BEFORE THE HARYANA REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY, GURUGRAM

Complaint no.	**:**	**5197 of 2025**
Date of complaint	**:**	**06.10.2025**
Date of decision	**:**	**11.08.2026**

M/s Sybex Support Services Pvt. Ltd. (Through its Authorised Representative Sh. Sunil Kumar Pandey),
R/o: - A39, LGF, Lajpat Nagar, New Delhi-110024. **Complainant**

Versus

ROF Infratech and Housing Private Limited
Regd. Office At: Building No.80, 1st floor, Sector-44, Gurugram.

Respondent

CORAM:
Arun Kumar **Chairman**

APPEARANCE:
Ms. Yamini and Akriti (Advocates) **Complainant**
Shri Gravit Gupta (Advocate) **Respondent**

ORDER

1. The present complaint has been filed by the complainant/allottees 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 provisions of the Act or the

Rules and regulations made there under or to the allottees 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	ROF Normanton Park, Sector-36, Sohna Gurugram
2.	Project area	Afforadable plotted colony-DDJAY
3	License No.	92 of 2021 dated 12.11.2021 valid upto 11.11.2026
4	Rera Registered	registered
	Date of allotment letter	06.03.2024 (page 36 of complaint)
5	Unit no.	G-06 (commercial unit) (page 38 of complaint)
6	Unit area admeasuring	458 sq.ft. (Page 38 of the complaint)
7	Date of execution of plot buyer's agreement	Not executed
8	Possession clause	*NA*
9	Due date of possession	NA
10	Total consideration of the plot	Rs. 94,97,774/- (page 38 of complaint)
11	Amount paid by the complainant	Rs.9,49,778/- [Page 7 of the complaint]
12	Occupation Certificate/Completion Certificate	Not obtained
13	Offer of possession	No offered
14	Demand and reminder letters	16.03.2024, 29.07.2024, 26.10.2024 and final opportunity 06.12.2024
15	Cancellation letter	22.04.2025 (page 47 of complaint)

16	Refund request made by the complainant	17.04.2025 & 22.08.2025

B. Facts of the complaint

3. The complainants have made the following submissions in the complaint:

I. That somewhere around 2023, the respondent advertised about its new Residential project namely **"ROF Normanton Mall"** ***(hereinafter called as 'the project')*** located in Sector- 36, Village Dhunela, Sohna, District Gurugram, Haryana. The respondent painted a rosy picture of the project in their advertisement making tall claims and representing that the project aims as a modern and premium commercial destination with state-of-the-art architecture, world-class amenities, and a strategic location, claiming it to be a landmark hub for retail, entertainment and lifestyle. The brochure highlighted features such as spacious retail outlets, wide corridors, escalators and elevators, ample parking, food courts, security arrangements, and an overall superior environment for business and leisure.

II. That believing the representations and relying on the goodwill of the respondent, while being on the lookout a commercial unit, on 29.05.2016, the complainant vide application form bearing no. NM-000069 dated 22.12.2023 booked a commercial unit in the said project by paying an amount of Rs. 51,000/- vide instrument bearing no. 34780795511 dated 22.12.2023, Rs. 4,50,000/- vide instrument bearing no. 34932717621 dated 07.01.2024, Rs. 2,00,000/- vide instrument bearing no. 35033382241 dated 16.01.2024, and Rs. 2,48,778/- vide instrument bearing no. 35140296161 dated 30.01.2024 thereby making a Total Payment amounting to **Rs. 9,49,778/-** against the Total Sale Consideration of **Rs. 94,97,774/-**.

III. That subsequently, on 06.03.2024, an allotment letter was executed between the complainant and the respondent thereby allotting shop bearing no. G-06 located on Ground Floor, ad measuring built up area of 459 sq. ft.

IV. That it is pertinent to mention that the complainant has duly made a payment of Rs. 9,49,778/- which constitutes **10%** of the total sale consideration of Rs. 94,97,774/- , strictly in terms of **Annexure-2** *(Payment Plan)* of the allotment letter issued by the respondent. As per **Clause 6.1** of the said Allotment Letter, it was expressly stipulated that both parties were required to execute the *"Agreement for Sale"* within **60 days** of allotment of the shop in question. However, despite the complainant's full compliance in paying the requisite 10% booking amount within time, the respondent failed to execute the agreement for sale within the stipulated period, thereby acting in breach of its own contractual obligation. Such failure on the part of the respondent not only violates the binding terms of the allotment letter but also amounts to a contravention of the provisions of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016, which mandates timely execution and registration of the Agreement for Sale upon receipt of the prescribed booking amount from an allottee.

V. That to the utter shock and surprise of the complainant, the respondent issued reminder letters dated 29.07.2024 and 13.08.2024 demanding further payments towards the purchase of the shop in question, despite the fact that the complainant had already deposited 10% of the total sale consideration, and the respondent had failed to execute the mandatory agreement for sale within the stipulated period. Such action on the part of the respondent is not only arbitrary and unjustified but also contrary to the provisions of the Real Estate (Regulation and

Development) Act, 2016, in particular **Section 13(1)**, which expressly prohibits a promoter from accepting more than 10% of the sale consideration without entering into a duly executed and registered Agreement for Sale. The conduct of the respondent in raising further demands without fulfilling its statutory obligation reflects unfair trade practice and has caused unwarranted harassment and financial pressure upon the complainant.

VI. That subsequently on, **17.04.2025,** the complainant due to such illegal acts of the respondent for demanding money without having been executing the agreement to sell as per RERA Act and also owing to certain unavoidable family circumstances, submitted a request for withdrawal from the project through an email of the same date, specifically seeking refund of the amount of Rs. 9,49,778/- already deposited with the respondent towards the booking of the shop in question.

VII. That the respondent instead of complying with the requests of the complainant regarding withdrawal of the project and further to refund the paid amount, sent an email dated thereby canceling the allotment of the unit in question. However, despite such cancellation, the respondent has failed and neglected to refund the booking amount received from the complainant. This conduct of the respondent is arbitrary, unfair, and in direct contravention of the provisions of the **Section 18** of Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016.

VIII. That the complainant, despite repeated requests, kept waiting endlessly for the refund of the booking amount, but to no avail. Eventually, on **22.08.2025**, the complainant was constrained to send another email to the respondent, wherein it was categorically stated that although the complainant had initially booked the aforesaid shop in the project, circumstances had rendered it impossible to continue with the investment.

It was specifically pointed out that the complainant's company is operating under a sanctioned credit limit, and the lending bank had raised objections to diversion of loan funds towards real estate investment as being in violation of financing norms. Further, the Income Tax Authorities had also raised queries in this regard, thereby making it commercially unfeasible and legally impermissible for the complainant to proceed with further payments towards the said unit. In light of these genuine constraints, the complainant once again requested refund of the advance amount of Rs. 9,49,778/- paid towards the purchase of shop in question. However, despite the repeated requests and clear justification provided, the respondent has failed and neglected to refund the said amount till date, thereby causing severe financial hardship, unwarranted harassment, and immense mental agony to the complainant.

IX. That the respondent simply duped the complainant of his hard-earned money and life savings. The aforesaid arbitrary and unlawful acts on the part of respondent have resulted into extreme kind of financial hardship, mental distress, pain and agony to the complainant. It is further to note that the complainant has firstly requested the respondent to withdraw from the project due to illegal demands from the respondent's part even after taking 10% of total sale consideration without executing the builder buyer agreement and also due to family and financial issues but instead of refunding the paid amount, the respondent has canceled the unit with the sole purpose of retaining hard earned money of the complainant.

C. Relief sought by the complainant:

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

I. Direct the respondent to refund the entire amount paid by it alongwith prescribed interest to the complainants.

5. On the date of hearing, the authority explained to the respondent/promoter about the contraventions as alleged to have been committed in relation to section 11(4) (a) of the Act to plead guilty or not to plead guilty.

D. Reply by the respondent

6. The respondent has contested the complaint vide its reply dated 20.03.2025 on the following grounds: -

i. That the respondent is the sole, absolute and lawful owner of the land parcel situated in Sector 36, Tehsil Sohna, District Gurugram, Haryana. The respondent had obtained the approval/sanction to develop a project known as 'ROF Normanton Park' from the Director Town and Country Planning, Haryana, Chandigarh (hereinafter referred to as the 'DTCP') vide approval bearing license no. **92 of 2021** under the Haryana Development and Regulation of Urban Areas Act, 1975 and the Haryana Development and Regulation of Urban Areas Rules, 1976 read with the Deen Dayal Jan Awas Yojna- Affordable Plotted Housing Policy, 2016 announced by the Government of Haryana vide the Town and Country Planning Department notification dated 01.04.2016. As per the approved plans and in accordance with the policy, the Vendor has constructed and developed a shopping complex under the name of **'ROF Normanton Mall'** comprising of commercial shops and forming part of the project. The project of the respondent was duly registered with this Hon'ble Authority under Registration No. GGM/744/476/2023/88, dated 04.09.2023.

ii. That the complainant, after checking the veracity of the said commercial project had applied for allotment of an apartment vide its booking application form dated 22.12.2023. The complainant agreed to be bound by the terms and conditions of booking application form. The

complainant was aware that all the payment demands towards the total sale consideration were to be demanded by the respondent strictly as per the payment plan and only after being completely satisfied about the same, had made the booking with the respondent.

iii. That pursuant to the booking made by the complainant, the respondent, vide allotment letter dated 06.03.2024, allotted a shop bearing No. G-06, admeasuring 458 sq. ft. (built-up area), in the said project of the respondent. It was expressly stipulated therein that the sale consideration of the said unit was Rs.94,97,774/- (exclusive of applicable statutory and ancillary charges). It is further submitted that, in terms of Clause 1.7 of the allotment letter, timely payment of the sale consideration by the complainant was an essential condition of the allotment. in the event of any delay or default in making payments as per the agreed payment plan, the complainant was liable to pay interest at the rate prescribed under Rule 15 of the Haryana Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Rules, 2017. Furthermore, in the event such default continued for a period exceeding 30 days from the issuance of notice by the promoter, the respondent was entitled to cancel the allotment of the said unit and refund the amount paid by the allottee after forfeiting the earnest money, being 10% of the total price of the unit, as stipulated therein.

iv. That the respondent, vide letter dated 16.03.2024, duly called upon the complainant to come forward and execute the builder buyer agreement in respect of the unit in question. The said communication clearly conveyed the requirement and obligation on the part of the complainant to execute the agreement within the stipulated time frame, as mandated under the terms of the allotment letter. Despite being duly notified and afforded sufficient opportunity, the complainant failed to comply with

this mandatory requirement and did not come forward to execute the agreement. In these circumstances, the respondent cannot be held liable for any consequences arising out of such non-compliance, as the failure to execute the builder buyer agreement is solely attributable to the inaction and default on the part of the complainant.

v. That thereafter, the respondent continued to raise demands for instalments from the complainant strictly in accordance with the agreed payment plan and the terms of the allotment letter dated 06.03.2024. In terms of the said payment plan, the next instalment, being payable "on or within 30 days from the date of booking," was duly demanded by the respondent vide demand letter dated 16.03.2024. It is further submitted that despite the said demand, the complainant failed to make payment within the stipulated time period. Consequently, the respondent issued reminder communications through emails and letters dated 29.07.2024, 13.08.2024 and 26.10.2024 calling upon the complainant to clear the outstanding dues. The respondent, thus, acted strictly in accordance with the contractual terms by raising demands and issuing reminders; however, the complainant failed to honour its payment obligations without any justifiable cause.

vi. That despite the issuance of repeated reminders, the Complainant failed to make the outstanding payment. In view of the continued default, the respondent issued a final opportunity email dated 06.12.2024, granting the complainant one last opportunity to clear the dues in accordance with the agreed payment plan. It is further submitted that, in addition to the said communication, the respondent also made efforts to approach and request the complainant to not only make the pending payments but also to come forward and execute the agreement for sale, which was a necessary and integral requirement for the continuation of the allotment.

It is pertinent to note that, as per the terms and conditions of the allotment letter, in the event of default on the part of the complainant in making timely payments and/or in executing the agreement for sale, the respondent is entitled to cancel the allotment of the unit and forfeit 10% of the total sale consideration. Accordingly, the respondent, after waiting for sufficient time and serving innumerable reminders and final opportunity communications acted strictly in accordance with the agreed terms, and the consequences that followed were solely on account of the complainant's continued non-compliance with its contractual obligations.

vii. That despite the issuance of repeated demand and reminders communications, the complainant failed to make the outstanding payments. Accordingly, the Respondent, vide cancellation letter dated 22.04.2025, terminated the allotment of the unit in question. It is pertinent to note that, as per Clause 34.1 of the Booking Application Form and Clause 1.7 of the allotment letter, the respondent was entitled to cancel the allotment upon continuation of default for a period of 30 days after issuance of a notice of demand. In the present case, the Respondent granted the complainant sufficient time and multiple opportunities to cure the default, far exceeding the minimum stipulated period of 30 days. Only after the complainant failed to comply even within such extended time and despite repeated opportunities, the respondent proceeded to cancel the allotment in accordance with the agreed terms. The cancellation was thus lawful, justified, and in strict compliance with the contractual provisions governing the parties.

viii. That in the present case, the complainant has paid only a sum of Rs.9,49,778/- out of the sale consideration of Rs.94,97,774/-, as is evident from the latest Statement of Account dated 29.04.2026. The said

paid amount constitutes merely 10% of the basic sale consideration, which position also stands admitted by the Complainant in the Complaint. It is further submitted that the complainant has committed clear defaults under the terms of the booking application form and the allotment letter, both in failing to make payments as per the agreed payment plan and in not coming forward to execute the Agreement for Sale. It is pertinent to note that the contractual terms expressly provide that in the event of such defaults, the respondent is entitled to forfeit 10% of the total sale consideration. Accordingly, in view of the admitted defaults on the part of the complainant, the forfeiture of the said amount is fully justified and in strict accordance with the agreed terms. Therefore, nothing remains payable on part of the Respondent in the present case.

ix. That without prejudice to the rights of the respondent and the statements made by the respondent vide the present reply, the Complainant, in the present complaint, has itself admitted that it sought refund of the amount paid vide email dated 17.04.2025 on account of personal/family circumstances. The said email dated 17.04.2025 is extremely important to adjudicate the present complaint. It is submitted that neither in the said email nor in the present complaint has the complainant pointed out any default, deficiency, or breach on the part of the respondent. complainant has sought to raise an unfounded plea that the non-payment of further instalments was on account of non-execution of the agreement for sale. However, the record clearly demonstrates otherwise. The respondent had, in fact, actively pursued the complainant to come forward and execute the Agreement, as is evident from the letter dated 16.03.2024. There is no material on record to show that the complainant ever approached the respondent for execution of the agreement. On the

contrary, the email dated 17.04.2025 relied upon by the complainant itself reflects that the reason for not proceeding further was purely personal in nature namely family circumstances which warranted the complainant not to continue with the booking. In these circumstances, the plea now sought to be raised regarding non-execution of the agreement is clearly an afterthought and is contrary to the complainant's own contemporaneous communications. Even if it is assumed that the complainant had withdrawn from the project and that the valid cancellation done by the respondent as per the terms of the allotment is not to be considered, the contractual terms would still govern the consequences thereof.

x. That no default, deficiency, or lapse whatsoever can be attributed to the Respondent in the present matter. As per the project details mentioned in the Allotment letter, the due date for offer of possession was clearly mentioned 31.12.2026, which has not yet lapsed as on date, and therefore, no question of delay in possession on the part of the respondent arises. Without prejudice to the rights of the respondent, the due date to handover the possession of the unit as per the allotment letter was 31.12.2026 and the withdrawal email was sent by the complainant on 17.04.2025 i.e almost 1.5 years before the lapse of the due date. It is further submitted that no other breach or non-compliance on the part of the respondent has been pointed out or substantiated by the complainant. The respondent has, at all times, acted in accordance with the terms and conditions of the booking application form and the allotment letter, and has duly complied with all its contractual and legal obligations. In these circumstances, the actions of the respondent are fully justified, lawful, and in consonance with the agreed terms, and no liability can be fastened upon it.

xi. That the respondent has duly complied with all its contractual and legal obligations in a timely and bona fide manner. The material on record clearly establishes that the allotment of the unit in question was validly terminated in accordance with the terms of the Booking Application Form and the allotment letter. Consequently, the complainant has no surviving right, title, interest, or lien whatsoever in respect of the said unit. The present complaint, being devoid of merit and based on untenable and afterthought pleas, deserves to be dismissed. It is, therefore, most respectfully prayed that the Authority may be pleased to dismiss the present complaint with heavy costs payable by the complainant to the respondent, in the interest of justice and to prevent abuse of the process of law.

5. All other averments made in the complaint were denied in toto.

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

E. Jurisdiction of the authority

6. The objection of the respondent regarding rejection of complaint on ground of jurisdiction stands rejected. The authority observes that it has territorial as well as subject matter jurisdiction to adjudicate the present complaint for the reasons given below.

E.I Territorial jurisdiction

7. As per notification no. 1/92/2017-1TCP dated 14.12.2017 issued by Town and Country Planning Department, Haryana the jurisdiction of Haryana Real Estate Regulatory Authority, Gurugram shall be entire Gurugram district for all purposes. 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.

E.II Subject-matter jurisdiction

8. Section 11(4)(a) of the Act, 2016 provides that the promoter shall be responsible to the allottees as per agreement for sale. Section 11(4)(a) is reproduced as hereunder:

> ***Section 11.....***
> *(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;*
> ***Section 34-Functions of the Authority:***
> *34(f) of the Act provides to ensure compliance of the obligations cast upon the promoters, the allottees and the real estate agents under this Act and the rules and regulations made thereunder.*

9. 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.

10. Further, the authority has no hitch in proceeding with the complaint and to grant a relief of refund in the present matter in view of the judgement passed by the Hon'ble Apex Court in ***Newtech Promoters and Developers Private Limited Vs State of U.P. and Ors."* 2021-2022(1)RCR(C), 357** and followed in case of ***M/s Sana Realtors Private Limited & other Vs Union of India & others SLP (Civil) No. 13005 of 2020 decided on 12.05.2022*** wherein it has been laid down as under:

"86. From the scheme of the Act of which a detailed reference has been made and taking note of power of adjudication delineated with the regulatory authority and adjudicating officer, what finally culls out is that although the Act indicates the distinct expressions like 'refund', 'interest', 'penalty' and 'compensation', a conjoint reading of Sections 18 and 19 clearly manifests that when it comes to refund of the amount, and interest on the refund amount, or directing payment of interest for delayed delivery of possession, or penalty and interest thereon, it is the regulatory authority which has the power to examine and determine the outcome of a complaint. At the same time, when it comes to a question of seeking the relief of adjudging compensation and interest thereon under Sections 12, 14, 18 and 19, the adjudicating officer exclusively has the power to determine, keeping in view the collective reading of Section 71 read with Section 72 of the Act. if the adjudication under Sections 12, 14, 18 and 19 other than compensation as envisaged, if extended to the adjudicating officer as prayed that, in our view, may intend to expand the ambit and scope of the powers and functions of the adjudicating officer under Section 71 and that would be against the mandate of the Act 2016."

11. Hence, in view of the authoritative pronouncement of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case mentioned above, the authority has the jurisdiction to entertain a complaint seeking refund of the amount and interest on the refund amount

F. Findings on the relief sought by the complainant.

F.I Direct the respondent to refund the entire amount paid by it alongwith prescribed interest to the complainant.

12. The complainant booked unit no. G-06 in Tower G pursuant to an allotment letter dated 06.03.2024 and paid a total amount of Rs.9,49,778/-, which is approximately 10% of the total sale consideration of Rs.94,97,778/-. As per the terms of the allotment letter, the builder buyer agreement was to be executed within 30 days, however, despite receiving 10% of the sale consideration, the respondent failed to execute the buyer agreement. The complainant further states the respondent raised a demand without executing the agreement for sale. Upon the complainant's refusal to pay the allegedly illegal demand, the respondent issued a demand and reminder letters

dated 16.03.2024, 29.07.2024, 26.10.2024 and final opportunity 06.12.2024 and subsequently a final cancellation letter dated 22.02.2025, cancelling the allotment. The complainant contends that the cancellation is arbitrary, illegal, and contrary to the provisions of RERA, and that the promoter has wrongfully forfeited the amount paid.

13. On the contrary, the respondent states that the complainant booked Shop No. G-06 for Rs.94,97,774/- but failed to make the instalment payments as per the agreed payment plan and also failed to execute the agreement for sale despite repeated reminders. Consequently, after granting sufficient opportunities, the respondent cancelled the allotment on 22.04.2025 in accordance with the contractual terms and forfeited Rs.9,49,778/- being 10% of the sale consideration. The respondent further contends that the complainant had himself sought withdrawal due to personal/family circumstances and had not alleged any deficiency or breach by the respondent. Therefore, the respondent claims that the cancellation and forfeiture were lawful and seeks dismissal of the complaint.

14. On consideration of documents available on record and submissions made by both the parties, the authority is of the view that on the basis of provisions of allotment, the complainant had paid a sum of Rs.9,49,778/- against the total sale consideration of Rs. 94,97,774/- which constitutes merely 10% of the total amount. The respondent had sent a letter of intimation as well as an email requesting the complainants to execute the Buyer's Agreement. However, no document has been placed on record to show that the complainants came forward to execute the Buyer's Agreement. As per the terms and conditions of the allotment letter executed between the parties, it has been duly agreed by the complainant vide clause 1.4 and 1.5 of the

allotment letter that the complainant is required to pay the timely payment of the installment as and when sought by the respondent. Further, as per clause 4 of the application form, it has been duly agreed by the complainant that the promoter is entitled to forfeit 10% of the total price paid for the allotment and interest component on delayed payment. While discussing earlier it has been held that the complainant was in default in making timely payments leading to cancellation of the allotted unit by the respondent as per the term and conditions of allotment. Now, the issue for consideration arises as to whether the complainant is entitled for refund of the illegal deduction of earnest amount from the respondent. It is observed that the respondent has raised various reminders letters to the complainant and as per section 19 (6) & (7) of Act of 2016, the allottees were under an obligation to make timely payment as per payment plan towards consideration of the allotted unit. Therefore, the cancellation of the allotted unit by the respondent is valid in the eyes of law. As the complainant had paid a sum of Rs.9,49,778/- against the total sale consideration of Rs. 94,97,774/- which constitutes merely 10% of the total amount. As per regulation, 11(5) of 2018 prescribed under the Haryana Real Estate Regulatory Authority Gurugram (Forfeiture of earnest money by the builder) the builder can deduct the earnest money which is 10% of the slae consideration.

15. Keeping in view the aforesaid factual and legal provisions, the respondent can deduct the amount paid by the complainant against the allotted unit as the as it is both the earnest money and 10% of the consideration amount. So, the same was liable to be forfeited in terms Regulations 11(5) of 2018. However, the amount paid by the complainant i.e., 9,49,778/- against the total sale consideration of Rs.

94,97,774/- which constitutes less than 10% of the sale consideration. Thus, no direction to this effect.

G. Directions of the Authority:

16. Hence, in view of the findings recorded by the authority on the aforesaid issues, no case of refund of the paid-up amount with interest is made out. Hence, the complainant is dismissed being devoid of merits.
17. Complaint stands disposed of.
18. File be consigned to the registry.

(Arun Kumar)

Chairman

Haryana Real Estate Regulatory Authority, Gurugram

Dated: 11.08.2026