IN THE ODISHA REAL ESTATE APPELLATE TRIBUNAL AT BHUBANESWAR

OREAT Appeal No.123/2025

Mani Tirumala Projects Pvt. Ltd. ... **Appellant**

-Versus-

Secretary, ORERA ... **Respondent**

For the appellant Mr.B.Subudhi & Ms.Devika Patnaik, Advocate
For respondent Mr.B.Nayak, Advocate

With

OREAT Appeal No.166/2024

Welcon Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd. ... **Appellant**

-Versus-

Secretary, ORERA ... **Respondent**

For the appellant Mr.D.M.Mishra, Advocate
For respondent Mr.B.Nayak, Advocate

CORAM :

Hon'ble Shri Justice P.Patnaik, Chairperson
Shri S.K.Rajguru, Judicial Member
Dr.B.K.Das, Tech./Admn. Member

O R D E R
12.06.2026

Both the appeals are taken up together for analogous hearing since the reliefs sought for in both the appeals are more or less similar.

2) The ***OREAT Appeal No.123/2025*** has been preferred by the appellant, praying inter-alia for quashing of the rejection of the refund communicated via letter dt.21.3.2025 (Ref.No.1822/ORERA) and direct the Respondent to refund the registration fees of Rs.16,14,461/- deposited by the Appellant under the earlier application No.ORERA 0924570093 dt.26.9.2024 to the source bank account or adjust the registration fees towards the fresh registration under ORERA 2.0 on 02.3.2025 vide Application No.PR250-3002.

3) Heard Mr.B.Subudhi and Miss.Devika Patnaik, learned counsels appearing for the appellant in OREAT Appeal No.123/2025, Mr.D.M.Mishra, learned counsel appearing for the appellant in OREAT Appeal No.166/2024 and Mr.B.Nayak, learned counsel appearing for the respondent-Authority.

4) The facts leading to filing of the appeal in nutshell are that the appellant is a reputed real estate promoter engaged for years in developing and delivering quality residential and commercial projects in the State of Odisha and other parts of India, committed to ensuring timely delivery, statutory compliance, and customer satisfaction. The appellant has successfully completed several large-scale real estate developments and enjoys goodwill in the market for its transparent dealings and adherence to legal obligations. The appellant had submitted an application bearing No.ORERA09224570093 dt.26.9.2024 for registration of its project ***"Mani Tribhuvan Phase II"*** under ORERA Version 1.0 platform by paying an amount of Rs.16,14,461/- as registration fee, as evident from the money receipt showing transaction details as per ***Annexure-1*** to the appeal.

5) While the application was under scrutiny, the respondent informed that ORERA Version 1.0 platform would become defunct from 19.2.2025 and advised promoters with pending applications to migrate or reapply under ORERA 2.0. Accordingly, the appellant submitted a representation dt.11.2.2025 to the respondent seeking either (i) migration/transfer of the existing application data to ORERA 2.0 platform or (ii) in the alternative, refund of the registration fees of Rs.16,14,461/- (Rupees sixteen lakhs fourteen thousand four hundred sixty-one) only for filing a fresh application under the new portal vide ***Annexure-2*** to the appeal.

6) Thereafter the appellant was informed vide letter dt.17.2.2025 (Ref.No.1189/ORERA) that its application stands withdrawn and rejected, with liberty to apply afresh under ORERA 2.0 as per ***Annexure-3***. Subsequently, the appellant applied for fresh registration under ORERA 2.0 on 02.3.2025 vide Application No.PR2503002. But the utter surprise and consternation, the appellant has been informed by the respondent vide letter dt.21.3.2025 (Ref.No.1822/ORERA) that it's prayer for refund was not permissible as withdrawal of the first application was not made within 30 days of submissions, in terms of Rule 3(5) of the Odisha Real Estate (Regulation & Development) Rules, 2017 (hereinafter referred to as the **"Rules"**) as evident from ***Annexure-4*** to the Appeal.

7) In ***OREAT Appeal No.166/2024***, the appellant has inter-alia prayed for (i) setting aside the impugned order of the respondent dt.1.7.2024 in rejecting the application of the appellant for registration of their project "Nature's Avenue" and the letter dt.3.7.2024 vide which it conveyed the order, (ii) to direct the respondent-Authority to allow the appellant, time required for submission of the approval of the building plan from the Khurda Municipality; and (iii) to direct the respondent not to forfeit the amount of Rs.8,60,283.00 deposited by the appellant for registration of the project, rather to use the same for the existing project "Nature's Avenue".

8) The brief facts of the appeal are that the Directors of the appellant company Smt.Kabita Dash & Ajay Kumar Dash are the owners of few plots of land situated under Dist.Khurda, Tahasil-Kurda, PS-Khurda under jurisdiction of Sub-Registrar, Khurda, and the said Directors being the owners of the above landed properties, wanted to launch a housing project namely "Nature's Avenue" through their in-house construction company being the appellant. Accordingly, a Development Agreement and Power of Attorney with the appellant was executed by the Landowners and thereafter, they applied to Bhubaneswar Development Authority (in short "BDA") for building plan approval and the BDA vide its letter No.25380/BDA, dt.24.7.2023 approved the building plan as disclosed from ***Annexure-A/2***. Thereafter, the appellant made an application before the respondent for registration of their project U/s.3 of the Act of 2016 vide application dt.25.10.2023. After submission of the said application, the appellant was asked by the respondent to make online payment of Rs.8,60,283/- (Rupees eight lakh sixty thousand and two hundred eighty three only) towards the fee for registration of the project, which the appellant made online into the dedicated account of the respondent on 05.10.2023 and the copy of the payment receipt has been marked as ***Annexure-A/3***.

9) The respondent upon scrutiny of the said application of the appellant found a mismatch of the area shown in the drawing and that of the BDA approval letter and required the same to be corrected in the BDA letter. Accordingly, the appellant vide its letter dt.5.12.2023 addressed to the BDA requesting for correction in the drawing and to give a revised approval duly incorporating the changes, as evident from ***Annexure-A/4***. The BDA accepted the application of the appellant and vide its letter dt.16.1.2024 asked the appellant to submit certain documents and affidavits, which the appellant submitted vide its letter dt.19.1.2024, as evident from ***Annexure-A/5***. After nearly one month, the BDA informed the appellant vide its letter dt.17.2.2024 that the existing proposal for revision cannot be considered under the same building plan application file and advised the appellant to submit the proposal for revision of plan afresh before the competent authority. The competent authority as per the new guidelines is Khurda Municipality. A cop of the letter of BDA dt.17.2.2024 has been marked as ***Annexure-A/6.***

10) Thereafter, the appellant made a fresh application to the Khurda Municipality on 29.2.2024. In view of such developments, since lot of time has expired, the appellant vide its letter dt.2.3.2024 addressed to the Secretary, ORERA, requested to get project registered on the basis of available documents and undertook not to take booking till submissions of the revised plan and/or alternatively to allow the appellant to withdraw the application for registration with a leave to apply afresh for the same project, as evident from ***Annexure-A/7***. While the appellant was pursuing the matter before the Khurda Municipality, the respondent vide its letter No.4577, dt.3.7.2024 addressed to the appellant for registration of the project "Nature's Avenue" is rejected by the learned Authority on 1.7.2024 and the copy of the letter dt.3.7.2024 has been enclosed as ***Annexure-A/1***. Pursuant to Annexure-A/1 the appellant vide letter dt.17.8.2024 requested the Secretary, RERA that the amount of Rs.8,60,283/- which has been deposited towards the fee for registration, either be refunded or retained on behalf of the appellant to be used at the time of considering the application afresh for this project and not to forfeit the same, as per ***Annexure-A/8***. Pursuant to letter dt.17.8.2024 of the appellant, the respondent vide letter dt.10.9.2024 informed that ***"once the application for registration of the project is rejected, there is no provision in the RE Act/Rules/Regulations to refund the fee deposited at the time of submissions of application***

or to adjust the said amounts against a fresh application for registration of the project." Copy of the letter dt.10.9.2024 has been enclosed as ***Annexure-A/9***.

11) Therefore, being aggrieved and dissatisfied with the order of the respondent-Authority dt.3.7.2024 and 10.9.2024 vide Annexure-A/1 and A/9 respectively, the instant appeal has been filed with the aforesaid prayer as mentioned in the preceding paragraphs.

12) Show cause has been filed by the respondent-Authority in ***OREAT Appeal No.123/2025*** stating therein that the learned Authority has passed a speaking order explaining as to how the appellant is not entitled to get back his money after lapse of statutory period. It has been inter-alia submitted in the show cause that on the application for registration of the appellant's project some deficiencies were pointed out by the learned Authority, which was not cured by the appellant. Since the appellant was not in a position to comply with the deficiencies as pointed out by the office, the appellant was willing to withdraw its application. The rejection letter further envisages that the appellant is at liberty to move a fresh application under version 2.0. Subsequently, the learned Authority vide its letter No.1822, dt.21.3.2025 has expressed its inability to either refund the application fee or adjust it towards the new application made under version 2.0 by citing statutory bar under Rule 3(5) of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Rules, 2017.

13) ***Rule 3(5) of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Rules, 2017*** provides that in case the promoter applies for withdrawal of application for registration of the project before expiry of the period of thirty days, registration fee to the extent of 10% paid shall be retained as processing fee by the Authority and the remaining amount shall be refunded to the promoter within thirty days from the date of such withdrawal. There is no law contrary or in addition to that specifically discussed. So, the hands of the learned Authority is tied and it cannot either refund the application fee or adjust it towards a new application made in respect of the same project for that would be in the teeth of statutory prohibition promulgated by the executive.

14) A show cause has also been filed in ***OREAT Appeal No.166/2024***. In the show cause it has been inter-alia submitted that the appellant requested to retain the registration fee or refund the same, is not tenable as per the provision of Real Estate(Regulation & Development) Act, 2016.

15) Rejoinder in the instant case has been filed by the appellant. In the rejoinder it has been inter-alia submitted that the learned Authority should not have rejected the application of the applicant without giving sufficient opportunity of hearing, otherwise if there were any defect in the approval given by the BDA, the learned Authority should not have asked the appellant to deposit the registration fee and should have returned the application for fresh submission. The action of the learned Authority has resulted in huge financial loss to the appellant.

16) It is also submitted that the purpose of the establishment of the learned Authority is to facilitate growth of real estate industry and not for enriching itself by imposing penalty or forfeiting builder's money deposited for registration. Therefore, the impugned order is liable to be set aside.

17) During pendency of the appeal, a memo has been filed by the appellant citing the case of the ***Rajasthan Real Estate Regulatory Authority : Notification Jaipur, March 14, 2024 and Goa Real Estate Regulatory Authority: Notification No.1/RERA/Regulation of GRERA/2020/07, Panaji, 6th October, 2021.***

18) Before adverting to the respective contentions as depicted in the appeal and the show cause reply filed by the respondent-Authority, it would be pertinent to refer to Rule 3(5) of the Odisha Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Rules, 2017.

"***Rule-3(5) of the Odisha Real Estate (Regulation and Development)Rules, 2017 : Information and documents to be furnished by the promoter for registration of real estate project.***

(5) *In case the promoter applies for withdrawal of application for registration of the project before expiry of the period of thirty days provided under sub-section (1) of Section 5 of the Act registration free to the extent of ten percent paid under sub-rule (3) above shall be retained as processing fee by the Authority and the remaining amount shall be refunded to the promoter within thirty days from the date of such withdrawal."*

On reading of the aforesaid provisions, it is crystal clear that the Rule has not contemplated and eventuality as to what would happen with regard to refund of the amount after rejection of the application of registration by the builder-promoter. The Rule is silent about refund of rejection of the application.

19) In order delve into the crux of the mater the relevant provisions of ***Rajasthan Real Estate Regulatory Authority : Notification Jaipur, March 14, 2024*** *are quoted below:*

"65. Administrative Charges and Standard Fees.-

(1) xx xx xx xx

(2) In the following cases registration fee, to the extent of five percent paid, shall be retained by the Authority towards administrative charges and the remaining amount shall be refunded online to the applicant in accordance with sub-rule (5) of rule-3 of the rules on furnishing the details of account:-

(i) rejection of application for registration of a project;
(ii) rejection of application for registration of a real estate agent;
(iii) rejection of application for extension of registration of a project; and
(iv) rejection of application for renewal of registration of real estate agent.
(v) rejection of application for map revision of a project."

Similarly, as per ***Goa Real Estate Regulatory Authority: Notification No.1/RERA/Regulation of GRERA/2020/07, Panaji, 6th October, 2021***, the following paragraphs are to be envisaged:

(6) The Authority has deliberated in detail the provisions under the said Act and rules and has decided to regulate the return of registration fee of real estate project and real estate agent as following :

(i) Return of registration fee in case of a Real Estate Project

(a) xx xx xx xx

(b) xx xx xx xx

(c) xx xx xx xx

(d) In the case of a real estate project where registration is rejected after hearing, registration fee to the extent of ten percent or rupees fifty thousand whichever is ore would be deducted. Such projects will be registered with charging fee afresh on furnishing required information/ documents.

20) Since Rule 3(5) of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Rules, 2017 is silent with regard to rejection of the registration application whereas the similar provisions have been made by the State of Rajasthan and State of Goa.

Therefore, the seminal point that falls for determination is as to whether the forfeiture of entire registration fee in the case of rejection of registration is lawful or it amounts to ***"unjust enrichment"***.

21) Learned counsel for the appellant in OREAT Appeal No.123/2025 submitted with vehemence that the impugned action of the respondent-Authority by illegal forfeiture and unlawful retention of the entire registration fee amount to Rs.16,14,461/-, deposited on 24.9.2024 is ex-facie, arbitrary, unreasonable, irrational, disproportionate and beyond the scope and authority vested under the Act and the Rules framed thereunder. Learned counsel for the appellant further submits that the appellant was compelled and placed in a precarious and impossible procedural situation by the respondent-Authority itself, which forced the appellant to withdraw the project application filed under the

ORERA 1.0 portal with liberty to file afresh in the ORERA 2.0 web application framework. The technical migration, deactivation and discontinuation of the ORERA 1.0 platform were unilateral administrative and technical decisions taken solely by the respondent-Authority. Learned counsel for the appellant further submits that the appellant cannot be penalised for a procedural impossibility and technical deadlock created by the Authority itself. Learned counsel for the appellant further submits that it is a settled principle of law that no party can be made to suffer for the fault of the Court or statutory authority. The learned counsel for the appellant further submitted that the respondent-Authority itself acknowledged the shortcomings and deficiencies prevailing in the earlier ORERA 1.0 framework and accordingly introduced substantial procedural modifications in ORERA 2.0. The respondent vide letter no.8649/ORERA dt.7.12.2024, specifically altered the process by providing that promoters are required to deposit only a nominal processing/scrutiny fee of Rs.5,000/- at the time of application submission and that the registration fee would be payable only upon the application being found fit for registration. The said direction was issued much prior to the impugned forfeiture and retention of the Appellant's registration fee and clearly demonstrates that the respondent-Authority itself was conscious of the unfairness and impracticality of the earlier framework. Copy of the said direction dt.7.12.2024 is enclosed as Annexure-C to the written notes of submissions filed by the appellant.

22) Learned counsel for the appellant further submits that Section 38(2) of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016 obligates the respondent-Authority to act reasonably, fairly and in furtherance of justice. The powers vested under the statute are required to be exercised to advance the object and purpose of the enactment and not to defeat substantive rights through technicalities. The refusal to refund or adjust the registration fee despite the peculiar facts arising from portal migration amounts to exercise of power in a manner wholly contrary to the object of the statute and therefore ultra vires the Act. Learned counsel for the appellant further submits that the public authorities cannot retain or illegally forfeit monies without authority of law. In absence of any completed registration or any fault attributable to the appellant, continued retention of the amount by the respondent-Authority is wholly illegal and unconstitutional.

23) Learned counsel for the appellant has referred to the progressive regulatory practices adopted by other Real Estate Regulatory Authorities, including the Goa Real Estate Regulatory Authority under the "Return of Registration Fee of a Real Estate Project and Real Estate Agent by the Authority Regulations, 2021" and the Rajasthan Real Estate Regulatory Authority Regulations, 2024 wherein refund mechanisms have specifically been incorporated to ensure fairness, equity and accountability in the administrative process. Learned counsel for the appellant further submits that the appellant is therefore, legally entitled to refund the entire registration fee together with interest. In order to buttress his submissions, learned counsel for the appellant has referred to in the case of ***Union of India (UOI) through Director of Income Tax Vs. Tata Chemicals Ltd., 2014 INSC 144, order dt.26.2.2014 (para 37).***

24) Learned counsel for the appellant in OREAT Appeal No.166 of 2024 has more or less adopted the submissions of learned counsel for the appellant made in OREAT Appeal No.123/2025 and he has also referred to the provisions of ***Rajasthan Real Estate Regulatory Authority : Notification Jaipur, March 14, 2024 and Goa Real Estate Regulatory Authority: Notification No.1/RERA/Regulation of GRERA/2020/07, Panaji, 6th October, 2021.***

25) In order to counter the submissions of the learned counsel for the appellants in both the appeals, learned counsel for the respondent-Authority has vociferously submitted that in the absence of specific provisions of refund of the amount beyond 30 days, the Authority could not have passed orders for refund of the entire amount, since Rule-3(5) of the Rules, 2017 envisages the situation of refund of amount only within 30 days of application for registration.

Admittedly, in both the appeals, the appellants have asked for refund beyond the statutory period of 30 days. Therefore, the Authority is bereft of its power to refund the registration fees or to adjust it in case of fresh application. Under the circumstances, the action of the respondent cannot be construed to be arbitrary or capricious, rather the same is justified under the relevant provisions of the Rules.

26) Reverting back to the pertinent issue, this Tribunal is of the considered view that it is the settled principles embodied in the maxim ***actus curiae neminem gravabit*** (an act of the court shall prejudice non one), that a party acting in good faith should not suffer due to acts or omissions of the adjudicating or regulatory authority. Since the Act, 2016 is silent, the State of Rajasthan and State of Goa have consciously provided for a partially deduction and refund mechanism, ensuring fairness to promoters whereas in the State of Odisha, Rule 2017 only speaks about the refund of the amount within 30 days of its application of withdrawal of registration within 30 days. So far as withdrawal of application for registration within 30 days, but beyond 30 days is concerned nothing has been contemplated in the Rules.

27) It is settled principles of law that silence in a statute does not amount to a carte balance for authorities to act as a they wish. The assumption of a power not expressly granted amounts to a **colourable exercise of power –** an act that appears legal in form but is ultra vires in substance. The Latin maxim ***expressio unius est exclusio alterius*** (the express mention of one thing implies the exclusion of another) applies squarely to the instant case.

28) Absence of such provision in the Rule cannot be construed in the wildest imagination to confer residual or inherent powers upon the Authority to forfeit the fees in toto. It would be profitable to refer to the decision of the Hon'ble Apex Court in the Case of ***Commissioner of Police, Bombay Vs. Gordhandas Bhanji (AIR 1952 SC 16),*** which holds that public authorities cannot act on dictation or assume powers merely because something is not expressly prohibited. They must act only within the powers explicitly granted by law.

29) The rigid and hyper technicality interpretation adopted by the respondents defeats the very object and spirit of RERA framework, which is intended to ensure transparency, fairness and facilitation of project registration rather than punitive enrichment through procedural technicalities. Rule-3.5 is intended to regulate ordinary voluntary withdrawals and cannot be interpreted in a manner enabling forfeiture of entire registration amount. Admittedly, the Rule is silent with regard to refund of the amount beyond the statutory period of 30 days. Therefore, the Authority in order to set right the difficulties raised by the builder-promoter for refund of the registration fees after rejection of their application, has thought it proper to issue direction U/s.37 of the Act. The learned Authority has decided to fix Rs.5,000/- only as processing fee to be paid at the time of filing of application for project registration as well as project extension without any fee towards facilitation charges or website maintenance charges being levied earlier. Only after final approval of registration and project extension, the applicant shall deposit the full fee pertaining to Regulation 4(1) & 4(3). This notification/ direction has been issued on 7.12.2024. Therefore, the Authority is well aware of the situation prior to 7.12.2024. Even in the absence of provision in the Rule, it does not appear logical that entire amount of registration fees can be forfeited.

30) Indisputably, Rule 3(5) of the Rules, are silent regarding withdrawal after expiry of 30 days period. Silence of the Rule, in our considered opinion, cannot be construed to confer unbridled and unfettered power upon the Authority to forfeit the entire registration fee of Rs.16,14,461/- in OREAT Appeal No.123/2025 and Rs.8,60,283/- in OREAT Appeal No.166/2024. We fail to fathom under which provisions of law, the entire forfeit can be effected. The Authority has not demonstrated any justifiable reason as to under what express statutory provision such forfeit has been made or nor the Authority has justified the rationale of withholding or retaining the entire registration fee. As per the normal practice a statutory authority cannot appropriate money just because the statute does not expressly provide for refund. The forfeiture of the entire registration money presupposes a power conferred under an authority of law under Article-265 of the Constitution of India, which reads as follows:

Article-265 of the Constitution of India : Taxes not to be imposed save by authority of law

No tax shall be levied or collected except
by authority of law.

Therefore, in our considered view that in absence of any specific provision of forfeiture in the Rule, 2017, the retention of entire amount can be assailable being arbitrary and disproportionate under Article-14 of the Constitution of India and the same can be construed as punitive in nature without any administrative and statutory power. Moreover, the forfeiture of the entire registration fee would also tantamount to unjust enrichment. So far as Rule 3(5) of the Rules is concerned, the Legislative in its wisdom has made provision for retention of 10% of the registration fee in case of withdrawal of registration within 30 days. Though the Rule is silent but forfeiture of 100% beyond 30 days does not stand to reason rather it would be manifestly excessive and arbitrary exercise of power.

31) We are quite mindful of the situation that the registration fee as envisaged under the statute i.e. RERA is usually regulatory and compensatory in nature and it is never a penal or punitive. Therefore, confiscation of the registration fee does not pass the muster of Doctrine of Proportionality. Though the example cited by the appellants in Rajasthan and Goa Real Estate Regulations/notifications are not binding on Odisha Real Estate Regulatory Authority but the same has got persuasive value based on rational nexus sought to be achieved on the anvil of doctrine of proportionality. No doubt Section84 of the RERA Act envisages that State can frame its own Rules but the examples of Rajasthan and Goa Real Estate Regulatory Authorities can be of some assistance while framing Rules in Rule 3(5) of Rules, 2017 to fill up the gap. Moreover, in such a situation a balanced approach has to be adopted by retaining a reasonable processing fee rather than 100% forfeiture. In the absence of any Rule, best course upon the authority is to exercise discretion tampered with reason to meet the doctrine of proportionality, fairness, non-arbitrariness, so that avowed of objective of RERA Act can be fulfilled. Moreover, there must be consistency in different Sate Rules under the Central enactment i.e. Real Estate Development Act, 2016. Otherwise that would result in analomous situation. Under the RERA Act, the Authority is a creature of the statute. The absence of Rule does not confer any right on the Authority to amplify power of complete forfeiture. Therefore, it is high time a calibrated and structured deduction system is adopted to subserve the ends of justice.

32) Further, where statute prescribes mode of retention the entire registration fee is impliedly excluded. It is apt to refer to Latin maxim ***expressio unius est exclusio alterius*** (the express mention of one thing implies the exclusion of another), meaning thereby when Rule 3(5) of the Rules, 2017 provides for retention of 10% of the registration fees within one month of application for withdrawal, the other mode of retention of 100% registration fee is impliedly excluded.

33) This Tribunal can well visualize the situation that after rejection of registration, certain percentage of registration fees may be retained and balance ought to be refunded to the builder-promoter. Otherwise retention of substantial amount to the tune of some lakhs of the appellant in both the appeals would amount to unjust enrichment by the statutory authority which is impermissible in law. Therefore, this Tribunal is of the considered view that the Authority may take a conscious decision in refund of the statutory amount by retaining 12% of the registration amount. Under the above circumstances, the authorities are directed to refund the entire registration fee by retaining 12% of the registration amount.

34) Before parting with the appeals, this Tribunal would suggest RERA to move before the appropriate Authority for insertion of the provisions in 3(5) of the Rules, 2017 may be at par with either Rajasthan Real Estate Regulatory Authority or Goa Real Estate Regulatory Authority and any other statute in vogue for calibrated, well structured deduction mechanism to fill the gap in the Rule in order to sub-serve the ends of justice.

35) On the cumulative effect of the facts, reasons and judicial pronouncement, we quash the impugned order and direct the learned Authority to refund the registration fee by retaining 12% of the registration fees in both the appeals.

36) Resultantly, both the appeals are allowed to the extent as indicated above.

The records of the learned Authority be returned back forthwith.

Send a copy of this order each to the appellant and the respondent-Authority.

Justice P.Patnaik
Chairperson

Shri S.K.Rajguru
(Judicial Member)

MP

Dr.B.K.Das
(Tech./Admn. Member)