## HARYANA REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHROITY, PANCHKULA.

**Date of Hearing: 15.11.2018** 

Complaint No-207/2018

Bharti Khulharia

...Complainant

Versus

M/s Umang Realtech Pvt. Ltd.

...Respondent

CORAM: -

Shri Anil Kumar Panwar Shri Dilbag Singh Sihag

...Member

APPEARANCE: -

1. Ms. Rupali S Verma, Counsel for Complainant.

2. None for Respondent.

Order:-

1. Today, notice along with the copy of complaint was sent to the respondent and the courier receipt available on file reveals that the respondent was duly served upon 05.06.2018. The respondent defaulted to appear on the date for which he was served and has also committed default for appearance on all subsequent dates fixed in the case. Accordingly, this authority vide order dated 04.10.2018 has directed the respondent to pay the cost of Rs. One Lakh for not filing reply on time and also burdened him with the cost of Rs. Five Thousand payable to Authority and Rs. Two Thousand payable to the complainant for causing adjournment on previous

date. The respondent thus as already incurred a total liability of Rs. One Lakh Seven Thousand.

- 2. Significantly, there are many other cases which were fixed for today itself of the same respondent involving complaints of similar nature as in the present case. Respondent is being represented in each of the other cases by an advocate and he has also deposited the cost amounting Rs. Twenty Seven Thousand each in Complaint No. 337/2018, 338/2018, 340/2018, 341/2018, 343/2018 and Rs Thirty Seven Thousand in case of Complaint No. 339/2018, for late filing of written statement. It seems that the respondent is more keen to avoid the payment of cost of this case and leaving this case for decision in terms of the verdict to follow in other cases.
- 3. The Authority has therefore, decided to initiate ex-parte proceeding against the respondent and take up this case for decision along with order cases fixed for today. The controversy involved in this case is covered by the decision taken today in bunch of other complaints which have been disposed of with reference to the facts of leading Case No. 337/2018 titled as Raj Parkash Versus M/s Umang Realtech Pvt. Ltd. So, the present complaint is also disposed off in terms of the above mentioned Judgement, for refund.
- 4. The respondent-promoter shall deposit the cost of Rs. One Lakh and Seven Thousand within one week of uploading of the order of the Authority on website failing which the A.O. Petitions shall put up the file before the

Authority in its next meeting for initiating such actions as may be deemed fit for the purpose of recovery of the cost of Rs. One Lakh and Seven Thousand.

Dilbag Singh Sihag Member Anil Kumar Panwar Member