



HARYANA REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY PANCHKULA

Website: www.haryanarera.gov.in

COMPLAINT NO. 1591 OF 2019

Rachita Bansal

.....COMPLAINANT

Versus

1. M/s Pardesi Developers & Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd
2. CM Developers and Infrastructures Pvt. Ltd.

.....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: Dr. Geeta Rathee Singh
Chander Shekhar

Member
Member

Hearing: 19th

Date of Hearing: 04.02.2025

Present: - Adv. Nidhi Jain, counsel for complainant through VC.
Adv. Shubhnit Hans, counsel for respondent no. 1, through VC.
None for respondent no. 2.

ORDER :

1. On the last date of hearing dated 15.10.2024, ld. counsel for respondent no.1 had submitted that no settlement could be arrived between the parties and argued that the receipts annexed with the complaint are issued by respondent no.2 and not respondent no.1, therefore respondent no.2 has not even received any payment from complainant / allottee. Further, he

Geeta Rathee

submitted respondent no.1 had taken over the said project in question from "CMD Build-tech" and not "CM Developers and Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd." That respondent no. 1 got the license transferred in its favour from CMD Build-tech and not CM Developers and Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd., therefore they are not liable for any act done by CM Developers and Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd. To these submissions made by Id. counsel for respondent no.1, Authority had directed him to clarify which project has been taken over, along-with the date of licenses issued in their name. Accordingly, an application has been filed on 03.02.2025 in the registry of Authority and a copy of renewed license annexed with the application shows that the project was transferred to respondent no.2 and not respondent no.1.

2. Further Authority had observed that notice was sent to respondent no.2, however same was returned un-delivered with the report: "person shifted from given address". Due to such report, on the next date of hearing, i.e. on 26.07.2023, directions were issued to complainant to collect dasti and serve it upon respondent. However same has not been collected till date.
3. Today, Id. counsel for complainant submitted that it was an inadvertent mistake on her part for failing to collect dasti from Authority and requested for one more opportunity to collect the same. Further she submitted that as per her knowledge respondent no. 2 company has gone into solvency however she requested for an opportunity to support her



statement with some proof and sought some time to file proof in relation to the same.

4. Authority grants last opportunity to complainant to collect dasti for service upon respondent no.2 and file service report of the same in the registry of Authority, else the matter shall be decided on basis of documents available on record. Further she is directed to submit proof with regard to the fact that whether respondent no.2 company has been subject to insolvency proceedings or not.
5. Case is adjourned to **27.05.2025** for arguments.


CHANDER SHEKHAR
[MEMBER]


DR. GEETA RATHEE SINGH
[MEMBER]