

Emaar India Ltd.
V/s
Rajeshwar Arora and another
Appeal No.347 of 2021

Present: Shri Mayank Aggarwal, Ld. proxy counsel for
Ms. Tanika Goyal, Advocate,
Ld. counsel for the appellant.

Shri Tushar Bahamni, Advocate,
Ld. counsel for the respondents.

Ld. Proxy counsel for the appellant has sought adjournment on the ground that the arguing counsel Ms. Tanika Goyal, Advocate is not well. An e-mail in this regard has also been received.

Ld. counsel for the respondents has filed *Vakalatnama* on behalf of the respondents. The same is taken on record.

From the perusal of the file, it reveals that at the time of institution of the present appeal, an application for condonation of delay has been moved. There is delay of 35 days in filing the present appeal.

Heard on the application for condonation of delay.

In view of the reasons mentioned in the application and as per the directions given by the Hon'ble Apex Court in Suo Motu (C) No.3 of 2020, the application for condonation of delay is hereby allowed and the delay of 35 days in filing the present appeal stands condoned, however, subject to just objection by the opposite party.

Now to come up on 18th October, 2022 for arguments.

Inderjeet Mehta
Member (Judicial)
Haryana Real Estate Appellate Tribunal
Chandigarh

Anil Kumar Gupta
Member (Technical)

August 22, 2022
Manoj Rana