BEFORE THE MAHARASHTRA REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY MUMBAI

- SOURCE COMPLAINT NO. SC10000980
 Abhay Hanumant Kamat
- SOURCE COMPLAINT NO. SC10001173 Amit Kumar Ram Prasad Singh
- SOURCE COMPLAINT NO. SC10001174 Kishor Ravindra Joshi
- SOURCE COMPLAINT NO. SC10001175 Mr Ganesh Narayan Bhise
- SOURCE COMPLAINT NO. SC10001176 Mr Arun Shankarrao Mandade
- SOURCE COMPLAINT NO. SC10001178 Mr Deepak Pandurang Saidane
- SOURCE COMPLAINT NO. SC10001179 Mrs Anuja Chandrakant Chalke
- SOURCE COMPLAINT NO. SC10001181 Mrs Shravani Govind Bagwe
- SOURCE COMPLAINT NO. SC10001182 Mr Yogesh Ramesh Dhamke
- SOURCE COMPLAINT NO. SC10001183
 Ms Sarayu Madhusudan Bhamaria
- SOURCE COMPLAINT NO. SC10001184
 Mr Mahesh Sahebrao Patil
- SOURCE COMPLAINT NO. SC10001185
 Mr Sohanlal Dungur Jatav
- SOURCE COMPLAINT NO. SC10001186
 Mr Jayesh Kantiprasad Kashiya
- SOURCE COMPLAINT NO. SC10001187
 Mr Safrajussain Gudusab Nadaf

a wall

15. SOURCE COMPLAINT NO. SC10001188 Mr Sagar Ramchandra Bhagat 16. SOURCE COMPLAINT NO. SC10001189 Mrs Sunanda Bhimcharan Maghade 17. SOURCE COMPLAINT NO. SC10001192 Mr Ashok Keru Dhadwad 18. SOURCE COMPLAINT NO. SC10001256 Kanchan Kiran Prabhu 19. SOURCE COMPLAINT NO. SC10001257 Bharat Ransingh Bansole 20. SOURCE COMPLAINT NO. SC10001258 Suresh Dattu Jadhav 21. SOURCE COMPLAINT NO. SC10001337 Mr Subhash Laxman Ghuge 22. SOURCE COMPLAINT NO. SC10001338 Ms Sunita Bajayya Penta 23. SOURCE COMPLAINT NO. SC10001577 Prakash Pandurang Sawant Complainants

Versus

Harish Ranchodbhai Bhanushali

Respondent

Coram: Shri. Gautam Chatterjee, Chairperson, MahaRERA

Complainant nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 13, and 16 were themselves present a/w Mr. Avinash Sangurdekar, Adv.

Complainant nos. 6, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, and 20 did not appear. Respondent did not appear.

Order (Ex-parte)

August 02, 2019

I war

- 1. The present complaints pertain to non-registration of a stalled project named 'Riel Heights Project' situated at Manda, Taluka: Kalyan, District: Thane 421605. The Complainants have stated that they are allottees of the said proposed project via agreements for sale/ allotment letters/booking applications since the year 2011 onward. They further stated, that even after paying a substantial consideration amount, construction work of the project has not been completed till date. It is the contention of the Complainants that though the Respondent is under obligation to register the project in accordance with the provisions of Real Estate (Regulation & Development) Act, 2016 (herein after referred to as the said Act), he has not registered the same and therefore they are praying that appropriate directions be issued to the Respondent to register the project.
- The Respondent did not appear, in spite service of notice to the address provided by the Complainants.
- 3. During the course of the hearing, the learned counsel for the Complainants further made submissions, that the project is stalled due to various reasons. They stated that the project comprises of 4 wings, for which the valid approvals have lapsed, and the Respondent has failed to revalidate it. Also, the project has encumbrances by way of a mortgage to a financial institution (DHFL), and unpaid heavy dues to the competent planning Authority (i.e. KDMC). Moreover, they mentioned that the Promoter is having disputes not only with the other Partners, but also, with the Promoter/Landowners of the project. Finally, they stated that, on grounds of diversion of funds, a complaint has been registered against the Respondent with the Economic Offences Wing.
- 4. On the background explained above, it is necessary to consider whether the respondent can be directed to register the project in accordance with the provisions of the said Act and rules and regulations made thereunder.
- 5. As per section 4 of the said Act, it is obligatory on the part of the promoter to make an application to the Authority for registration of the Real Estate Project in such a manner and within such time and accompanied by such fee as may be specified by the regulations made by the Authority. As per Section 4(2) (c) and (d) of the said Act, it is

A next

obligatory on the part of the promoter to enclose along with the application for registration, the authenticated copy of the approvals and commencement certificate, sanctioned plan, layout plan, etc. from the competent authority.

6. Since the Respondent does not have approvals as mentioned above in para 5, no directions can be issued to the Respondent to register the project, at this stage. However, the Respondent shall apply for MahaRERA registration within 30 days of them obtaining the valid approvals for the project.

7. It was also explained that as stated in Para 86 of the judgment of Hon'ble Bombay High Court in Writ Petiton No. 2737/- U Neelkamal Realtors. Vs. Union of India, RERA will apply after getting the project registered. Therefore, merits of the other grievances made by the Complainants have not been gone into. The Complainants have the liberty to raise the same in an appropriate forum.

8. In view of the above, the complaints for registration of the project stands disposed of.

(Gautam Chatterjee) Chairperson, MahaRERA