



HARYANA REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY PANCHKULA

Website: www.haryanarera.gov.in

1. SUO MOTU COMPLAINT NO. 1211/2020

HRERA Panchkula

....COMPLAINANT(S)

VERSUS

1.Ritu Sareen

2. BPTP Ltd

....RESPONDENT(S)

2. SUO MOTU COMPLAINT NO. 1266/2020

HRERA Panchkula

....COMPLAINANT(S)

VERSUS

1.Akshita Sharma

2. BPTP Ltd

....RESPONDENT(S)

3. SUO MOTU COMPLAINT NO. 1267/2020

HRERA Panchkula

....COMPLAINANT(S)

VERSUS

1.Shalini Gupta

2. BPTP Ltd

....RESPONDENT(S)

4. SUO MOTU COMPLAINT NO. 1268/2020

HRERA Panchkula

....COMPLAINANT(S)

VERSUS

1.Babita Kaushik

2. BPTP Ltd

....RESPONDENT(S)

5. SUO MOTU COMPLAINT NO. 1270/2020

HRERA Panchkula

....COMPLAINANT(S)

VERSUS

1.Kamal Jain

2. BPTP Ltd

....RESPONDENT(S)

6. SUO MOTU COMPLAINT NO. 1271/2020

HRERA Panchkula

....COMPLAINANT(S)

VERSUS

1.Yojna Khotar

2. BPTP Ltd

....RESPONDENT(S)

7. SUO MOTU COMPLAINT NO. 1272/2020

HRERA Panchkula

....COMPLAINANT(S)

VERSUS

1.Pawan Kumar

2. BPTP Ltd

....RESPONDENT(S)

8. SUO MOTU COMPLAINT NO. 1273/2020

HRERA Panchkula

....COMPLAINANT(S)

VERSUS

1.Antony Vargese

2. BPTP Ltd

....RESPONDENT(S)

9. SUO MOTU COMPLAINT NO. 1275/2020

HRERA Panchkula

....COMPLAINANT(S)

VERSUS

1.Madhu Sareen

2. BPTP Ltd

....RESPONDENT(S)

10.SUO MOTU COMPLAINT NO. 1276/2020

HRERA Panchkula

....COMPLAINANT(S)

VERSUS

1.Raj Ratti

2. BPTP Ltd

....RESPONDENT(S)

11.SUO MOTU COMPLAINT NO. 1278/2020

HRERA Panchkula

....COMPLAINANT(S)

VERSUS

1.Puran Sharma

2. BPTP Ltd

....RESPONDENT(S)

12.SUO MOTU COMPLAINT NO. 1279/2020

HRERA Panchkula

....COMPLAINANT(S)

VERSUS

1.Neera R Pathak

2. BPTP Ltd

....RESPONDENT(S)

13.SUO MOTU COMPLAINT NO. 1280/2020

HRERA Panchkula

....COMPLAINANT(S)

VERSUS

1.Jai Prakash Gupta

2. BPTP Ltd

....RESPONDENT(S)

14. SUO MOTU COMPLAINT NO. 1281/2020

HRERA Panchkula

....COMPLAINANT(S)

VERSUS

1.D K Vijn

2. BPTP Ltd

....RESPONDENT(S)

15. SUO MOTU COMPLAINT NO. 1282/2020

HRERA Panchkula

....COMPLAINANT(S)

VERSUS

1.Meenakshi Kwatra

2. BPTP Ltd

....RESPONDENT(S)

16.SUO MOTU COMPLAINT NO. 1283/2020

HRERA Panchkula

....COMPLAINANT(S)

VERSUS

1.Sachin Wadhwa

2. BPTP Ltd

....RESPONDENT(S)

17.SUO MOTU COMPLAINT NO. 1284/2020

HRERA Panchkula

....COMPLAINANT(S)

VERSUS

1.Arup Kumar Banerjee

2. BPTP Ltd

....RESPONDENT(S)

18.SUO MOTU COMPLAINT NO. 1285/2020

HRERA Panchkula

....COMPLAINANT(S)

VERSUS

1.Nikhil Malhotra

2. BPTP Ltd

....RESPONDENT(S)

19.SUO MOTU COMPLAINT NO. 1286/2020

HRERA Panchkula

....COMPLAINANT(S)

VERSUS

1.Yogesh

2. BPTP Ltd

....RESPONDENT(S)

20. SUO MOTU COMPLAINT NO. 1287/2020

HRERA Panchkula

....COMPLAINANT(S)

VERSUS

1.Rajdeep Kaur

2. BPTP Ltd

....RESPONDENT(S)

21. SUO MOTU COMPLAINT NO. 1289/2020

HRERA Panchkula

....COMPLAINANT(S)

VERSUS

1.Manish Sharma

2. BPTP Ltd

....RESPONDENT(S)

22. SUO MOTU COMPLAINT NO. 1290/2020

HRERA Panchkula

....COMPLAINANT(S)

VERSUS

1.Priyadarshi Kumar

2. BPTP Ltd

....RESPONDENT(S)



23. SUO MOTU COMPLAINT NO. 1291/2020

HRERA Panchkula

....COMPLAINANT(S)

VERSUS

1.Sanjiv Mehrotra

2. BPTP Ltd

....RESPONDENT(S)

**CORAM: Dr. Geeta Rathee Singh
Nadim Akhtar****Member
Member****Date of Hearing: 16.05.2023****Hearing: 4th in all cases****Present: None for respondent no. 1 in all cases.**

Mr. Hemant Saini, Counsel for the respondent no.2 in all cases.

ORDER: (NADIM AKHTAR-MEMBER)

On hearing dated 13.12.2022 following order was passed:-

"Captioned suo motu complaints have been taken up for refund of pre-deposit of amount in terms of order passed by Hon'ble Appellate Tribunal. Details of cases are as follows:-

Sr. No.	Suo moto complaint no.	Appeal No.	Pre-deposit Amount (₹)	Order dated in appeal	Relevant part of order
1.	1275-2020	42 of 2019	₹ 2,66,637/-	27.08.2019	The amount, if any deposited by the appellant/promoter (BPTP Ltd) with this Tribunal be transferred to the account of learned Real Estate Regulatory Authority, Panchkula
2.	1276-2020	26 of 2019	₹ 1,84,593/-	27.08.2019	
3.	1278-2020	49 of 2019	₹ 1,89,695/-	27.08.2019	
4.	1273-2020	57 of 2019	₹ 2,40,521/-	29.08.2019	
5.	1268-2020	56 of 2019	₹ 90,000/-	29.08.2019	
6.	1271-2020	59 of 2019	₹ 90,000/-	29.08.2019	
7.	1272-2020	40 of 2019	₹ 2,63,474/-	27.08.2019	
8.	1290-2020	55 of 2019	₹ 1,87,599/-	29.08.2019	
9.	1267-2020	53 of 2019	₹ 90,000/-	29.08.2019	
10.	1266-2020	51 of 2019	₹ 90,000/-	29.08.2019	



11.	1211-2020	44 of 2019	₹ 2,55,770/-	27.08.2019
12.	1282-2020	50 of 2019	₹ 1,82,029/-	29.08.2019
13.	1283-2020	47 of 2019	₹ 2,67,094/-	27.08.2019
14.	1284-2020	29 of 2019	₹ 1,88,017/-	27.08.2019
15.	1285-2020	41 of 2019	₹ 2,25,868/-	27.08.2019
16.	1279-2020	28 of 2019	₹ 2,28,076/-	27.08.2019
17.	1280-2020	43 of 2019	₹ 1,88,641/-	27.08.2019
18.	1281-2020	27 of 2019	₹ 1,75,891/-	27.08.2019
19.	1291-2020	46 of 2019	₹ 2,02,274/-	27.08.2019
20.	1270-2020	58 of 2019	₹ 90,000/-	29.08.2019
21.	1289-2020	48 of 2019	₹ 1,96,406/-	27.08.2019
22.	1287-2020	39 of 2019	₹ 2,34,901/-	27.08.2019
23.	1286-2020	54 of 2019	₹ 2,89,258/-	29.08.2019

2. On the last date of hearing, captioned complaints were adjourned sine die with liberty to respondents to approach this Authority after getting the modified order. Relevant part of last order dated 28.01.2021 is reproduced below for reference:-

“On perusal of said order, it is not clear as to whom the said amount deserves to be returned/disbursed. Relevant part of order passed by Hon’ble Real Estate Appellate Tribunal is reproduced below for reference:-

‘The amount, if any, deposited by the appellant/promoter with this Tribunal be transferred to the account of learned Real Estate Regulatory Authority, Panchkula.’

Authority is duty bound to comply with the orders of the Hon’ble Appellate Tribunal without any amendment. Since the order is not clear for the reasons stated above, party which intends to claim the amount of pre-deposit is directed to seek modification of the order passed in appeal. Meanwhile, case is adjourned sine die. However, party is at liberty to approach the Authority after getting the modified order.”

3. All of captioned complaints have been re-opened for the reason that both the respondents have failed to produce any modified order since January, 2021. Today, Sh. Hemant Saini has put in appearance on behalf of respondent no. 2 and has sought time to get the necessary modification done in order passed in appeal by Hon'ble Real Estate Appellate Tribunal. Since modification in order is necessary, the request of counsel is allowed.

4. Respondent is directed to get the modified order on or before next date of hearing. Cases are adjourned to 16.03.2023."

2. Cases were adjourned granting time to respondent no. 2 to get the modified order from Hon'ble Appellate Tribunal. Today, Sh. Hemant Saini, Id. counsel for respondent no. 2 has again sought time to get the modified order. His request has been accepted.

3. Cases are adjourned to 26.09.2023.



.....
Dr. GEETA RATHEE SINGH
[MEMBER]



.....
NADIM AKHTAR
[MEMBER]