BEFORE THE MAHARASHTRA REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY,

MUMBAI

1. Complaint No. CC12504525

Ajay Ramdarash Yadav ... Complainant/s

Versus

1.Anil Thakurdas Kursija

2.Laxmi Developers

3.Trinity Oasis Cooperative Housing Society Ltd.

4.Thane Municipal Corporation ... Respondents/s

MahaRERA Project Registration No. P51700016602

Along with

2. Complaint No. CC12504360

1.Vidya Bhushan Prasad

2.Nanda Prashant ... Complainant/s

Versus

Trinity Oasis Cooperative Housing Society Ltd. ... Respondent/s

Balaji Construction Company (*as per email)*

MahaRERA Project Registration No. P51700008216

Coram: **Shri. Mahesh Pathak, Hon'ble Member – I/MahaRERA.**

Ld. Adv. Tanay Mandot appeared for the complainants.

Mr. David appeared for the respondent -promoter in both these complaints.

Ld. Adv. Sandeep Raman appeared for the respondent-society in both these complaints .

FINAL ORDER

(Order Pronounced on Monday, 22nd June 2025)

(Matter reserved for order on 16-04-2026)

(Hearing Through Hybrid Mode)

1. The complainants above named have filed these online complaint before the MahaRERA on 18-12-2025 (sr. no. 1) and on 09-12-2025 (sr. no. 2), mainly seeking directions from the MahaRERA, under the provisions of the RERA to invoke Section 8 of the Act and take over the remaining development work of the project by appointing

an appropriate agency or competent authority for completion of the project, or to adopt such other measures as may be deemed necessary to ensure its completion. The complainant has further sought directions for monitoring and supervising the completion of the project within a time-bound schedule; directing respondent nos. 1 and 2 to provide all documents, approvals, funds and necessary assistance required for such completion in terms of Section 8 of the RERA; directing the incoming agency and/or respondent no. 3 to execute an Agreement for Sale with the complainant and admit the complainant as a member of respondent no. 3; rejecting any application for extension of project registration under Section 6 of the RERA filed or proposed to be filed by respondent nos. 1 and 2; and revoking the project registration granted to respondent nos. 1 and 2, as prescribed under the provisions of the Real Estate (Regulation & Development) Act, 2016 (hereinafter referred to as 'RERA') in respect of the booking of a Flat No. 604 in S-3 Building (hereinafter referred to as the said flat), in the respondent no.1's registered project known as "**TRINITY OASIS PHASE II**" AND **"TRINITY OASIS"** bearing MahaRERA registration No. **P51700016602 and P51700008216** located at Plot/S.No. S.No.197, H.NO.16, NEW S. NO. 100, H.NO.16, OLD S.NO.198, HISSA NO.4PT, NEW S. NO.98, HISSA NO.4/B,, Taluka Thane, Dist. Thane (hereinafter referred to as the 'said projects').

2. These these complaints have been filed in respect of two different MahaRERA project registration numbers, namely **P51700016602** and **P51700008216**, both projects form part of the same layout and the claims, contentions, and reliefs sought by the complainants are similar in nature. Hence, these complaints were clubbed together and heard by MahaRERA on several occasions and were finally heard on 16-04-2026 respectively as per Circular no. 49 dated 12-09-2025 issued by MahaRERA for hearing of complaints through Hybrid Mode. Both the parties have been issued prior intimation of this hearing, and they were also informed to file their written submissions if any. On the said dates of hearing, both the parties appeared as per their appearances recorded in the Roznamas and made their respective submissions. The MahaRERA heard the submissions of both the parties as per their appearances and also perused the available record.

3. After hearing the arguments of both the parties, the following Roznamas were recorded in these complaints:–

i) **On 02-03-2026 :** (sr. no. 1)

"First Hearing Matter"

All the parties are present, except the respondent - landowner M/s. Laxmi developers. However, the said land owner has not been shown as a promoter in the project registration details. Therefore, at the outset, the privity of the complainant is questionable.

However, the respondent No. 3 - society and the respondent No. 1 - developer (Balaji Construction Company) contend that there is an area share agreement between the respondent No. 1 and 2, and therefore, the respondent No. 2 has issued the said allotment letter of December 2016.

Even the prayer of the complainant is not tenable, since the project registration has already lapsed in December 2024 and the extension of a project registration would be dealt with as per law by the MahaRERA.

Moreover, the complainant has filed this complaint more than 9 years after the said allotment letter of December 2016.

The society in the project has supported the complaint.

All the respondents, except the planning authority may upload the copies of the development agreement as well as details of the pending litigation before the Hon'ble High Court along with their replies, which may be filed within 2 weeks, i.e. by 16-03-2026. They may also file their replies on the issue of maintainability of this complaint, including the issues of privity, delay as well as the prayers. Further 3 weeks' time i.e. till 06-04-2025 is granted to the complainant to file rejoinders to the replies of the respondents.

The matter is adjourned to 16-04-2026 to be listed with the complaint NO. CC12504360 for further hearing and on the issue of maintainability of this complaint."

ii) **On 05-01-2026 :** ***(sr. no. 2)***

"First Hearing Matter"

"Both the parties are present. The complainants have not made the promoter in the project i.e. 'Balaji Construction Company' as a party-respondent in the complaint. Therefore, the complainants may do so within a period of one week i.e. by 12-01-2026. The complainants may also serve a copy of the complaint on the said promoter by the said date as respondent no.2. The respondents may file a reply within a period of two weeks i.e. by 26-01-2026 on the issue of maintainability of this complaint. The complainants may file rejoinders to the replies of the respondents within a further period of two weeks i.e. by 09-02-2026. This matter is adjourned to 17-02-2026 for arguments on the issue of maintainability of this complaint."

iii) **<u>On 17-02-2026:</u>** ***(sr. no. 2)***

"Both the parties are present. The complainants have already served the promoter in the project with a copy of the complaint. However, the promoter declines that he had received any copy. The e-mail was screen shared during the hearing. The promoter is imposed a cost of Rs. 1,000/- to be paid to the complainant before the next date of hearing. The society in the project has supported the complaint for transferring the project under Section 7 and 8 since the project is kept in abeyance and the project registration has also lapsed on 31-07-2023. According to the respondent - society, proceedings before the Hon'ble Bombay High Court have also been initiated by the said society, which have not attained finality. The respondent may file its reply to the complaint within a further period of four weeks i.e. by 17-03-2026. The complainant may file a rejoinder to the replies of the respondent within a further period of four weeks i.e. by 07-04-2026. It is expected that the society would provide details of the pending litigation before the Hon'ble High Court in its reply. The matter is adjourned to 16-04-2026. Needless to mention, both the parties may serve each other with the copies of the reply and rejoinder."

iv) **<u>On 16-04-2026:</u>** ***(common Roznama in both these complaints)***

"All parties are present (except the respondent no. 2 in complaint at Sr. No. 4(CC12504525). However, despite directions, the respondent - Anil Thakurdas Kursija (Prop of Balaji Construction), who has issued the said allotment letter, has not filed any reply to these complaints. Moreover, he has also not paid the cost of Rs. 1,000/- imposed in the previous hearing in the complaint at Sr. No. 3 (CC12504360). Therefore, the cost is increased to Rs. 2,000/- which may be paid to the complainants immediately by the respondent No. 2 in the complaint at Sr. No. 3 (CC12504360) (cause title may accordingly be corrected). The society which is the respondent No. 1 in Sr. No. 3 (CC12504360) and the respondent No. 3 in Sr. No. 4 (CC12504525) may serve copies of its replies on the complainants who may upload the same in the complaints. The remaining respondents are granted two weeks' time i.e. till 30-04-2026 to file their replies to these complaints. The complainants may file rejoinders to the replies of both respondents within a further period of one week i.e. by 07-05-2026. The respondent - society contends that it is in the process of withdrawing the proceedings before the Hon'ble Bombay High Court. Both the parties may file their written submissions along with their replies and rejoinders. In view of the above, these matters are reserved for orders as per the prayers of the complainants suitably after 07-05-2026 based on the arguments in the hearing as well as the reply, rejoinder and written submissions filed in the complaints."

4. Pursuant to the said directions, given by the MahaRERA both the parties have uploaded their respective submissions and said submissions are shown in the tabular format below:-

Sr. No. / Complaint No	Promoter's Submission – 1. Society's Submission – 2.	Complainant Submission
1. CC12504525	30-04-2026 – reply -1. 20-04-2026 – reply -2. 07-05-2026 – WS - 2	07-05-2026 - Rejoinder
2. CC12504360	20-04-2026 – reply – 1 30-04-2026 - reply – 2 – email	Not filed / uploaded

5. The complainants have filed these present complaints seeking various direction from MahaRERA as mentioned in para 1. The details of the flats booked by the allottees, dates of agreements for sale, dates of possession, total consideration and consideration paid are as per the table given below –

Sr. No. / Complaint No/Flat Details	Date of Allotment Letter Date of Possession	Total Consideration Consideration paid
1. CC12504525 604, Building S-3	16-12-2016 issued by the landowner i.e Laxmi Developer Not mentioned	Rs. 25,66,000/-, Rs. 4,00,000/-
2. CC12504360 1004 and 602 in Tower no. 4	23-09-2011 and 06-01-2012 issued by the Balaji Construction – promoter Not mentioned	Rs, 30,24,000/- each flat Rs.5,00,000/- each

6. It is the case of the complainant at Sr. No. 1 that he is an allottee of Flat No. 604 in Building S-3 of the project known as "Trinity Oasis", being developed by M/s. Balaji Construction Company and M/s. Laxmi Developers (hereinafter referred to as the "Promoters"). The project is registered with MahaRERA in two phases bearing Registration Nos. P51700016602 and P51700008216. The total consideration of the said flat was Rs. 25,66,000/-, out of which the complainant has paid Rs. 4,00,000/-.The complainant stated that the project was pre-launched in 2011 and that bookings and allotment letters were issued even before obtaining necessary approvals. According to him, the project remained stalled between 2011 and 2014 due to lack of approvals and, thereafter, various irregularities came to light, including alleged double sale of flats, diversion of funds, disputes between landowners and developers, and locking of the project site. He claims to

be a victim of double sale as another person with a registered agreement for the same flat has been admitted as a member of the Society. The complainant further stated that the project was registered with MahaRERA on 12-05-2018 and 25-05-2018 in two phases. Although Building S-4 has been constructed up to about 19 floors, Buildings S-1, S-2 and S-3 have remained incomplete and the construction has been stalled for several years. He also alleged non-compliance with Section 14(2) of the RERA in relation to the proposed utilisation of additional FSI. Since no Agreement for Sale has been executed and the project remains incomplete, the complainant has sought directions under Section 8 of the RERA for completion of the project through an authorised agency, association of allottees or competent authority.

7. The complainants at Sr. No. 2 stated that they are allottees of Flat Nos. 1004 and 602 in Tower S-4 of the same project. The total consideration of each flat was Rs. 30,24,000/-, out of which they have paid Rs. 5,00,000/- each. The complainants contended that the project was pre-launched in 2011 and remained stalled due to non-availability of approvals. They further alleged irregularities such as double sale of flats, diversion of funds, disputes between landowners and developers, unauthorised shifting of allottees from one building to another, and failure to obtain approval for revised plans proposed for utilisation of additional FSI. They claim to be victims of double sale as persons having registered agreements for the same flats have been admitted as members of the Society.The complainants further stated that the project has remained incomplete for the last several years, no Agreements for Sale have been executed in their favour and the promoter has failed to complete the project. They therefore sought directions under Section 8 of the RERA for completion of the project through an authorised agency, association of allottees or competent authority.

.

8. The respondent no. 3 Society, in its reply filed on 20-04-2026 in the complaint at Sr. No. 1, broadly supported the case of the complainant. It stated that the project was launched before obtaining requisite approvals and that construction remained stalled for several years. The Society further stated that it has filed Suit (L) No. 8055 of 2023 before the Hon'ble Bombay High Court seeking reliefs against the promoters. The Society submitted that it is neither willing nor financially capable of taking over the project under Section 8 of the

RERA. However, it has no objection if MahaRERA invokes its powers under Section 8 and appoints a competent third-party developer or agency for completion of the project. The Society also stated that the complainant appears to be a victim of double sale and supported the reliefs sought in the complaint.

9. The Society filed a similar reply in the complaint at Sr. No. 2. It reiterated that the project was launched without obtaining necessary approvals, remained stalled for several years and that the promoter failed to complete the project despite expiry of the timelines declared under MOFA and MahaRERA. The Society further stated that revised plans proposed by the promoter have not been approved and that instances of double sale are apparent from the records available with it. The Society contended that MahaRERA is empowered to invoke Section 8 of the RERA notwithstanding the pendency of proceedings before the Hon'ble Bombay High Court. It further stated that it lacks the financial and technical capacity to undertake the project and therefore supported the complainants' request for appointment of a competent agency for completion of the project.

10. The complainant at Sr. No. 1 filed a rejoinder and written submissions on 07-05-2026 denying the objections raised by Respondent No. 1. He contended that Respondent No. 2 had acted with apparent authority and represented itself as being entitled to deal with the subject flat. The complainant relied upon the Affidavit-cum-Declaration dated 18-05-2018 and the Supplementary Agreement dated 06-01-2015 to contend that both Respondent Nos. 1 and 2 fall within the definition of "Promoter" under the RERA and are jointly responsible for the project. Accordingly, he sought rejection of the objections raised by the respondents and grant of the reliefs sought in the complaint.

11. The respondent no. 2 (Promoter), vide reply dated 30-04-2026, contended that the complaint is not maintainable against him. He submitted that the complainant has impleaded Trinity Oasis CHS Ltd. as respondent no. 1, whereas no such society is registered in relation to the Trinity Oasis project. Therefore, according to the respondent, the complaint is liable to be dismissed for impleading incorrect parties. The respondent further stated that **M/s. Balaji Construction Company** was originally a partnership firm in which he was a partner and, upon retirement of the other partners, the firm was

converted into a proprietorship concern. He submitted that the development rights in respect of the project land were assigned to M/s. Balaji Construction Company by **M/s. Laxmi Developers** and **M/s. Siddhivinayak Enterprises** through Deeds of Assignment dated **28-02-2011** and **30-01-2012**, respectively. The respondent further stated that commencement and revised commencement certificates were obtained from the Thane Municipal Corporation for Buildings S-1, S-2, S-3 and S-4 and that construction activities were carried out until December 2015. However, in 2016, the original landowners allegedly locked the project site and obstructed the construction work. Thereafter, upon settlement with the landowners, the construction site was reopened. The respondent further submitted that revised plans were submitted to the Thane Municipal Corporation on **22-08-2017** due to changes in the Development Control Rules and that, in principle, approval was granted subject to compliance with certain conditions. The respondent stated that in 2021-2022 he attempted to secure financial assistance under the Special Window for Affordable and Mid-Income Housing Scheme, but the same was unsuccessful. He further stated that issues relating to missing property card records and other administrative difficulties also contributed to delays in the project. According to him, Building S-4 has been completed up to the RCC work of the 19th floor.The respondent further contended that certain allottees were shifted to alternative flats due to circumstances beyond his control and that execution of Agreements for Sale could not take place in some cases due to non-payment of stamp duty and registration charges by the concerned allottees.The respondent reiterated that the society named in the complaint is not associated with the Trinity Oasis project and, therefore, the complainants cannot seek membership therein. He further submitted that the project was adversely affected by the COVID-19 pandemic during 2020-2022 and that he was imprisoned during 2022-2023, which also impacted the progress of the project. The respondent further pointed out that the society formed by the allottees has filed **Suit (L) No. 8055 of 2023** before the Hon'ble Bombay High Court, which is presently pending. According to him, any action under Sections 7 and 8 of the RERA may prejudice the proceedings pending before the Hon'ble High Court. Accordingly, he prayed for dismissal of the complaint and for rejection of the reliefs sought by the complainants.

12. The complainant at Sr. No. 1 filed additional written submissions on 07-05-2026 reiterating

the averments made in the complaint and alleging violations of Sections 11 and 13 of the RERA. The complainant prayed for grant of the reliefs sought in the complaint.

13. The Society filed its written submissions on 07-05-2026 reiterating that Respondent Nos. 1 and 2 have failed to complete the project despite expiry of the stipulated timelines and that no valid extension has been obtained from MahaRERA. The Society further stated that the material on record discloses apparent instances of double sale and accordingly supported the complainants' case and prayed that the complaints be allowed.

14. The MahaRERA has examined the rival submissions made by all parties viz the complainants, the respondent no. 1 promoter and the respondent no. 3 society and also perused the available record.

15. In the present case, the complainants have filed these complaints against the promoter viz Mr. Anil Thakurdas Kursija in his individual capacity, M/s. Balaji Construction Company (proprietorship firm), society viz Trinity Oasis Cooperative Housing Society Ltd., and the landowner viz M/s. Laxmi Developers as respondents. Since the respondent numbers mentioned to these parties are different in both complaints, for the sake of convenience and brevity, they are hereinafter referred to as the **Promoter**, **Society**, and **Landowner**, respectively.

16. The complainants claiming to be the allottees of the said project, by filing these complaints under Section 31 of the RERA, have approached MahaRERA mainly seeking following reliefs under the provisions of RERA:- (The reliefs sought by the complainants in both these complaints are identical. Hence, for the sake of brevity, the reliefs are reproduced only from the complaint at Sr. No. 1.):-

"A. Invoke Section 7 of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016 and revoke the Registration under Section 5 granted to the Respondent Nos. 1 and 2 Builders.

B. Invoke Section 8 of the RERA Act and take over the remaining development work of the project by appointing an appropriate agency/competent authority for

completion; or taking any such measure deemed necessary for completion of the project. C. Monitor and supervise the completion of the project within a time-bound schedule. D. Direct the Respondent Nos. 1 and 2 to provide all documents, approvals, funds, and support necessary to ensure completion under Section 8. E. Direct the incoming Agency and/or the Respondent No. 3 to execute an Agreement for Sale with the Complainants and admit the Complainant as member of the Respondent No. 3. F. Be pleased to reject any application for extension of project registration under Section 6 filed or proposed to be filed by Respondent Nos. 1 and/or 2, and be pleased to hold that the Respondents are not entitled to extension in view of their wilful defaults, fraud, abandonment of project, and financial incapacity. G. Direct payment of compensation, if any, as deemed fit by this Hon'ble Authority. H. Pass any other order or direction deemed appropriate in the interest of justice."

17. The complainants herein have contended that they have purchased the said flats as per the booking details mentioned in the aforesaid table at para no. 5 mentioned above and have paid amounts towards the said booking done with the landowner/promoter(as applicable). However, neither an agreement for sale have been executed in their favour nor have they been admitted as the members of society, as the same flats have allegedly been allotted to other allottees, resulting in a case of dual sale. They further contended that the said project was registered with MahaRERA under registration nos. P51700008216 and P51700016602, and the same has remained stalled for many years due to alleged irregularities committed by promoter and landowner, including dual sale of flats, diversion of funds and project related disputes and the said project remained lapsed. Hence, they have filed these complaints for reliefs as stated hereinabove.

18. In the present case, the promoter has registered the said project with MahaRERA under the provisions of RERA. The landowner has assigned the development rights with respect to the said project to the promoter. The said society formed and registered by the allottees of the said projects.

19. The promoter has refuted these complaints mainly contending that these complaints are not maintainable as the society impleaded by the complainant (as applicable) is not

associated with the Trinity Oasis project. He stated that the project was delayed due to disputes with landowners, changes in DC Rules, approval-related issues, missing property records, financial constraints, the Covid-19 pandemic, and pending litigation. The promoter further contended that the complainant(as applicable), was shifted to another flat due to circumstances beyond his control and that the agreement for sale could not be executed as the said complainant had not paid the requisite stamp duty and registration charges. Hence, the respondent prayed for dismissal of the complaints.

20. The society has filed its reply/written submissions on record of MahaRERA to this complaint. The society although has filed its written submissions on record of MahaRERA, it has supported the case of the complainant. However, the promoter/landowner have not filed any reply/written submissions on record of MahaRERA.

21. In the present case, at the outset, during the course of hearing, MahaRERA has observed the specific issues regarding the maintainability of these complaints were raised, including the issues of privity of contract, delay in in filing these complaints before MahaRERA and the tenability of the reliefs sought by the complainants. Accordingly, all parties were granted an opportunity to file their submissions on the said issue of maintainability. However, the record shows that thereafter the matters were heard on merits and all parties were granted sufficient opportunity to file their respective submissions along with supporting documents. Therefore, although the issue of maintainability was initially raised, these complaints were subsequently heard on merits based on the available on record.

22. Be that as it may, in the present case, it appears that the complainants have relied upon an allotment letters as detailed in the aforesaid table at para- no. 5 above issued by the landowner/promoter (as applicable) and claims to have paid an amount of Rs.4,00,000/- and Rs.5,00,000/- respectively towards the booking of the said flats. Admittedly, there is no agreement for sale signed or registered in favour of the complainants. The complainants themselves have alleged that the said flats have already been allotted to some other person, and the said person has already been admitted as a member of the society on the basis of a registered agreement for sale (as applicable). Thus, the main grievance of the

complainants is that the same flat has allegedly been allotted to another person, giving rise to a dispute regarding ownership and entitlement to the said flat.

23. In this regard, MahaRERA is of the view that the complainants' allegations involve disputed issues regarding entitlement to the said flats, validity of the allotment letters, alleged dual sale and competing claims of third party over the said flats. Such issues cannot be decided in the present complaints under Section 31 of the RERA. Therefore, these disputes are required to be adjudicated by a competent Civil Court of law or any other forum having jurisdiction to decide such matters.

24. In addition to this, MahaRERA has further noticed that the said allotment letters relied upon by the complainants were issued on 16-12-2016 (sr. no. 1) and on 23-09-2011 and 06-01-2012 (sr. no. 2) and the present complaints have been filed only on 18-12-2025 and on 9-12-2025 respectively, which is after more than 9/14 years respectively. Further, no satisfactory explanation has been submitted on record of MahaRERA for such inordinate delay in approaching MahaRERA by the complainants. The complainants have remained silent for several years despite admittedly not having any registered agreement for sale in their favour. Needless to state here that in complaint at sr. no. 1 , the said allotment letter was issued by the landowner and it has not been shown as promoter of the said project on MahaRERA website.

25. In addition to this, MahaRERA has further noticed that the bookings of the said flats were done even before the issuance of the IOD and Commencement Certificate for the said project. This shows that, at the time of booking, the said project had not received the requisite statutory approvals and was not a sanctioned project. Despite this, the complainants chose to book the said flats. Further, it is also an admitted fact that the complainants had paid only a small portion of the total consideration amount and had not paid even 20% of the consideration of the said flats as per MOFA. Therefore, despite the passage of several years, no concluded rights were created in favour of the complainants by way of registered agreements for sale.

26. In these circumstances, the complainants cannot claim the same rights as those allottees

who have executed registered Agreements for Sale and substantially complied with their payment obligations. The facts on record show that the complainants had made only preliminary bookings and did not take further steps to secure their rights in the project in accordance with the provisions of the MOFA.

27. In addition to this, MahaRERA also noticed that the main reliefs sought by the complainants are revocation of the project registrations issued in favour of the promoter under Section 7 of the RERA, invocation of powers under Section 8 of the RERA, rejection of any future application for extension of the said project registrations, and appointment of an alternate agency for completion of the projects. MahaRERA is of the view that the powers under Sections 7 and 8 of the RERA are statutory powers of the MahaRERA, which are required to be exercised in accordance with law after considering all relevant facts and circumstances of the project. Such powers cannot be exercised by MahaRERA merely on the basis of the complaints filed by the individual allottees like complainants under Section 31 of the RERA. It is ostensibly because the such issues need to be raised by the society formed in the said project. Moreover, the society is not willing for the same as per the reply.

28. Moreso, the registration of the said projects has already lapsed and hence, the question of revocation of the same does not arise. Hence, any issue relating to extension, or any other regulatory action against the project is required to be considered separately by MahaRERA in accordance with the provisions of the RERA and the Rules and Regulations made thereunder.

29. In view of the above facts and circumstances, MahaRERA is of the considered view that the present complaints and the reliefs sought therein are not maintainable under the provisions of the RERA. However, the complainants are always at liberty to pursue their grievance about the dual sale before the appropriate forum under the applicable law.

30. However, in the present case, on a bare perusal of the webpage information uploaded by the -promoter it appears that the project registrations expired on 30-12-2024 and 31-07-2023 respectively. Furthermore, the promoter has neither uploaded the full Occupancy

Certificate nor submitted the Architect's Certificate in Form 4. This clearly shows that the projects have not yet received the Occupancy Certificate. Hence, promoter is also directed to take steps for seeking extension of the said project within 30 days from the date of this order failing which the promoter shall be liable to pay penalty under section 63 of the RERA if such default is brought to the notice of the MahaRERA.

31. With these observations and directions, both these complaints stand disposed of.

MAHESH DINKAR PATHAK
Digitally signed by MAHESH DINKAR PATHAK
Date: 2026.06.22 12:38:31 +05'30'

(Mahesh Pathak)

Member – 1/MahaRERA