

Sandeep Jain
Vs.
Narinder Rathi and another
CM No.740 of 2025
In Appeal No.288 of 2025

Present: Mr. Shailabh Singhal, Advocate,
for the appellant.

Mr. Kartik Parmod, Advocate for
Mr. Vineet Kumar Shrivastav, Advocate,
for respondent No.1.

None for respondent No.2 (HRERA, Panchkula).

As per report from the Registry, service has been effected on respondent No.2 (HRERA, Panchkula). However, it remains unrepresented.

Learned counsel for the appellant submits that she may be given liberty to effect service on respondent No.2-HRERA, Panchkula by way of *Dasti* process.

Liberty as prayed for is granted.

Dasti process be issued.

Proxy counsel for respondent No.1 prays for adjournment on the ground that the arguing counsel for respondent No.1 is not available today.

Mr. Singhal has opposed the prayer for adjournment and pointed out that no prior intimation has been given to him for non-availability of arguing counsel for the respondent. He submits that he has travelled all the way from Delhi to attend the hearing of this case.

It is made clear that in case such situation occurs again, we shall consider imposition of punitive costs.

Purely, in the interests of justice, however, last opportunity is granted.

List on 05.02.2026.

Interim order dated 10.06.2025 to continue till the next date of hearing.

Photocopy of this order be placed in files of Appeal No.288 & 289 of 2025.

Justice Rajan Gupta
Chairman
Haryana Real Estate Appellate Tribunal

Dr. Virender Parshad
Member (Judicial)

08.01.2026
Manoj Rana