

**BEFORE THE HARYANA REAL ESTATE APPELLATE TRIBUNAL**

---

**CM No. 944 of 2026 in/and**

**Appeal No. 131 of 2026**

**Date of Decision: May 01,2026**

M/s DLF Limited through its Authorized Representative Sh. Vinod Kumar, aged about 54 years S/o D. N. Jha, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Shopping Mall, Arjun Marg, Phase-I, DLF City, Gurugram-122002

Appellant.

Versus

Sh. Gautam Rana, Plot No. 38, Behind Uncover Restaurant, Sector 12A, Dwarka, Delhi-110075

Respondent

**CORAM:**

**Justice Rajan Gupta  
Dinesh Singh Chauhan**

**Chairman  
Member (Technical)**

Present : Mr. Vansh Vohra, Advocate for the appellant.

**ORDER:**

**RAJAN GUPTA, CHAIRMAN**

In the accompanying appeal, challenge has been made to order dated 01.08.2025, passed by the Authority<sup>1</sup> operative part whereof reads as under:

***“G. Directions of the authority***

*22. Hence, the authority hereby passes this order and issues the following directions under section 37 of the Act to ensure compliance of obligations cast upon the promoter as per the function entrusted to the authority under section 34(f):*

---

<sup>1</sup> Haryana Real Estate Regulatory Authority, Gurugram

CM No. 944 of 2026 in/and  
Appeal No. 131 of 2026

*i. The respondent/builder is directed to refund the deposited amount in both the cases after deducting 10% of the sale consideration along with an interest @ 10.90% on such balance amount, from the date of termination/cancellation till the actual date of refund of the amount within the timelines provided in rule 16 of the Haryana Rules 2017 ibid.*

*ii. A period of 90 days is given to the respondent to comply with the directions given in this order and failing which legal consequences would follow.*

*23. This decision shall mutatis mutandis apply to cases mentioned in para 3 of this order.*

*24. Complaints stands disposed of.*

*25. Files be consigned to registry.”*

2. The appeal is accompanied with an application seeking waiver/exemption from the pre-deposit required to be made along with the appeal in view of proviso to Section 43(5) of the Act<sup>2</sup>.

3. Counsel for the promoter primarily contended that it has challenged the impugned order on the ground that the respondent-allottee himself was in breach of contractual obligations under BBA having failed to adhere to the agreed payment schedule despite repeated reminders and ultimately the allotment was cancelled on 20.09.2023. The question of making pre-deposit while challenging such an order would not arise.

4. On 02.04.2026, report was sought from the Registry whether the promoter is liable to make the pre-deposit.

---

<sup>2</sup> The Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016

CM No. 944 of 2026 in/and  
Appeal No. 131 of 2026

5. As per report from the Registry, the appellant-promoter is required to deposit Rs.73,26,417/-.

6. We have heard learned counsel for the appellant.

7. The promoter is posing a challenge to the order, whereby it has been directed to refund the amount after deducting 10% of the sale consideration along with an interest @10.90% on balance amount. The order was passed on 01.08.2025. Same has been impugned after a delay of 103 days. Delayed possession charges would be payable as order of the Authority remained in operation during that period. Pre-deposit has been calculated by the Registry accordingly. It needs to be kept in mind that the party, who is aggrieved by the order, has to make the pre-deposit. In the instant case, only the promoter has preferred the appeal. Thus, the mandatory provision of pre-deposit has to be complied with. In case, the allottee is aggrieved, he is also at liberty to file an appeal, however in his case, provision for pre-deposit is not there in the Act.

8. The question of condonation of delay etc. falls for consideration only where appeal is accompanied with the requisite pre-deposit, however, same has not been made. An appeal, which is not accompanied with the pre-deposit deserves outright dismissal. Challenge on the ground that the order is unsustainable, can only be considered if the appeal is found to be maintainable.

9. In view of law laid down in **M/s Newtech Promoters and Developers Pvt. Ltd. v. State of UP, 2022(1) RCR (Civil) 367**, it is not possible to entertain an appeal which is not

CM No. 944 of 2026 in/and  
Appeal No. 131 of 2026

accompanied by the requisite pre-deposit. There is no provision for waiver or exemption of pre-deposit. Relevant paragraphs of the judgment are reproduced hereunder for ready reference:

*“122. It may straightaway be noticed that Section 43(5) of the Act envisages the filing of an appeal before the appellate tribunal against the order of an authority or the adjudicating officer by any person aggrieved and where the promoter intends to appeal against an order of authority or adjudicating officer against imposition of penalty, the promoter has to deposit at least 30 per cent of the penalty amount or such higher amount as may be directed by the appellate tribunal. Where the appeal is against any other order which involves the return of the amount to the allottee, the promoter is under obligation to deposit with the appellate tribunal the total amount to be paid to the allottee, which includes interest and compensation imposed on him, if any, or with both, as the case may be, before the appeal is to be instituted.”*

*123. The plea advanced by the learned counsel for the appellants is that substantive right of appeal against an order of authority/adjudicating officer cannot remain dependent on fulfilment of pre-deposit which is otherwise onerous on the builders alone and only the builders/promoters who are in appeal are required to make the pre-deposit to get the appeal entertained by the Appellate Tribunal is discriminatory amongst the stakeholders as defined under the provisions of the Act.*

xxxx xxx

*125. The submission in the first blush appears to be attractive but is not sustainable in law for the reason that a perusal of scheme of the Act makes it clear that the limited rights and duties are provided on the shoulders of the allottees under Section 19 of the Act*

CM No. 944 of 2026 in/and  
Appeal No. 131 of 2026

*at a given time, several onerous duties and obligations have been imposed on the promoters i.e. registration, duties of promoters, obligations of promoters, adherence to sanctioned plans, insurance of real estate, payment of penalty, interest and compensation, etc. under Chapters III and VIII of the Act 2016. This classification between consumers and promoters is based upon the intelligible differentia between the rights, duties and obligations cast upon the allottees/home buyers and the promoters and is in furtherance of the object and purpose of the Act to protect the interest of the consumers vis-a-viz., the promoters in the real estate sector. The promoters and allottees are distinctly identifiable, separate class of persons having been differently and separately dealt with under the various provisions of the Act.”*

10. In view of the above, it is evident that there is no scope for hearing the appeal on merits, as the same is not maintainable due to lack of pre-deposit. The same is hereby dismissed with no order as to costs. However, the appellant-promoter would be at liberty to seek revival of the appeal in case it makes the pre-deposit within one month from today.

11. Consequently, the accompanying applications are also dismissed.

12. Copy of this order be sent to the parties/their counsel and the Authority.

13. File be consigned to records.

Justice Rajan Gupta,  
Chairman,  
Haryana Real Estate Appellate Tribunal

Dinesh Singh Chauhan  
Member (Technical)

May 01 ,2026/mk

CM No. 944 of 2026 in/and  
Appeal No. 131 of 2026