HARYANA REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY PANCHKULA

Website: www.haryanarera.gov.in

COMPLAINT NO. 3087 of 2022

HRERA, Panchkula .... COMPLAINANT

VERSUS

Gold Souk Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd. ....RESPONDENT

CORAM:	**Nadim Akhtar**	**Member**
	Dr. Geeta Rathee Singh	**Member**
	Chander Shekhar	**Member**

Date of Hearing: 30.09.2026

Hearing: 10th

Present: Adv. Shubhnit Hans on behalf of 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) at the time of seeking registration nor applying for extension of registered project namely "Gold Souk Golf Link" on the land measuring 12.48 acres (Part of 32.056 acres) in Sector -17, Sohna, Mewat registered vide Registration No. HRERA-PKL-MEW-106-2019 dated 10.07.2019 valid upto 31.12.2020. After granting benefit of covid period the registration stands expired on 30.09.2021.

When this matter was last heard by the Authority on 16.01.2023, Authority had directed the promoter not to sell any unsold inventory or create any third party rights in the project till extension is granted.

2. On 10.04.2023, no one appeared on behalf of respondents nor any reply was filed. The Authority directed the promoter to show cause as to why registration be not revoked by the Authority U/s 7 of the RERA Act, 2016 and penalty proceedings U/s 60 and 61 read with Section 63 be not initiated against him for contravention of the provisions of the Act and not complying with the orders of the Authority.

3. On 31.01.2024, no one appeared on behalf of the respondent promoter nor any reply filed. Therefore, the Authority granted one last opportunity to the respondent to comply with the orders failing which it would be constrained to impose a penalty of ₹ 5 Lac U/s-60 ,61 read with Section-63 for contravention of the provisions of the Act and not complying with the orders of the Authority.

4. Vide reply dated 26.03.2024, the respondent informed that the Company had applied for the Completion Certificate with DTCP, Haryana, on 10.11.2020. A reminder dated 30.05.2022 had also been sent to DTCP for issuance of the Completion Certificate; however, the same had not been received till that date. The Company, as a precautionary measure, had applied for renewal of Licence No. 92 of 2017 dated 07.11.2017 on 28.10.2022, along with the requisite renewal fee. In view of the above, the promoter had considered the Completion Certificate as deemed to have been granted under Section 4(11)(3). Accordingly, the respondent had contended that there was no requirement to file an application for extension of the registration of the project.

5. On 15.05.2024, the Authority after examining the reply dated 26.03.2024 imposed penalty of ₹5 Lac U/s-60,61 read with Section-63 for contravention of the provsions of the RERD Act,2016 and not complying with the orders of the Authority. The Authority directed the promoter to deposit the said amount in the registry of the Authority before the next date of hearing and apply for extension of the registration of the project.

6. On 06.11.2024, the Authority observed that the orders dated 15.05.2024 had been sent through email, which was delivered on 12.09.2024, and through registered post, which was returned with the remarks "Addressee left without instructions". Despite service through email, the respondents had neither filed the application for extension of registration nor deposited the penalty of ₹5 lakh as directed by the Authority. Taking note of the same, the Authority decided to grant one last opportunity to the respondents to comply with the aforesaid orders and deposit the penalty of ₹5 lakh, failing which additional costs of ₹2 lakh would be imposed.

7. On 08.01.2025, Adv. Shubhnit Hans, appearing on behalf of the respondents, informed the Authority that he was unable to assist the Authority due to lack of instructions from his client and, therefore, requested another opportunity. The Authority, while confirming the penalty of ₹2 lakh, directed the respondents to deposit the total penalty of ₹7 lakh in the Registry of the Authority before the next date of hearing and also to file an application for extension of registration.

8. On 06.05.2026, no one appeared on behalf of the promoter, and no reply had been filed. Since the matter was not listed for hearing on 14.05.2025 and, therefore, could not be taken up, the Authority again directed the promoter to show cause as to why the registration granted should not be revoked under Section 7 of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016, for failure to complete the project within the timeline declared under Section 4(2)(l)(C) of the Act and for continued non-compliance with the directions of the Authority issued under Section 37 of the Act, thereby attracting the provisions of Section 63 of the Act. The Authority also directed the office to issue a show cause notice in this regard. The respondent was directed to file a reply to the aforesaid observations or an application for extension of registration and to deposit the penalties before the next date of hearing.

9. On the last date of hearing i.e.,22.07.2026, Adv. Diya for Adv. Shubhnit Hans appeared on behalf of the promoter and submitted that they have filed the reply on 21.07.2026. The Authority after consideration directed the office to examine the reply and place it before the Authority on the next date of hearing.

10. Today, Adv. Shubhnit Hans appeared on behalf of the promoter and submitted that the respondent has submitted reply to the show cause notice on 21.07.2026 and has made an application seeking waiver and / or reduction of penalty and cost imposed in the present proceedings. However after perusal of the record it is found that no reply has been filed by the promoter . The Authority is of the view that adequate opportunities have already been granted to make compliances, therefore, the Authority decides to revoke the said registration granted to the respondent. The registration granted to the respondent be transferred to the list of defaulter/cancelled projects. Further, since adequate opportunities have already been granted to the respondent to deposit the penalty, 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 earlier imposed penalty of ₹5 Lac and cost of ₹2 Lac on the respondent for non-appearance of the Director. These orders be complied with by the respondent promoter within a period of 90 days of

uploading of this order, failing which legal consequences shall follow. Since the registration in this case has been revoked therefore, the promoter shall not advertise, market, book, sell or offer for sale, or invite persons to purchase in any manner any plot, apartment or building, as the case may be.

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

11. Disposed Off.

.....

Dr. Geeta Rathee Singh
Member

.....

Nadim Akhtar
Member