



HARYANA REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY PANCHKULA

Website: www.haryanarera.gov.in

1. COMPLAINT NO. 01 of 2021

Seema Gulati

....COMPLAINANT

VERSUS

Aegis Value Homes Ltd.

....RESPONDENT

2. COMPLAINT NO. 180 of 2021

Susma Rani and Anr.

....COMPLAINANT

VERSUS

Aegis Value Homes Ltd.

....RESPONDENT

3. COMPLAINT NO. 401 of 2021

Satpal Kundal

....COMPLAINANT

VERSUS

Aegis Value Homes Ltd.

....RESPONDENT

4. COMPLAINT NO. 402 of 2021

Rajbir

....COMPLAINANT

VERSUS

Aegis Value Homes Ltd.

....RESPONDENT

Handwritten signature

5. COMPLAINT NO. 509 of 2020

Rajesh Kumar

....COMPLAINANT

VERSUS

Aegis Value Homes Ltd.

....RESPONDENT

6. COMPLAINT NO. 649 of 2019

Mrs. Jyoti Chopra

....COMPLAINANT

VERSUS.

Aegis Value Homes Ltd.

....RESPONDENT

7. COMPLAINT NO. 721 of 2021

Navneet Kalia

....COMPLAINANT

VERSUS

Aegis Value Homes Ltd.

....RESPONDENT

8. COMPLAINT NO. 981 of 2019

Ram Kishan Madaan and Anr.

....COMPLAINANT

VERSUS

Aegis Value Homes Ltd.

....RESPONDENT

9. COMPLAINT NO. 1230 of 2020

Pawan Kundra

....COMPLAINANT

VERSUS

Aegis Value Homes Ltd.

....RESPONDENT



10. COMPLAINT NO. 1420 of 2020

Reena

....COMPLAINANT

VERSUS

Aegis Value Homes Ltd.

....RESPONDENT

11. COMPLAINT NO. 1598 of 2022

Sagar Arora

....COMPLAINANT

VERSUS

Aegis Value Homes Ltd.

....RESPONDENT

12. COMPLAINT NO. 2217 of 2019

Sajid Ali

....COMPLAINANT

VERSUS

Aegis Value Homes Ltd.

....RESPONDENT

13. COMPLAINT NO. 2299 of 2019

Rakesh Sandhu

....COMPLAINANT

VERSUS

Aegis Value Homes Ltd.

....RESPONDENT

14. COMPLAINT NO. 2851 of 2019

Sudesh Kumari

....COMPLAINANT

VERSUS

Aegis Value Homes Ltd.

....RESPONDENT

15. COMPLAINT NO. 2852 of 2019

Amit Kumar Mishra and Anr.

....COMPLAINANT

VERSUS



Aegis Value Homes Ltd.

....RESPONDENT

CORAM: **Dr. Geeta Rathee Singh** Member
Nadim Akhtar Member

Date of Hearing: 30.05.2023

Hearing: 5th (in sr. no. 11)

8th (in sr. no. 1,2,9,10,)

11th (in sr. no. 5,7)

12th (in sr. no. 3,4,14,15)

13th (in sr. no. 12,13)

14th (in sr. no. 8)

14th (in sr. no. 6)

Present: Mr. Nitin Gulati Proxy Counsel on behalf Adv. Vikram Rathore.
Counsel for the complainant in 01 of 2021

Mr. B R. Sarohi, counsel for the complainant in complaint no. 401 and
402 of 2021

Mr. Sanjev Gupta, counsel for the complainant in complaint no. 509
of 2020

Mr. Navneet, counsel for the complainant in complaint no.
721,981 of 2019 and 1420 of 2020.

Mr. Akshat Mittal, counsel for the complainant in complaint no.
2851,2852 of 2019.

Mr. Gaurav Chaudhary, counsel for the complainant in complaint no.

2299 of 2019

None in complaint no. 1598 of 2022, 180 of 2021, 1230 of 2020, 2217 of 2019 and 649 of 2019.

Mr. Sanjay Jain, Ld. counsel for the respondent.

ORDER (NADIM AKHTAR - MEMBER)

Ld. counsel for complainants appeared and stated that respondent has not not complied with the orders of the Authority dated 02.03.2023 as they have not paid the cost of Rs. 2000/- to each complainants till date. Respondent submitted that the director of the company is present to pay the cost to each complainant. During hearing Ld. counsel for the respondent had paid the cost of Rs.2000/- each to Adv. Nitin Gulati in complaint no. 01 of 2021, Adv. Sanjeev Gupta in complaint no. 509 of 2020 and Adv. Akshat Mittal in complaint no. 2851 of 2019 and 2852 of 2019. Since remaining complainants were not present physically therefore, Authority directs respondent to approach the complainants and pay the cost to each complainant within one week.

2. Ld. counsel for respondent apprised the Authority that reply in each case was filed in the registry yesterday only i.e. 29.05.2023. Perusal of order dated 02.03.2023 reveals that respondent was directed to file reply within three weeks time with advance copy to the complainants. Such actions of respondent in filing of reply one day before the date of hearing appears to be a delay tactics on the part of the respondent. Even on the last date of hearing, i.e., 02.03.2023 respondent had filed documents one day prior to the date of hearing, i.e.,




01.03.2023. Therefore, Authority deems it fit to impose a cost of Rs 10,000/- each in complaint no. 180 of 2021, 649 of 2019, 1230 of 2020, 1598 of 2022 and 2217 of 2019 payable to Authority within four weeks. In complaint no. 1 of 2021 respondent is directed to pay a cost of Rs. 25,000/- payable to the Authority within one week. In complaint no. 401 of 2021, 402 of 2021, 509 of 2020, 981 of 2019, 721 of 2021, 1420 of 2020, 2299 of 2019, 2851 of 2019 and 2852 of 2019 respondent is directed to pay a cost of Rs. 25,000/- each to the Authority within four weeks.

3. During hearing a few counsels for the complainants pointed out that reply which was filed by the respondent was received by them via electronic means and perusal of same reveals that they are just short replies of two to three pages. Therefore, Authority directs the respondent to file a written submission mentioning each complainant's unit and the project concern marked in layout plan and also to identify each project in licence granted alongwith layout plans and also to mark unit of each complainant in concerned project. Respondent is further directed to file an affidavit mentioning details of the project along with licence granted by DTCP.

4. Cases are adjourned to 31.08.2023.


.....
DR. GEETA RATHEE SINGH
(MEMBER)


.....
NADIM AKHTAR
(MEMBER)