



## HARYANA REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY PANCHKULA

Website: [www.haryanarera.gov.in](http://www.haryanarera.gov.in)

### COMPLAINT NO. 872 OF 2022

Lovleen

....COMPLAINANTS

VERSUS

Haryana Shehri Vikas Pradhikaran, Panchkula

.....RESPONDENT

**CORAM: Nadim Akhtar**

**Member**

**Chander Shekhar**

**Member**

**Date of Hearing: 12.05.2025**

**Hearing: 13<sup>th</sup>**

**Present:-** None for complainant

Adv. Arvind Seth and Adv. Shubham, counsels for the respondent  
through VC.

### **ORDER (NADIM AKHTAR-MEMBER)**

1. As per previous orders, case was adjourned for arguments,

2. Learned counsel for the respondent appeared and submitted that the complainant had earlier filed Complaint No. 1103 of 2019 titled *Loveleen vs. Haryana Urban Development Authority*, wherein the Hon'ble Adjudicating Officer passed an order dated 12.01.2022. In that order, it was held that the offer of possession was required to be specifically communicated to the complainant and could not be presumed. Accordingly, the complainant was awarded total compensation of ₹11,21,965/-. The respondent challenged the said order by filing Appeal No. 377 and 378 of 2023 before the Hon'ble Haryana Real Estate Appellate Tribunal. The Appellate Tribunal, vide its order dated 10.01.2025, accepted the respondent's prayer for remand and disposed of the appeal by remitting the matter back to the Hon'ble Adjudicating Officer for a fresh decision. Subsequently, the Hon'ble Adjudicating Officer, in a fresh decision dated 18.03.2025, held that Complaint No. 1103 of 2019 is not maintainable as it was not filed in accordance with Rule 28 of the Haryana Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Rules, 2017. The learned counsel for the respondent submitted that copies of the aforementioned orders have already been emailed to both the Authority and the complainant. He sought time to an application enclosing these orders. His request is allowed.
3. The respondent's counsel further submitted that the respondent was required to deliver possession of the allotted unit within three years from the date of



allotment, i.e., by 20.01.2018, as the allotment was made on 20.01.2015. The complainant had accepted the allotment letter and possession was duly offered in the year 2017. Extension charges were levied in accordance with the HSVP policy, and the complainant has not challenged the imposition of such charges.

4. Today, none appeared on behalf of the complainant.
5. In order to clarify the present status of the case and considering the request of the ld. counsel for respondent, the respondent is directed to place on record hard copies of the orders dated 10.01.2025 passed by the Hon'ble Haryana Real Estate Appellate Tribunal in Appeal Nos. 377 and 378 of 2023 and the order dated 18.03.2025 passed by the Hon'ble Adjudicating Officer, within two weeks in the Registry.
6. Case is adjourned to 21.07.2025 for arguments.

  
CHANDER SHEKHAR  
[MEMBER]

  
NADIM AKHTAR  
[MEMBER]