

PROCEEDINGS OF THE DAY		10
Day and Date	Friday and 31.10.2025	
Complaint No.	CR/4874/2023 Case titled as Pavan Dutta VS Sweta Estate Private Limited	
Complainant	Pavan Dutta	
Represented through	Shri Vibhor Sharma Advocate	
Respondent	Sweta Estate Private Limited	
Respondent Represented through	S/Shri Venket Rao, Dharmender Sehrawat Advocates with Shri Lokesh Madan AR of company	
Last date of hearing	24.10.2025	
Proceeding Recorded by	Naresh Kumari and HR Mehta	

Proceedings

The present complaint was received by this Authority on 03.11.2023, and the reply on behalf of the respondent was filed on 21.02.2024.

Counsel for the complainant submits that the complainant seeks delayed possession charges along with interest.

Conversely, counsel for the respondent contends that the respondent had cancelled the allotment of the unit vide letter dated 19.05.2015 and forfeited the amount paid by the complainant.

Subsequently, the respondent, vide letter dated 11.12.2015, forwarded a cheque amounting to ₹22,85,763/- after deducting ₹15,00,000/- towards Earnest Money Deposit (EMD) and ₹10,06,201/- towards brokerage charges paid by the company. The respondent has further argued that the present complaint is barred by limitation, as it has been filed after a lapse of eight years from the date of cancellation, and has accordingly moved an application seeking dismissal of the complaint on that ground.

Upon perusal of the record, the Authority observes that it is an undisputed fact that subsequent to the cancellation of the unit on 19.05.2015, the complainant did not approach any competent forum to challenge the said cancellation or to



HARERA
GURUGRAM

HARYANA REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY
GURUGRAM

हरियाणा भू-संपदा विनियामक प्राधिकरण, गुरुग्राम, 2023

New PWD Rest House, Civil Lines, Gurugram, Haryana

नया पी.डब्ल्यू.डी. विभाग भू, सिविल लाइन्स, गुरुग्राम, हरियाणा

seek refund of the deposited amount. The complainant was at liberty to approach a civil court, consumer forum, or any other competent authority for appropriate relief; however, no such steps were taken. This conduct clearly indicates that the complainant remained inactive and slept over his rights concerning the allotted unit.

Furthermore, it is evident that the cancellation of the unit occurred on 19.05.2015, whereas the present complaint has been filed only on 03.11.2023, after a delay of more than eight years. The complaint is, therefore, barred by limitation.

In view of the factual matrix and legal position discussed hereinabove, this Authority holds that the complaint seeking possession or related reliefs is not maintainable, being barred by limitation, and is accordingly dismissed.

Detailed order will follow. File be consigned to the registry.

Arun Kumar
Chairman
31.10.2025