HARYANA REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY PANCHKULA

Website: www.haryanarera.gov.in

COMPLAINT NO. 3091 OF 2022

HRERA, Panchkula .... COMPLAINANT

VERSUS

Haryana Shehri Vikas Pradhikaran, Hisar ....RESPONDENT

CORAM:

Nadim Akhtar **Member**

Dr. Geeta Rathee Singh **Member**

Chander Shekhar **Member**

Date of Hearing: 16.09.2026

Hearing: 14th

Present: Adv. Tarun Ranga on behalf of the Promoter.

ORDER (Nadim Akhtar - Member)

Present Suo-motu complaint was registered against the respondent promoter for neither completing the project within the timelines declared u/s 4(2)(1)(c) of HRERA Act,2016 nor applying for extension of registered Project of residential plotted colony measuring 31.65 acres being developed by HSVP situated in Sector 24, Raipur Road, Hisar registered vide Registration No. HRERA-PKL-HSR-125-2019 dated 25.06.2019 valid upto 31.12.2020. However, after granting benefit of COVID period, expiry of registration of project extended upon 31.09.2021.

2. When the matter was heard on 23.01.2023, respondent promoter was directed not to sell any unsold inventory or create any third party rights in the project till extension is granted.

3. On 06.03.2023, the Authority had directed that a D.O. letter be sent to the Chief Administrator, HSVP to look into the matter and direct the concerned officer to file reply.

4. On 18.12.2023, no one appeared on behalf of the respondent and nor any reply was filed. The Authority directed to show cause Respondent HSVP as to why penalty U/s 60, 61 read with Section 63 be not imposed for contravention of the provisions of the Act and not complying with the orders of the Authority.

5. The matter was heard on 21.02.2024, when a last opportunity was granted to the respondent to comply with the earlier directions. However orders of the Authority were not complied. Thereafter on 10.04.2024,Adv. Tarun Ranga appeared on behalf of respondent and due to continuous non compliance of its orders , the Authority was constrained to impose a penalty of ₹5,00,000/- under Sections 60, 61 read with Section 63 of the HRERA Act, 2016, directing respondent to its deposit the same before the next date of hearing.

6. On 10.04.2024, learned counsel Sh. Tarun Ranga appeared on behalf of the respondent and sought time to file a reply, submitting that the Authority's order dated 21.02.2024 had been uploaded on 09.04.2024. Acceding to the request, the Authority granted time to the respondent to file the reply. The Authority reiterated its direction that the concerned Estate Officer (E.O.) shall remain personally present on the next date of hearing. The Authority also imposed a penalty of ₹5,00,000/- under Sections 60 and 61 read with Section 63 of the RERA Act, 2016, with directions to deposit the same in the Authority's registry before the next date of hearing.

7. On 05.06.2024, learned counsel Sh. Tarun Ranga appeared on behalf of the respondent and informed the Authority that the application for extension of the project's registration would be submitted on the same day. The Authority granted a final opportunity to the respondent to deposit the penalty of ₹5,00,000/- imposed vide order dated 10.04.2024.

8. On 28.08.2024, learned counsel Sh. Tarun Ranga appeared on behalf of the respondent and informed the Authority that a request dated 14.08.2024 seeking the grant of moratorium in all suo motu complaints and project-related cases of HSVP had been submitted before the Authority. Learned counsel requested that the matter be adjourned until the Hon'ble Authority decided the request for grant of moratorium. Acceding to the request, the Authority adjourned the matter accordingly.

9. On 03.12.2025, Adv. Tarun Ranga appeared on behalf of HSVP and submitted that they have filed a Special Leave Petition (SIP) before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India vide Diary No. 63782/2025 against the order passed in CWP No. 4760 of 2020 titled Anil Kumar Yadav V/s State of Punjab by the IHon'ble High Court of Punjab and Haryana seeking authoritative clarification on the applicability of RERA Act, 2016 to statutory authorities, including the question of whether statutory development authorities fall within the definition of "Promoter" under Section 2(zk) of the Act. Since the issue is sub-judice and clarification from the Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs is awaited, it is prayed that no adverse or coercive action be taken against HSVP until the Supreme Court decides the matter and also requested that the moratorium carlier granted may be extended. A copy of request for extension of Moratorium in matters pertaining to Suo Motu Complaints and Project-related proceedings concerning HSVP sector on the ground of filing of SLP before the Hon ble Supreme court issued by HSVP dated 3/12/25 has also been submitted during the course of hearing by the counsel.

10. On 29.07.2026, neither anyone appeared on behalf of the promoter nor was any reply filed on behalf of the promoter. Further, no correspondence has been received from HSVP after 03.12.2025.

The office, upon checking the status of the case matter on the online portal of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, found that the Special Leave Petition (Civil) bearing Diary No. 63782/2025, filed by the promoter against the order passed in CWP No. 4760 of 2020, titled Anil Kumar Yadav Vs. State of Punjab, stands dismissed vide order dated 09.02.2026.

In view of the dismissal of the aforesaid SLP by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, the Authority directed the promoter to deposit the penalty of 5,00,000/- imposed vide order dated 10.04.2024, in compliance thereof.

The promoter was directed to deposit the aforesaid penalty before the next date of hearing.

6. Today, upon examination of the official record, it is observed that the respondent has failed to comply with the preceding orders of the Authority even after grant of adequate opportunities. Hence the Authority in exercise of its mandate under Section 37 read with Section 34(f) of the RERD Act, 2016 hereby directs the respondent to deposit the penalty amount of ₹ 5,00,000/- within a period of 90 days of uploading of this order, failing which legal consequences follow. As the registration of the project has lapsed, the Authority imposed a complete ban on advertisement, sale, and creation of any third-party rights in the project.

   The office is directed to inform the Concerned Deputy Commissioner of the ban on sale imposed by the Authority with the directions not to allow sale / purchase and registry of plots in the project/colony.

16. Disposed Of.

Chander Shekhar	Dr. Geeta Rathee Singh	Nadim Akhtar
Member	Member	Member