



HARYANA REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY PANCHKULA

Website: www.haryanarera.gov.in

COMPLAINT NO. 1294 OF 2023

Saroj Bala

....COMPLAINANT

VERSUS

Ruhil Promoter Pvt. Ltd.

....RESPONDENT

Date of Hearing: 10.02.2026

Hearing: 6th

Present: - Adv Jasdeep Singh, Learned Counsel for the
Complainant
Adv. Kamaljeet Dahiya and Adv. Navneet,
Learned Counsels for the Respondent.
Mr. Mohit, Authorised Representative of the respondent
company(Accounts Manager)

ORDER(DR. GEETA RATHEE SINGH- MEMBER)

1. Today, the case is fixed for physical appearance of both the parties for verification of the documents annexed as Annexure C1-C9 in original.
2. Adv. Jasdeep Singh placed before the Authority documents annexed as Annexure C1-C9 in original for perusal.

3. Mr. Mohit, authorized representative appeared on behalf of the respondent company along with counsels and perused the documents. Upon perusal he submitted as follows:

- i. The signature on the documents under the name of "Shailesh" is not the routine signature of the employee, namely Shailesh, employed at the time at the respondent company.
- ii. The alleged builder buyer agreement dated 13.06.2013 is printed on a stamp paper of 'W' series whereas at the time the series in operating were F, G and H.
- iii. The alleged payments made by the complainant are all in cash which is without any proof. He further submitted that the receipts submitted by the complainant bears title 'Receipts Voucher' whereas the receipts issued by the respondent company bear title 'Receipts Rr Voucher'.
- iv. Complainant in the present complaint already has two more units in the project in question. For those two units the mode of payment opted by the complainant is not all cash.

4. Adv. Jasdeep, learned counsel for the complainant rebutted that the stamp paper on which the agreement has been printed bears notarised stamp on the back page that the same has been purchased by respondent company in 2013. Further, all the documents which have been relied upon by the complainant have been put forth for perusal which shows bona fide on the



part of the complainant. Till date the respondent has not challenged the veracity of these documents. It is pertinent to mention that the back page of the stamp paper has not been copied on the copy of builder buyer agreement annexed with complaint file.

5. In response, Adv. Kamaljeet Dahiya, learned counsel for the respondent argued that the respondent is denying all the documents annexed with the complaint file being forged and fabricated. These documents are not a true copy. Further the documents placed in original have been verified by the authorised representative and have been found to be different from the documents issued by the respondent company in routine. Thus the same are also denied.
6. At this point, learned counsel for the respondent was enquired as to why the respondent company did not object to these documents before filing of this complaint.

Learned counsel for the respondent submitted that it was only through this present complaint that the respondent company came to know about these documents and accordingly proper objections have been raised in the reply filed in the captioned complaint.

7. Upon perusal of original documents and complaint file it is observed that true copy of documents has not been placed on file. All documents in original have been handed over to the learned counsel for complainant.



8. Complainant is directed to file the true copy of all the documents being relied upon by the complainant along with signatures of both the complainant and the learned counsel along with affidavit with an advance copy supplied to the opposite party within 10 days of uploading of this order. Respondent is directed to file its objections to the documents filed by the complainant, if any, along with an affidavit verifying the same within 10 days after being supplied the copy by complainant counsel.
9. Case is adjourned to **17.03.2026.**


.....
DR. GEETA RATHEE SINGH
[MEMBER]