

PROCEEDINGS OF THE DAY		23
Day and Date	Tuesday and 23.05.2023	
Complaint No.	CR/1707/2019 Case titled as Vishakha Bist Vs Oasis Landmarks LLP	
Complainant	Vishakha Bist	
Represented through	Shri Ashish Sardana AR of complainant in person	
Respondent	Oasis Landmarks LLP	
Respondent Represented through	Shri Kapil Madan and Saurabh Gauba Advocates	
Last date of hearing	14.03.2023	
Proceeding Recorded by	Naresh Kumari and HR Mehta	
Proceedings		
The present complaint was filed on 29.04.2019 and the reply on behalf of respondent has been received on 17.02.2021. The counsel for the respondent states that Shri Ashish Sardana appearing on behalf of complainant is neither the allottee nor the counsel for the complainant. However, Shri Ashish Sardana clarifies that he is authorized representative of the complainant and an application for change of AR has been filed in the authority on 21.03.2023 duly signed by the complainant and a copy has been supplied to the counsel for the complainant. Shri Ashish Sardana states that he is covered under section 56 of the Act 2016 and has been duly authorized by the complainant vide application dated 14.03.2023 received in the registry on 21.03.2023. However, the counsel for the respondent states that Shri Sardana is not covered under any of the provisions of section 56 of the Act which states as under:- The applicant or appellant may either appear in person or authorize one or more chartered accountants or company secretaries or cost accountants or legal practitioners or any of its officers to present his or its case before the Appellate		

PROCEEDINGS OF THE DAY		27
Day and Date	Tuesday and 23.05.2023	
Complaint No.	CR/3040/2020 Case titled as Mrs. Shelly Chaudhary Vs Godrej Properties	
Complainant	Mrs. Shelly Chaudhary	
Represented through	Shri Aashish Sardana AR	
Respondent	Godrej Properties	
Respondent Represented through	Shri Kapil Madan and Saurabh Gauba Advocates	
Last date of hearing	14.03.2023	
Proceeding Recorded by	Naresh Kumari and HR Mehta	
Proceedings		
The present complaint was filed on 12.10.2020 and the reply on behalf of respondent has been received on 08.03.2021. The present complaint was filed for refund before the adjudicating officer and the same was allowed by the AO vide order dated 06.10.2021. Against the said dated order the respondent preferred the appeal and the appellate tribunal after hearing the parties at length set aside the order dated 06.10.2021 and ordered the authority to try the complaint a fresh. The counsel for the respondent states that Shri Ashish Sardana appearing on behalf of complainant is neither the allottee nor the counsel for the complainant. However, Shri Ashish Sardana clarifies that he is authorized representative of the complainant and an application for change of AR has been filed in the authority on 21.03.2023 duly signed by the complainant and a copy has been supplied to the counsel for the complainant. Shri Ashish Sardana states that he is covered under section 56 of the Act, 2016 and has been duly authorized by the complainant vice application dated 14.03.2023 received in the registry on 21.03.2023. However, the counsel for the respondent states that Shri Sardana is not covered under any of the provisions of section 56 of the Act which states as under:-		