



HARYANA REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY PANCHKULA

Website: www.haryanarera.gov.in

COMPLAINT NO. 939 OF 2026

Jyoti Sinha and Dhiraj Verma

....COMPLAINANT

VERSUS

Adore Realtech Private Ltd.

....RESPONDENT

Date of hearing: 07.09.2026

Hearing : 1st

Present: Adv. Pankaj Bains, Counsel for complainant.

Adv. Himani, Counsel for the respondent through VC.

ORDER (NADIM AKHTAR- MEMBER)

1. In the present case the complainant has sought various reliefs as provided here:

- To appoint a local commissioner to carry out the tasks as mentioned in Para 26 of the complaint.

- To conduct a forensic audit of the books of accounts of the Respondent as per task mentioned in Para 27 of the complaint.
- To direct the Respondent to provide an affidavit as to when an offer of possession shall be given. If the Respondent fails to provide the same, penal proceeding in violation of section 4(2) (i) (C) be initiated against the Respondent.
- To direct the Respondent not to demand balance cost of 75 % of the Flat till execution of BBA as well as occupancy certificate is obtained.
- To direct the Respondent to provide a valid physical possession after receipt of occupancy certificate.
- To direct the Respondent to give delayed possession charges @ MCLR + 2% from 24-09-2019 till the date of actual physical possession of the prescribed rate of interest.
- To direct the Respondent to execute the conveyance deed after offering valid offer of possession to the Complainant;
- seize control of the project and finish the same either directly or through another organization.
- Grant any other relief as this Hon'ble Authority deems fit in the peculiar facts and circumstances of the present complaint.



- To direct the Respondent to adjust the excess amount paid by the Complainant over and above the total sale price, when demanding the balance amount of 75 % of the total cost.
- To restrain the Respondent from demanding labour Cess, VAT, work Contract Tax and power backup charges.
- To direct the Respondent to give bifurcation of the total sale price including the clarification of cost of parking under the Affordable House Policy, 2013;
- To restrain the Respondent from charging any maintenance charges in future as the Complainant is not bound to pay the same under the affordable House Policy, 2013;
- To restrain the Respondent from demanding car parking charges from the Complainant;
- To take action for violation of section 6, i.e. non extension of registration of the Act, if not applied in time for extension;
- Keeping in mind the current status of the project, it is prayed that this Authority may take steps/action under section 8 of RERA Act for completing the project and if required necessary steps be taken.



2. Ld. Counsel for the complainant was put a specific query by the Authority that how all these reliefs are maintainable before the Authority. Ld. counsel for the complainant could not give a satisfactory response to the query put up by the Authority.
3. Authority observes that the complainant has sought a number of reliefs before this Authority, including appointment of a Local Commissioner, forensic audit of the books of accounts of the Respondent, furnishing of an affidavit indicating the timeline for offer of possession, restraint against raising certain demands, payment of delayed possession charges, execution of conveyance deed, adjustment of alleged excess payments, action in respect of project registration, and exercise of powers under Section 8 of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016 for completion of the project. However, during the course of hearing, when the Complainant was specifically called upon to explain the statutory provision under which each of the aforesaid reliefs is maintainable before this Authority and to demonstrate the jurisdictional foundation for seeking such reliefs in the present complaint, the Counsel for the complainant was unable to satisfactorily explain the same. Mere enumeration of various reliefs in the prayer clause, without identifying the corresponding statutory provision conferring jurisdiction upon the Authority or establishing the factual and



legal foundation necessary for grant thereof, cannot by itself entitle a party to seek adjudication of such reliefs. Reliefs sought by the Complainant are diverse in nature and encompass matters relating to inspection and forensic audit, regulatory/compliance action, monetary claims, contractual obligations, levy of various charges and measures contemplated under Section 8 of the Act. The Complainant has not clearly delineated the precise cause of action, the statutory provision invoked in support of each relief, or the manner in which the reliefs fall within the adjudicatory or regulatory jurisdiction of this Authority.

This Authority cannot adjudicate a complaint on the basis of vague, omnibus and unexplained prayers. The burden lies upon the party approaching the Authority to clearly set out the cause of action, the relief claimed and the statutory basis on which such relief is sought. The Authority cannot be expected to ascertain or construct a case for the Complainant which has neither been specifically pleaded nor satisfactorily explained during the proceedings.

4. In view of the aforesaid position and without entering into the merits of the individual claims or expressing any opinion on the entitlement of the



Complainant to seek any particular relief, the present complaint, in its existing form, is not found fit for adjudication.

5. Ld. Counsel for the complainant withdrew the complaint with the request to grant permission to file a fresh complaint with better facts. His request is accepted with a liberty to file a fresh complaint/petition before the Authority, duly setting out the specific cause of action, precise reliefs sought and the statutory provisions conferring jurisdiction for grant of such reliefs.
6. In view of the foregoing discussion, the present complaint is hereby **disposed off** for the reasons mentioned above.



.....
NADIM AKHTAR
[MEMBER]