in favour of "New World Residency". A copy of the said cheque is annexed as Annexure R-6 along with a copy of the receipt at Annexure R-7.

16. Thereafter, the respondent issued a demand letter dated 27.07.2012 to the applicants calling upon them to remit the amount payable towards allotment money amounting to ₹19,95,000/-. A copy of the said letter is annexed as Annexure R-8 along with a reminder at Annexure R-9.

17. Despite the aforesaid demand and reminder, the applicants failed to make the requisite payment. Consequently, the respondent issued another

reminder letter dated 19.10.2012. A copy of the said reminder letter is annexed as Annexure R-10. Thereafter, multiple demand letters were issued which are annexed as Annexure R-11, Annexure R-12 and Annexure R-13. Finally, the respondent issued a final notice dated 08.04.2013, calling upon the applicants to remit the outstanding amount of ₹57,35,069/-. A copy of the said final notice is annexed as Annexure R-14.

18. Respondent issued a cancellation letter dated 23.04.2013 cancelling the allotment. A copy of the said cancellation letter is annexed as Annexure R-15. Vide the said cancellation letter, the respondent specifically communicated to the applicants that, in terms of the conditions of the application for allotment, the earnest money along with interest on delayed payment and other amounts non-refundable in nature were liable to be forfeited in the event of default. Accordingly, an amount of ₹14,00,000/- was forfeited.

19. It is evident that against the Basic Sale Price of the unit amounting to ₹1,34,30,001/-, the applicants paid only ₹14,00,000/-. It is further stated that the respondent has obtained the Occupation Certificate on 17.07.2018, a copy of which is annexed as Annexure R-16 and RERA licence has also been renewed till 30.04.2026, a copy of the extension order is annexed as annexure R-17.

20. Further, a total of ₹9,50,000/- was paid by Mr. Ashok Kapoor and ₹4,50,000/- was paid by Mr. Vinod Kapoor. The complainant has not disclosed the complete and correct facts before this Authority and has remained silent

about the second applicant, namely, Mr. Ashok Kapoor, despite the record clearly reflecting the same. The unit in question stood cancelled on 23.04.2013, whereas the present complaint has been instituted after a lapse of more than 12 years. Accordingly, the present complaint is liable to be dismissed on the ground of limitation as well as want of locus standi.

21. The present complaint is also liable to be dismissed on account of non-joinder of necessary parties in view of the fact that the transaction and the provisional application form specifically involve both Mr. Vinod Kapoor and Mr. Ashok Kapoor as applicants, and payments were made by both of them. In the absence of the necessary and proper parties, the complaint is not maintainable in its present form.

E. REJOINDER FILED BY THE COMPLAINANT

22. The complainant has filed the rejoinder on 06.07.2026, wherein it is stated that the complainant is well within the jurisdiction and limitation for filing the present complaint before this Authority and has the requisite locus standi to maintain the same. The complainant is not a stranger to the respondent but is the legal heir of Late Sh. Vinod Kapoor, whose death certificate is already on record. The legal heir certificate and Parivar Pehchan Patra of the complainant are annexed as Annexure A-1 and Annexure A-2 respectively. It is submitted that the objection raised by the respondent regarding the locus standi

of the complainant is misconceived and that the respondent is merely seeking to mislead this Authority.

23. Further, all the legal heirs of Late Sh. Vinod Kapoor, as well as Sh. Ashok Kapoor, have submitted their no-objection to the amount claimed in the prayer clause being paid to the present complainant. The affidavits in this regard are annexed as Annexure A-3. There is no dispute amongst the concerned legal heirs regarding the payment of the amount to the complainant.

24. The respondent has, without justification, forfeited and retained the amount deposited by the complainant and his father and has failed to return the same to the rightful heir. The respondent has thereby misled this Authority and is unnecessarily raising objections regarding limitation and locus standi despite the settled position of law, and the said objections are liable to be rejected.

F. WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS FILED BY THE RESPONDENT

25. The respondent has filed its written submissions on 25.09.2026 reiterating the contentions as raised in its reply. It has further been stated that the complainant has tried to cover up the objections raised by the respondent in its reply by filing various affidavits along with the rejoinder and has tried to make a new case which is not legally sustainable. The complainant has not annexed any legal heir certificate with the rejoinder and the complaint deserves to be dismissed.

G. ARGUMENTS OF LEARNED COUNSEL FOR COMPLAINANT AND RESPONDENTS

26. During the course of arguments, learned counsel for the complainant reiterated the arguments as were submitted in complaint and the rejoinder and has pressed upon refund of the amount paid by the complainant along with interest. Learned counsel for the respondent has raised primary objections with regard to the locus of the complainant, limitation and non-joinder of parties as also stated in its reply and written submissions.

H. ISSUES FOR ADJUDICATION

27. Whether the complainant is entitled for refund of the entire amount deposited by them under Section 18 of the Real Estate (Regulation And Development) Act, 2016, along with interest at the prescribed rate of interest as per Rule 15 of the Haryana Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Rules, 2017?

I. FINDINGS AND OBSERVATIONS OF THE AUTHORITY

28. The Authority has carefully considered the submissions made by both the parties. In light of the background of the matter as recorded in this order and the arguments advanced by the complainants, the Authority observes as follows:

i. It is an admitted fact that the flat in question was booked in the year 2011 by two applicants, namely, Mr. Vinod Kapoor and Mr. Ashok

Kapoor by paying an amount of ₹4,50,000/- each. Later on, Mr. Ashok Kapoor paid another amount of ₹5,00,000/-, the receipt for which was issued on 13.01.2012 in the name of both the applicants/allottees. Therefore, a total payment of ₹14,00,000/- stands paid to the respondent out of the Basic Sale Price of ₹1,34,30,001/-. As per record available, the complainant has alleged that the said flat was booked by his father, who expired in the year 2021 and the project was delayed by the respondent. Further, the latest receipt was issued on 13.01.2012 and no further payments were made by the complainant/allottees thereafter.

ii. The respondent has contended that multiple demands were issued to the applicants i.e Mr. Vinod Kapoor and Mr. Ashok Kapoor, but no payments were made by them, following which a cancellation letter was issued to the applicants on 23.04.2013 and ₹14,00,000/- already paid by the allottees was forfeited as earnest money. The receipt of the cancellation letter has been denied by the complainant in the rejoinder and no delivery report has been attached with the said cancellation letter by the respondent. The occupation certificate was also received by the respondent on 17.07.2018.

iii. It is pertinent to mention that in the present complaint, the complainant has prayed for possession along with delayed possession charges or refund with interest in the alternate. However, as both the reliefs could not be adjudicated together, the complainant opted for the

relief of refund along with interest, as clarified in the interim order dated 13.03.2026 passed in the present complaint.

iv. The respondent has raised various objections with regard to locus of the complainant to file the present complaint, limitation, non-joinder of parties and documents filed by the complainant being inadequate. The Authority is of the view that before delving into the merits of the present complaint, it would be appropriate to consider the aforesaid objections.

v. The respondent has stated that the present complaint has been filed at a belated stage and deserves dismissal being beyond the period of limitation. In this regard, the Authority is of the considered view that the law of limitation does not apply to complaints filed under the provisions of the RE(RD) Act. The RE(RD) Act is a special enactment and does not prescribe any specific period of limitation for filing a complaint before the Authority. In terms of Section 29(2) of the Limitation Act, 1963, the provisions of the Limitation Act apply only insofar as they are not expressly excluded by a special or local law. Therefore, in the absence of any prescribed limitation period under the RE(RD) Act, the Limitation Act has no direct applicability. For ready reference, Section 29 of the Limitation Act, 1963, is reproduced below:

> ***Section 29 - Limitation Act, 1963***
> *29. Savings– (1) Nothing in this Act shall affect section 25 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872 (9 of 1872).*

(2) Where any special or local law prescribes for any suit, appeal or application a period of limitation different from the period prescribed by the Schedule, the provisions of section 3 shall apply as if such period were the period prescribed by the Schedule and for the purpose of determining any period of limitation prescribed for any suit, appeal or application by any special or local law, the provisions contained in sections 4 to 24 (inclusive) shall apply only in so far as, and to the extent to which, they are not expressly excluded by such special or local law.

(3) Save as otherwise provided in any law for the time being in force with respect to marriage and divorce, nothing in this Act shall apply to any suit or other proceeding under any such law.

(4) Sections 25 and 26 and the definition of "easement" in section 2 shall not apply to cases arising in the territories to which the Indian Easements Act, 1882 (5 of 1882), may for the time being extend.

Even, Section 18(2) of RE(RD) Act, brings the complaint out of the purview of the Limitation Act, 1963.

Further, the Hon'ble Apex Court, in ***Consolidated Engg. Enterprises vs. Irrigation Department, (2008) 7 SCC 169,*** has held that the provisions of the Limitation Act, 1963, are not applicable to quasi-judicial authorities or tribunals unless specifically provided for in the statute governing such bodies. A similar view has been reiterated by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***M.P. Steel Corporation vs. Commissioner of Central Excise, (2015) 7 SCC 58,*** wherein it was observed that the Limitation Act

would not apply to proceedings before quasi-judicial forums created under special enactments.

Therefore, the Authority does not find merit in the said objection and the present complaint falls beyond the scope of limitation as per the settled law.

vi. Further, the respondent has raised the objection that the complainant i.e. Mr. Vikrant Kapoor, one of the legal heirs of Mr. Vinod Kapoor, has no locus to file the present complaint and he is a stranger to the respondent. It is stated that the flat was booked in the name of Mr. Ashok Kapoor and Mr. Vinod Kapoor. It has also been pointed out that the said fact was never mentioned in the complaint and the complainant has tried to conceal the same. Objection has also been raised with regard to non-joinder of Mr. Ashok Kapoor as a party to the present matter and non-filing of a legal heir certificate by the present complainant. It has also been contended that the complainant has only stated the above stated facts i.e about the allottees being his father i.e Mr. Vinod Kapoor and Mr. Ashok Kapoor, in the rejoinder and the complainant, cannot be allowed to make a new case by filing affidavits in the rejoinder when the complainant remained silent about these material facts in the main complaint. On the other hand, the complainant has stated that he has locus to file the said complaint as he is one of the legal heirs of Mr.

Vinod Kapoor and the affidavits of the other legal heirs along with the legal heir certificate have been filed along with the rejoinder. The complainant has further stated that Mr. Ashok Kapoor i.e the co-allottee has no objection if the amount is refunded to Mr. Vikrant Kapoor, who is the present complainant and an affidavit has also been filed in that regard along with the rejoinder.

vii. The Authority has considered the above said objections and has perused the documents available on record. It is an admitted fact that the flat was allotted in the name of Mr. Vinod Kapoor and Mr. Ashok Kapoor. However, the present complaint has been filed by Mr. Vikrant Kapoor, who is one of the legal heirs (son) of Mr. Vinod Kapoor. Section 31 of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016 provides for filing of a complaint by an *"aggrieved person"* against a promoter, allottee or real estate agent, as the case may be, for any violation or contravention of the provisions of the Act or the rules and regulations made thereunder. Therefore, a person approaching the Authority is required to establish his/her locus and his/her status as an aggrieved person in relation to the subject matter of the complaint.

viii. In the present case, the complainant has sought to establish his locus by stating himself to be one of the legal heirs of Mr. Vinod Kapoor, one of the original allottees and by relying upon the affidavits of the other

legal heirs and Mr. Ashok Kapoor filed with the rejoinder. It is observed that the affidavits filed with the rejoinder are undated and are not accompanied by the requisite identity documents or other foundational documents from which the Authority could conclusively ascertain the identity of the persons executing the affidavits and their relationship with the deceased allottee. The legal status of a person claiming through a deceased allottee cannot be satisfactorily ascertained merely on the basis of such affidavits and subsequent assertion made in pleadings when the same was not filed along with the complaint. A rejoinder is ordinarily intended to answer the case of the respondent and cannot ordinarily be used to introduce a new factual foundation or to set up locus to institute the proceedings.

ix. Further, the flat in question admittedly stands jointly in the names of Mr. Vinod Kapoor and Mr. Ashok Kapoor. The complainant has not impleaded Mr. Ashok Kapoor as a party to the present proceedings. An undated affidavit/no-objection certificate has been relied upon to contend that Mr. Ashok Kapoor has no objection to the refund being made in favour of Mr. Vikrant Kapoor. However, such subsequent consent cannot by itself cure the absence of the co-allottee from the proceedings. The rights of the co-allottee and the rights claimed through the deceased allottee are matters which ought to have been disclosed and appropriately

placed before the Authority at the stage of institution of the proceedings and Mr. Ashok Kapoor ought to have joined the proceedings himself. No concrete ground has been shown for non-joinder of Mr. Ashok Kapoor as a party. The independent rights of Mr. Ashok Kapoor as a co-allottee cannot be disregarded merely on the basis of a subsequent undated affidavit/no-objection and such rights cannot be treated as transferred in favour of the complainant by way of such affidavit.

x. It is also relevant to observe that the complainant's rights, if any, in his individual capacity arising out of the rights of Mr. Vinod Kapoor could have been considered by the Authority, provided that the complainant had properly placed on record the requisite documents and necessary material establishing his entitlement to pursue the rights of the deceased allottee. However, the same was not done by the present complainant and some documents in that regard were only placed on record along with rejoinder only after the respondent raised such an issue. Therefore, the Authority is unable to satisfactorily determine the complainant's entitlement/locus on the material presently available on record.

xi. The Authority is also conscious that in terms of Section 38(2) of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016, the Authority is empowered to regulate its own procedure while exercising its functions

under the Act. However, such procedural flexibility does not dispense with the fundamental requirements of fairness, due process and establishing the locus of a person seeking to invoke the jurisdiction of the Authority. The basic canons of law and equity require that a person must disclose the material facts and satisfactorily cure the deficiencies, if any. The flexibility of procedure contemplated under Section 38 is intended to facilitate effective adjudication and not to dilute the essential requirements of fair disclosure and natural justice.

xii. In view of the above, the Authority is of the considered view that although Mr. Vikrant Kapoor, along with the other legal heirs of late Mr. Vinod Kapoor, may have locus to institute proceedings in respect of the rights arising from the allotment made in favour of Mr. Vinod Kapoor. However, such a claim must be duly supported by proper documents establishing the identity, relationship and legal heirship of the persons concerned. In the present case, although certain affidavits/documents have been filed along with the rejoinder, the same are not supported by adequate identity documents and also appear to be undated. It is also pertinent to note that, after the filing of the respondent's reply, the objections were within the knowledge of the complainant. However, the documents subsequently filed along with the rejoinder do not satisfactorily cure the aforesaid defects. The present complainant, in such

circumstances does not satisfactorily fall within the ambit of an *"aggrieved person"* under Section 31 of the RE(RD) Act, 2016.

xiii. In these circumstances, and keeping in view the rights and interests of the other legal heirs of late Mr. Vinod Kapoor as well as the co-allottee i.e. Mr. Ashok Kapoor, the Authority does not find it appropriate to pass any substantive order in favour of the present complainant in the absence of adequate proof of his entitlement and in the absence of Mr. Ashok Kapoor as a party to the present proceedings. This course is necessary to ensure that no order is passed which may prejudice or adversely affect the rights of the other legal heirs or the co-allottee.

xiv. It is clarified that the aforesaid observations and the conclusion regarding the maintainability of the present complaint are confined strictly to the issue of locus and procedural maintainability of the complaint in its present form. This Authority has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the substantive claims raised by the complainant, nor shall the observations made herein be construed as an adjudication upon the rights or liabilities of either party in respect of the subject matter of the allotment. Accordingly, the present findings shall not prejudice either party in pursuing such remedies or proceedings as may otherwise be available to them in accordance with law.

29. Accordingly, the present complaint is ***dismissed being non-maintainable*** in its present form, with liberty to the complainant or other relevant parties to file a fresh complaint with complete and proper particulars in accordance with law. File be consigned to the record room after uploading of order on the website of the Authority.

CHANDER SHEKHAR
[MEMBER]

16.10.2026
Raghav Jain
(Law Associate)