



Real Estate Regulatory Authority, Punjab

First Floor, Block-B, Plot No. 3, Sector-18 A, Madhya Marg, Chandigarh – 160018

Before the Bench of Sh. Rakesh Kumar Goyal, Chairman.

Phone No. 0172-5139800, email id: pschairrera@punjab.gov.in & pachairrera@punjab.gov.in

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. Complaint No. | GC No. 0011/2024 |
| 2. Name & Address of the complainant (s)/ Allottee | Ms. Payal Luthra W/o Sh. Hrithik Sood R/o H. No. 309, Parmeshwar Vihar, Yaunanagar-135001.
Now at, Flat No.669Z2, Ground Floor, Silver Birch, Omaxe Phase-2, New Chandigarh, SAS Nagar, Mohali-140901. |
| 3. Name & Address of the respondent (s)/ Promoter | 1. M/s Omaxe Chandigarh Developers Pvt. Ltd., 10 Local Shopping Centre, Kalkaji, South Delhi, Delhi – 110019.
2. Sh. Bhupender Singh, B-16, 1 st Floor, East of Kailash, Delhi-110065.
3. HDFC Bank, SCO-153-55, IInd Floor, Sector-8C, Chandigarh (Attention:- Ms. Ailisha Nandal).
4. Sh. Jatin Jain, C/o Omaxe India Trade Tower, First Floor, Chandigarh-Siswan Road, Mullanpur-140901. |
| 4. Date of filing of complaint | 07/01/2024 |
| 5. Name of the Project | Celestia Royal Premier Phase 3C, part of RERA Registered Project Name "Integrated Residential Township Phase-3C" Residential Project developed on a portion of land situated at Omaxe New Chandigarh. |
| 6. RERA Registration No. | PBRERA-SAS81-PR0403 |
| 7. Name of Counsel for the complainant, if any. | Advocate, Sh. Bhanu Partap Singh, Sh. Vibhuti Naranja Counsels for the complainant & Ms. Payal Luthra, the complainant. |
| 8. Name of Counsel for the respondents, if any. | Advocates Sh. Ashim Aggarwal, Sh. K. J. Singh and Sh. Gautam Goyal, Counsels for the respondent |
| 9. Section and Rules under which order is passed | Section 31 of the RERD Act, 2016 r.w. Rule 36 of Punjab State RERD Rules, 2017. |
| 10. Date of Order | 19.05.2026 |

Order u/s. 31 read with Section 40(1) of Real Estate (Regulation & Development) Act, 2016 r/w Rules 16, 24 and 36 of Pb. State Real Estate (Regulation & Development) Rules, 2017

The present complaint dated 07.01.2024 has been filed by the complainant, Ms. Payal Luthra (hereinafter referred as the 'Complainant' for the sake of convenience and brevity) u/s. 31 of the Real Estate (Regulation & Development) Act, 2016 (hereinafter referred as the 'RERD Act, 2016' for the sake of convenience and brevity) read with Rule 36 of the Punjab State Real Estate (Regulation & Development) Rules, 2017 (hereinafter referred as the 'Rules' for the sake of convenience and brevity) before the Real Estate Regulatory Authority, Punjab (hereinafter referred as 'Authority' for the sake of convenience and brevity) **seeking delivery/ physical possession of the allotted unit along-with interest for the delayed possession** relating to a RERA registered project namely '**Celestia Royal Premier Phase-3C**' developed on a portion of land situated at Omax New Chandigarh registered with RERA in the project name of Integrated Residential Township Phase-3C (New Chandigarh Master Plan) in GMADA, Punjab promoted by



M/s. Omaxe Chandigarh Extension Developers Pvt. Ltd. (hereinafter referred as the 'Respondent for the sake of convenience and brevity).

2. The brief gist of the complaint is that the complainant, acting upon the representations of the Respondent Company regarding timely delivery, booked on 27.08.2019 a 3 BHK residential flat in the project "Celestia Royal Premier Phase 3C" forming part of *Omaxe New Chandigarh*, District SAS Nagar, Punjab, duly registered with this Hon'ble Authority under registration no. PBRERA-SAS81-PR0403. The Respondent Company thereafter allotted Flat No. CRPC/TF/450P11, on TF floor In Tower No.450P11 alongwith garage/ closed parking, having a super area of approximately 1955 sq. ft./ carpet area of approximately 1305 sq.ft. A Builder Buyer's Agreement was executed on 20.12.2019, whereby possession was contractually assured to be delivered on or before 11.02.2022. The complainant, under the construction-linked payment plan, has paid a total sum of ₹74,12,740/- inclusive of GST out of the total sale consideration of ₹77,02,421/- excluding GST, as contended by the complainant. The Respondent Company offered physical possession of the unit vide letter dated 11.08.2023 seeking an amount of ₹9,51,272.91/- which was disputed by the complainant. The complainant has availed bank loan facility against the flat. As per document placed on record, the bank HDFC has remitted an amount of Rs.4,65,005/- on behalf of the complainant to the respondent on 14.09.2023. There is inordinate delay in handing over possession which constitutes a violation of the Builder Buyer's Agreement as well as the statutory rights of the allottee under the RERD Act, 2016. The complainant has prayed that this Real Estate Regulatory Authority, Punjab may direct the Respondent Company to offer possession of the allotted flat forthwith and to pay interest for the delay from agreed date of possession till actual handover of possession on the amounts deposited by the complainant.

3. In response to the complaint, the respondent filed its reply on 17.02.2025 and contested the present complaint stating therein that the present complaint is misconceived and liable to be dismissed, as the complainant themselves are in default of their obligations under the Agreement for Sale dated 20.12.2019, executed pursuant to her application dated 27.08.2019 for allotment of 3 BHK residential flat in the project "Celestia Royal Premier Ph 3C forming part of *Omaxe New Chandigarh*, District SAS Nagar, Punjab. The complainant opted for construction linked payment plan subject to the condition of making timely payments of all installments. However, despite repeated reminders and demand notices, the complainant made delayed payments on multiple occasions, thereby rendering herself liable to pay the delay interest, as per Clause 5 & 7.3 of the Agreement. The allegation that possession was due by 11.02.2022 is denied, as the timelines stood subject to extension on account of the complainants' own defaults. It was further submitted that the period of completion stipulated under the Agreement cannot be treated as binding in view of the unforeseen disruption caused by the COVID-19



pandemic, and accordingly, the date of possession stands duly extended. The said allegations of unfair trade practice, misuse of funds, or mala fide intent are false, baseless, and defamatory, as the Respondent is a reputed developer with a track record of more than three decades across 25 cities. In view of the complainant's own defaults and concealment of material facts, no cause of action arises in her favour, and she is not entitled to any of the reliefs sought in the present complaint.

4. The violations and contraventions contained in the complaint were given to the representative of the respondent to which it denied and did not plead guilty. The respondent no.3 has filed its reply dated 11.11.2025. The complainant filed an application dated 27.01.2026 seeking permission to place on record the settlement deed dated 06.09.2023. The complaint was preceded further.

5. The complainant and respondent was asked to file the information in tabular form mentioned in Annexure-A and Annexure-A1 vide this Authority's record of proceedings dated 21.01.2025. The complainant filed Annexure A as per record of proceedings dated 10.11.2025 which was duly given to respondent whereas the respondent neither filed Annexure-A nor its comment on Annexure-A filed by the complainant & given to the respondent. The counsels of all the parties were present on 18.11.2025. It was observed as under from the record of proceedings dated 02.03.2026:-

Annexure-A had already filed by the complainant and a copy of the same also given to the other counsel. Both the parties will exchange their forms as per stipulation mentioned in 'Annexure-A'. The respondent is hereby given an opportunity to submit its comments regarding the authenticity, correctness and accuracy of information contained in 'Annexure-A' filed and shared by the complainant. In case, respondent does not submit the information in 'Annexure A', the information submitted by the complainant will be presumed to be true and correct.

5.1 The record of proceedings dated 02.03.2026 also shows that the same was repeated again in the presence of the counsels for both the parties on many occasions. Annexure A contains specific information about the property and the details of payments made. In absence of any response from the respondent, the undersigned holds the particulars of property and its payments furnished by the complainants being true and correct.

6. The representatives for both parties i.e. complainant and respondents addressed their arguments on the basis of their submissions made in their respective pleadings as summarized above. I have duly considered the documents filed and written & oral submissions of the parties i.e., complainant and respondents.

7. It is an admitted position on record that the complainants booked a 3 BHK residential flat in the project "Celestia Royal Premier Ph 3C" forming part of Omaxe New Chandigarh, District SAS Nagar, Punjab, duly registered with this



Authority under registration no. PBRERA-SAS81-PR0430. The flat allotted was Flat No. CRPC/TF/450P11, on TF floor In Tower No.450P11 alongwith garage/ closed parking, having a super area of 1955 sq. ft. approximately / carpet area of 1305 sq.ft. approximately, wherein possession was stipulated to be delivered on or before 11.02.2022 as per clause 7.1 of the "Agreement For Sale" dated 20.12.2019. However, there was a clause for extending time line due to Force Majeure. The Real Estate Regulatory Authority, Punjab has granted six months to all the projects falling in the period of COVID-19 pandemic. Therefore, the due date of possession is extended to 11th August, 2022 in this case. The total sale consideration of the unit was fixed at ₹77,02,421/- excluding GST, against which the complainant has paid ₹67,34,186/- till 11.08.2022 [Inclusive of six months relaxation due to covid-19] when the possession was due to be handed over to the complainant by the promoter. The offer for physical possession of the unit was made to the complainant vide letter dated 11.08.2023. The complainant did not take possession as she was being coerced by the promoter to sign the settlement deed so that the complainant can-not claim any amount regarding delay possession/ compensation. Therefore, this offer/ settlement between the parties did not mature.

8. The respondent, while contesting the complaint, submitted that the complainant herself is in default of her obligations under the Agreement for Sale dated 30.08.2019. It is contended that the complainant opted for the "Additional Down Payment/Additional Discount Payment Plan" under which a rebates were extended reducing the basic sale price subject to the condition of making timely payments of all installments. However, despite repeated reminders and demand notices, the complainant made delayed payments on multiple occasions, thereby disentitling herself to the said discount and rendering themselves liable to pay rebate along with delay interest, as per Clause 7.3 of the Agreement. The allegation that possession was due by 11.02.2022 is denied, as the timelines stood subject to extension on account of the complainant's own defaults. It was further submitted that the period of completion stipulated under the Agreement cannot be treated as binding in view of the unforeseen disruption caused by the COVID-19 pandemic, and accordingly, the date of possession stands duly extended. Clause 7.3 of the Agreement reads as under:-

"7.3 Failure of Allottee to take possession of Unit:- Upon receiving a written intimation from the promoter as per clause 7.2, the Allottee shall take possession of the Said Unit from the Promoter by executing necessary indemnities, undertakings and such other documentation as prescribed in this Agreement, and the Promoter shall given possession of the Said Unit to the allottee. In case the Allottee fails to take possession within the time provided in clause 7.2, such Allottee shall continue to be liable to pay maintenance charges as applicable.

On failure of a allottee to pay the installment as per schedule given in allotment letter, apart from paying the interest on the delayed amount, the possession of the Said Unit to be extended to the extent of delay in paying the defaulted amount."



9. This Authority has carefully considered the pleadings and submissions of both parties. It is undisputed that the complainant was allotted the unit in question on 20.12.2019 and that possession was offered as late as on 11.08.2023 that too with condition. The complainant have already paid a substantial portion of the sale consideration, i.e., ₹67,34,186/- out of ₹77,02,421/- excluding GST. The primary defense of the respondent is two fold: (i) the complainant's alleged defaults in making timely payments disentitle her to any relief, and (ii) the completion timelines stood extended due to the COVID-19 pandemic. While it is correct that delays in payments of installment may attract consequences under the 7.3 Clause of Agreement but such defaults cannot be used to justify a delay of almost one year in handing over possession, particularly when a major portion of the consideration already stands paid. However, the clause 7.3 cannot be interpreted for such minor delays to count the interest on day to day basis. A part of payment cannot be considered to delay for the whole project. The respondent, in its reply has not filed any document in its support that the project was stage-wise timely completed or intimated to the complainant. In the present case, not an iota of evidence has been placed on record by the respondent, as to what stage the development and construction places on the particular date & time when it was promised. It has not filed reports of any Architect/ Engineer at the site, to testify as to whether all these development/ construction activities are being undertaken and completed from time to time as per schedule or otherwise. It has a clause to delay the possession. It is held that charging of interest is sufficient in the given circumstances for delay period provided the respondent had furnished sufficient documentary evidence(s) in its support that the completion of stages of construction was on time. However, such plea can-not be accepted so as to hold that it has resulted in delay in handing over of the possession of the unit. Therefore, in the peculiar facts this part of clause 7.3 is not considered applicable in this particular case. The consequence of non-payment in such a big project, where the unit of the allottee is a small part, cannot delay the project to an extent that possession is delayed. There may be other reason for delay at the end of the respondent but this alone reason cannot be accepted as sole reason to entitle the promoter to delay the possession. The promoter has itself offered possession for a delay of more than one and half years. Therefore this plea is rejected.

9.1 As regards the reliance on COVID-19, the project construction period falls in the COVID-19 period. This Authority extended the period by 6 months for completion of project. Therefore the due date of possession after extension comes to 11.08.2022 instead of 11.02.2022 which was promised date of possession as per Agreement for Sale dated 20.12.2019.



9.2 Another dispute is on account of demand raised on account of increase in super area. As per facts, there is increase of 40 sq.ft. in the super area. The respondent has raised additional demand of ₹1,57,900/- (40 sq.ft.@ ₹3,936.43/-). The complainant has raised objection against this demand as well as the rate at which it was raised. Here, the respondent has a case. Rule 8 of Punjab State Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Rules 2017 permits additions and alterations to the extent of 5% in sanctioned plans without previous written consent of the allottee. In this case, the addition is only 2%. Therefore, the complainant is under obligation to pay for the same. However, the basic rate is the rate which was agreed upon at the time of agreement. It is observed that the base rate is ₹74,82,421/- for super area of 1955 sq. ft. Therefore, the cost of 40 sq. ft. comes to ₹1,53,093/- (40X1955/7482421) GST extra. The complainant is directed to pay [if already not paid] the same along-with interest @ 10.80% (i.e. 8.80% SBI's Highest MCLR Rate applicable as on 14.05.2026 + 2%) as per Rule 16 of the Punjab State Real Estate (Regulation & Development) Rules, 2017 from the end of month in which it was payable [16th September, 2025 (Date of Possession)] i.e. 1st October, 2025 till the month in which payment is made. In case, the promoter has charged and the same has been paid by the complainant, in excess of the amount determined, the same shall be refunded alongwith the interest @10.80% per annum from the end of month in which payment was made to the end of month in which the payment was made.

10. Since the construction has been delayed; therefore, as per provisions of Section 18 of RERD Act, 2016, the complainant is entitled to claim possession/ refund along-with interest as per its choice in case of non-completion on due date. The said section reads as under:-

"18. (1) If the promoter fails to complete or is unable to give possession of an apartment, plot or building,—

(a) in accordance with the terms of the agreement for sale or, as the case may be, duly completed by the date specified therein; or

(b) due to discontinuance of his business as a developer on account of suspension or revocation of the registration under this Act or for any other reason, he shall be liable on demand to the allottees, in case the allottee wishes to withdraw from the project, without prejudice to any other remedy available, to return the amount received by him in respect of that apartment, plot, building, as the case may be, with interest at such rate as may be prescribed in this behalf including compensation in the manner as provided under this Act:

Provided that where an allottee does not intend to withdraw from the project, he shall be paid, by the promoter, interest for every month of delay, till the handing over of the possession, at such rate as may be prescribed."

Accordingly, the delay is attributable to the respondent and the complainant is held entitled to interest for the period of delay.



11. The committed date of possession under Clause 7.1 of the Buyer Agreement was 11.02.2022, and accounting for the six-month COVID-19 extension, the revised possession date is 11.08.2022. The offer for Possession has been made vide letter dated 11.08.2023 after obtaining Occupancy Certificate which is a mandatory requirement before handing over possession. The construction delay is partly attributable to the Respondent, and reliance on COVID-19 beyond the extended period is not sustainable. There is a serious dispute over the period of delay. As per the complainant's version, the delay shall be from 11.08.2022 to 16.09.2025 when the complainant has actually taken the possession as the offer for possession dated 11.08.2023 after obtaining the occupancy certificate was laced with a condition to forego her legal right and the promoter was not ready to deliver the possession sans her nod to the conditions imposed by the respondent. The respondent has vehemently argued that the delay was at the most upto the date of offer of possession which was 11.08.2023 in this case.

12. The arguments on this issue by both parties have been heard. It is on the record that the complainant had paid more than 85% of sale price by the time the respondent issued offer of the possession was issued on 11.08.2023. It is also on record that the complainant was residing in rented accommodation and was repaying loan obtained from the bank. The complainant vide application dated 27.01.2026 has placed on record the settlement deed prepared by the respondent and provided to the complainant to sign at the time of offering possession. It is on Rs.100 stamp paper purchased by the respondent. The clause (f) of the said settlement deed proposed to be signed by the complainant reads as under:-

f) After execution of this Settlement Deed, the Second party undertakes not to claim any right, lien, interest, expense, right of purchase, delayed possession penalty, compensation etc. of any kind or nature whatsoever, from the First Party and/ or any other person(s) in future towards unit/ plot no. CRPC/TF/450P11 in the said Project;

12.1 The existence of this document has not been denied by the respondent. The complaint has been filed on 02.12.2024 and there was no mention of such a settlement deed to be signed forcefully. The said settlement deed was filed before this Authority on 28.01.2026 for first time. The promoter did not know, till filing of settlement deed that the refusal is due to this reason. It was stated orally by the respondent that it was optional and not forced upon any allottee. The promoter has not adopted any coercive measures to sign this document. It is seen from records that the offer of possession was given only once and later on demands of money were sent but no letter was sent again to take possession. The allottee has nowhere protested about signing of this settlement deed atleast in any correspondence, email or during proceedings till filing of application dated 27.01.2026. It shows that this document was not the main or sole reason for not taking the possession. There is no plausible reason for not taking the possession. The complainant filed complaint on



07.01.2024 although it was finally corrected and completed on 02.12.2024 almost after 11 months and a number of hearings before this Authority. Any mention of the coercion would have made the respondent to deny it and offer possession once again. The complainant can not take benefits of her own non-action. Both parties did not try to expedite possession and waited till the order of this Authority on 15.09.2025 fixing the time at 11.30 am on 16.09.2025 for handing over the possession.

13. The complainant has asked interest payable on ₹74,12,740.37 without mentioning the date upto which interest is to be paid by the respondent. The offer of possession was made vide letter No. CRPC/74 dated 11.08.2023 and the possession was to be taken in 30 days. There is no written reply to this letter by the allottee-cum-complainant and reason for denial for possession were filed in the complaint which was finally accepted on 02.12.2024 after removing deficiencies. This Authority does not find that the said settlement deed was being forced to be signed upon the complainant but one of the documents being given to the allottee at the time of offer of possession by the promoter. In absence of any email communication or document regarding the settlement deed signing compulsory by the complainant-cum-allottee, the failure to take possession after issue of offer of possession is considered to be on part of the allottee. **Therefore, the due date for offer of possession is considered as 30.09.2023 for the purposes of calculation of interest under section 18 of the RERD Act, 2016.**

14. The Respondent's failure to pay interest as per "Agreement for Sale" and further as per Section 18 of the RERD Act, 2016 constitutes violation of contractual and statutory obligations. The Complainant is entitled to interest from the deemed date of possession till actual handover or offer of due possession of the unit. The period for payment of interest will be considered from the next month in which the due date of possession till it is validly offered to the allottee by the promoter/respondent to the previous month of the date in which possession has been effectively handed over by the promoter. Therefore, the calculation of delayed interest is calculated as follows:-

Interest payable from	Principal Amount Paid	Interest Calculated till	Rate of Interest as per order	Tenure (Months)	Interest Amount
1	2	3	4	5	6
01.09.2022	67,34,186/-	30.09.2023	10.80%	13	7,87,900/-

The amounts i.e. interest due on delayed possession and balance amount payable at the time of possession, if any, are part of the same agreement and are enforceable together. The promoter is directed to adjust such amount against the accrued interest on account of delayed offer of possession. The principle of approbate and reprobate is squarely applicable.



15. In view of the above findings, the complaint deserves to be **Partly Allowed** and this Bench holds that the respondent has failed to fulfill its obligation of delivering possession within the agreed period, and the complainant is entitled to interest for the delay caused in handing over of due possession. Accordingly, the respondent shall pay interest for delayed possession @ 10.80% (i.e. 8.80% SBI's Highest MCLR Rate applicable as on 18.05.2026 + 2%) as per Rule 16 of the Punjab State Real Estate (Regulation & Development) Rules, 2017, on the amounts paid by the complainant, for the period from 01.09.2022 to 30.09.2023 which comes to ₹7,87,900/-.

16. The Hon'ble Supreme Court, in its judgment in the matter of *M/s. Newtech Promoters and Developers Pvt. Ltd. Vs. State of U.P. and Others (Civil Appeal Nos. 6745-6749 of 2021)*, has upheld that the refund to be granted u/s. 18 read with Section 40(1) of the Real Estate (Regulation & Development) Act, 2016 is to be recovered as Land Revenue along-with interest and/or penalty and/or compensation.

17. In view of the aforesaid legal provisions and judicial pronouncement, it is hereby directed that the above amount shall be recovered as Land Revenue as provided u/s 40(1) of the RERD Act, 2016. The total amount due towards delayed interest upto 30.01.2026 is calculated at an amount of ₹7,87,900/- and the respondent is directed to make the payments within 90 days to the complainant.

18. However, at the cost of repetition it is ordered in addition to the above direction and discussion in various paras, the following directions are ordered specifically for necessary compliance:-

- a. The Authority has partly allowed this complaint, holding that *M/s Omaxe Chandigarh Extension Developers Pvt. Ltd.*, the promoter shall pay an amount of ₹7,87,900/- to the complainant, Ms. Payal Luthra as interest for delayed period of possession which is from 11.08.2022 to 30.09.2023 under proviso to section 18(1) of RERD Act, 2016 within 90 days of this order.
- b. This order has determined the cost of extra 40 sq. ft. area at ₹1,53,093/- GST extra. The complainant has been directed to pay [if already not paid] or refund, if any extra amount already charged with interest. Similarly, if the complainant has paid extra towards this cost of extra super area, the same shall be refunded. The rate of Interest, in either of the case shall be @ 10.80%.
- c. The Authority has held that the determined amount of ₹7,87,900/- shall be treated as arrears of land revenue under Section 40(1) of the RERD



Act, 2016 and shall be recoverable through the competent revenue authorities in accordance with the Punjab Land Revenue Act, 1887.

- d. The promoter has been directed to comply with the order proactively by making payment and both parties have been directed to inform the Authority regarding any payments or adjustments made so that the same may be duly accounted for before initiation of recovery proceedings.

19. The amount of ₹.7,87,900/- as interest upon the delayed period, as determined vide this order u/s. 31 of the Real Estate (Regulation & Development) Act, 2016 has become payable by the respondent to the complainant and the respondent is directed to make the payment within 90 days from the date of receipt of this order as per Section 18 of the Real Estate (Regulation & Development) Act, 2016 read with Rules 17 of the Punjab Real Estate (Regulation & Development) Rules, 2017. The amount of ₹7,87,900/- determined as interest upon the delayed period is held **“Land Revenue” under the provisions of Section 40(1) of the RERD Act, 2016. The said amounts are to be collected as Land Revenue by the Competent Authorities as provided/authorized in the Punjab Land Revenue Act, 1887 read with section 40(1) of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016.**


20. **The Secretary of this Authority is hereby directed to issue a “Debt Recovery Certificate” after 90 days, for an amount of ₹7,87,900/- as interest on delayed possession, till the amount is paid. He will send the Debt Recovery Certificate to the jurisdictional Deputy Commissioner of the District being Competent/ jurisdictional Authority as mentioned in the Punjab Land Revenue Act, 1887 after 90 days of the issuance of this order to be recovered as arrears of “Land Revenue”. The complainant & the respondents are directed to inform the Secretary of this Authority regarding any payment received or paid respectively so as to take the same in to account before sending “Recovery Certificate” to the Competent Authority for recovery. **Further, Ms. Payal Luthra W/o Sh. Hrithik Sood is held to be Decree Holder and the Respondent i.e. M/s. Omaxe Chandigarh Extension Developers Pvt. Ltd. as judgment debtor for the purposes of recovery under this order.****

21. No other relief is made out.

22. A copy of this order be supplied to both the parties under Rules and file be consigned to record room.

Chandigarh
Dated: 19.05.2026




(Rakesh Kumar Goyal),
Chairman,
RERA, Punjab.


Endst. No./CP/RERA/PB/PA/Sec.31/764

Dated:-20.05.2026

A copy of the above order may be sent by the Registry of this Authority to the followings:-

1. Ms. Payal Luthra W/o Sh. Hrithik Sood R/o H. No. 309, Parmeshwar Vihar, Yaunanagar- 135001. Now at, Flat No.669Z2, Ground Floor, Silver Birch, Omaxe Phase-2, New Chandigarh, SAS Nagar, Mohali-140901.
2. M/s Omaxe Chandigarh Extension Developers Pvt. Ltd. through its Authorized Signatory/Managing Director 10, LSC, Kalkaji, South Delhi, Delhi 110019.
3. Sh. Bhupender Singh, B-16, 1st Floor, East of Kailash, New-Delhi-110065.
4. HDFC Bank, SCO- 153-155, 2nd Floor, Sector-8C, Chandigarh.
5. Sh. Jatin Jain, Omaxe India Trade Tower, First Floor, Chandigarh- Siswan Road, Mullanpur, SAS Nagar (Mohali)- 140901.
6. The Secretary, RERA, Punjab.
7. The Director (Legal), RERA, Punjab.
8. The Complaint File.
9. The Master File.




(Sawan Kumar),
P.A. to Chairman,
RERA, Punjab.