



HARYANA REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY PANCHKULA

Website: www.haryanarera.gov.in

COMPLAINT NO. 1231 OF 2024

Mrs Punam Mor

....COMPLAINANT

VERSUS

Parsvnath Developers Ltd.

....RESPONDENT

COMPLAINT NO. 1316 OF 2024

Dr. Anita Kalia

....COMPLAINANT

VERSUS

Parsvnath Developers Ltd.

....RESPONDENT

Date of Hearing: 15.12.2025

Hearing: 3rd

Present: Adv. Sushil Malhotra, counsel for complainant through VC.

Adv. Rupali Verma, counsel for respondent through VC.

ORDER: (NADIM AKHTAR-MEMBER)

1. As per last order dated 19.07.2025, case was adjourned for awaiting the outcome of appeal.
2. Ld. counsel for the complainant submitted that the present complaint is squarely covered by the matter titled "*Bhim Singh Panwar versus Parsvnath*

Developers Ltd.”, wherein this Authority has already passed an order in favour of the complainant(s). He, therefore, prayed that the present complaint may also be decided in a similar manner. He further referred to page no. 26 of the complaint, wherein a receipt dated 23.09.2009 for an amount of ₹2,50,000/- paid towards advance registration by the previous allottee, namely Mr. Satyavir Singh Shastri, has been placed on record. He then referred to page no. 27, where the said receipt stands duly endorsed in favour of the present complainant, Ms. Punam Mor. He also drew the attention of the Authority to page no. 30 of the complaint, wherein a letter issued by Parsvnath Developers Ltd. to the complainant is annexed, acknowledging the amounts paid. In the said letter, receipts amounting to ₹2,50,000/- and ₹35,000/- have been referred to by the respondent company and the same have been admitted, while endorsing the receipts against the present/future project. Ld. counsel further submitted that a rejoinder has also been filed by the complainant on 07.04.2025. He additionally referred to page no. 96, where a copy of the order dated 09.03.2025 passed in Complaint No. 606 of 2022 has been annexed by the complainant, wherein this Authority had granted relief in favour of the complainant(s). It was submitted that in both the complaints, the relief sought is identical, i.e., possession of the unit.



3. On the contrary, Ld. counsel for the respondent submitted that no copy of the rejoinder has been received by the respondent till date. Perusal of file reveals that a copy of rejoinder has already been mailed on the email of counsel of respondent on 23.03.2025. She further submitted that the respondent does not have possession in the present project and neither can purchase units from the open market for the purpose of possession. It was further submitted that the respondent can only refund the amount paid by the complainant, and in the present complaint, the complainant is interested in seeking refund of the amount paid. Ld. counsel for the respondent also submitted that an appeal is pending before the Hon'ble Appellate Tribunal in the similar matter titled "Bhim Singh Panwar versus Parsvnath Developers Ltd." Upon query by the Authority as to whether any stay has been granted in the said appeal, Ld. counsel for the respondent replied in the negative.
4. Case is adjourned to 02.03.2026 for further arguments and consideration.


.....
NADIM AKHTAR
[MEMBER]