



REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY, BIHAR

Before the Single Bench of Hon'ble Chairman Mr. Vivek Kumar Singh,
RERA, Bihar.

RERA/Exe/136/2025

RERA/CC/133/2024

Amit Abhinandan, Tripti Rani, Alok Kumar
Mallick, Mamta Kumari

.... Executant/Complainant

Vs

M/s Palviraj Construction Pvt. Ltd.

....Respondent

Project: **MUMBAI RESIDENCY, BLOLCK 9(H) AND 10 (1)**

Present: For Complainant: Mr. Satish Kumar (husband of the
complainant).

For Respondent : None.

25.06.2026

ORDER

1. Hearing taken up. Mr. Satish Kumar (husband of Mrs. Mamta Kumari, complainant) appears on behalf of the complainant. Nobody appears on behalf of the respondent.
2. Mr. Satish Kumar (husband of Mrs. Mamta Kumari) informs that all the complainants have received the entire principal amount.
3. This execution case has been filed for compliance of the order dated 02.05.2025 passed in RERA/CC/133/2023 in which the Authority had directed the respondent company and its directors to refund the principal amount of Rs.3,50,000/- to the complainant/ executant Mrs. Tripti Rani, Rs.1,51,000/- to the complainant Mrs. Mamta Kumari, Rs.1,99,000/- to the complainant, Sri Alok Kumar Mallick and further principal amount of Rs.1,99,000/- to the complainants Sri Amit Abhinandan and Puja along with an interest at 2% above marginal cost of fund-based lending rate (MCLR) of the State Bank of India (as applicable) on the date on which the amount becomes due till the date of payment, within sixty days of issuance of order.
4. Learned counsel for the complainant submits while the complainant has received the principal amount now he wants the interest on the principal amount to be refunded to him.

5. It is evident that as per order dated 02.05.2025 passed in the original Complaint Case all the principal amount of the complainants as mentioned above was to be refunded back by the respondent to the complainant. As per the records of the case, the same amount has been refunded back by the respondent. Yet, there exists conflict regarding the interest on principal amount which ought to be adjudicated under PDR Act.
6. Hence, for expeditious justice, the Authority is compelled to pass an order for the recovery of the interest amount, as the respondent cannot be allowed to prolong the matter indefinitely.
7. The Authority directs that in order to recover the interest on principal amount mentioned in the order dated 02.05.2025, a certificate of Public Demand Recovery be issued under Section 40(1) of the RERA Act, 2016, read with Rule 25 of the Bihar Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Rules, 2017, and Section 4/5 of the Bihar and Orissa Public Demand Recovery Act, 1914.
8. A copy of the order be sent to the Collector, Patna for recovery of the aforesaid amounts.

Accordingly, this matter stands disposed of.

Sd/-

(Vivek Kumar Singh)

Chairman