



HARYANA REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY PANCHKULA

Website: www.haryanarera.gov.in

COMPLAINT NO. 792 OF 2022

Ramesh Kumar

.....COMPLAINANT

Versus

Vatika Ltd.

.....RESPONDENT

CORAM:	Parneet S Sachdev	Chairman
	Nadim Akhtar	Member
	Chander Shekhar	Member

Date of Hearing: 15.01.2026

Hearing: 12th

Present: Mr. Brijesh Singh, Counsel for the complainant, in person
Ms. Vertika H. Singh, Counsel for the respondent, through
VC.

ORDER (PARNEET S SACHDEV-CHAIRMAN)

1. Today, Ld. counsel for the complainant appeared and submitted that the booking of the unit in question was made in the year 2010 by the original allottee, and that an amount of ₹10,50,000/- has been paid towards the total sale consideration till date. It was further submitted that

the original allottee and the complainant signed a sale agreement on 14.02.2011. However, the complainants time and again visited the office of the respondent to get the said unit transferred in favour of the present complainant which was not done by respondent. He contended that the sale consideration amount was paid by the complainant to the original allottee vide cheques. It was further submitted that the complainant addressed written representations to the respondent and in continuation thereof, also issued a legal notice and lodged police complaint in the year 2021, however, no redressal was granted by the respondent.

2. Ld. counsel for the respondent submitted that the present complainant has no locus standi to maintain the complaint, as no agreement was ever executed between the respondent and the present complainant. It was contended that there exists no privity of contract between the complainant and the respondent no. 1. Ld. counsel submitted that in the present case, respondent no. 2, i.e, Mr. Pawan Kumar Chopra continues to be the allottee of the unit, who has failed to make the requisite payments, and that only an amount of ₹8,50,000/- has been received against the total sale consideration.
3. It was further submitted that there is no material on record to show that the unit was ever transferred or endorsed in favour of the present complainant, nor was any request made to respondent no. 1 by respondent no. 2 seeking such endorsement. According to the



respondent, the allotment continues to subsist in the name of respondent no. 2. With respect to the legal notice and police complaints alleged by the complainant, Ld. counsel submitted that the respondent no.1 never received any such communications, and that no proof of service has been placed on record to substantiate the said averments.

4. Arguments heard. Case is adjourned to 19.02.2026 for further arguments and consideration.


CHANDER SHEKHAR
[MEMBER]


NADIM AKHTAR
[MEMBER]


PARNEET S SACHDEV
[CHAIRMAN]