

REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY, BIHAR
Before the Bench of Mr. Ved Prakash,
Special Presiding Officer

RERA/CC/286/2025

Nitish Kumar Verma

....Complainant(s)

Vs

M/s Ghar Lakshmi Buildcon Pvt. Ltd.

....Respondent

PROJECT- Income Tax Residency

For the complainant:

Mr. Sumit Kumar (Adv.)

For the respondent :

None

22.05.2026

O R D E R

Hearing is taken up. Shri Sumit Kumar, learned counsel on behalf of complainant is present, but none is present on behalf of respondent.

2. Learned counsel for complainant submits that the complaint case has been filed for refund of the principal amount along with interest. The complainant had booked a Flat bearing no. 201 on 2nd floor, Type 3 BHK in Block -B having built up area of 970 sq. ft. along with a parking space on ground floor/basement in the project, namely, Income Tax Residency on 12.08.2019 for a consideration of Rs. 23,00,000/-. The complainant paid a total sum of Rs. 3,11,000/- out of two consideration Rs. 23,00,000/-. Learned counsel further submits that the respondent has failed to make any progress in constructing the building. He further submits that the project registration with RERA dated 30.10.2019 as well as its extension has already lapsed. Due to laches and failure on the part of the respondent, the project in question has not been completed and is also unlikely to be completed. Hence, the complainant has prayed for refund of the principal amount paid in lieu of booked flat along with interest.

3. On the other hand, there is no representation on behalf of the respondent. No counter reply has been filed on behalf of respondent. On 06.02.2026, one Sri Sujit Chandra Kesari, an authorized representative on

behalf of respondent appeared, but thereafter none turned up on behalf of respondent company.

4. Considering the submissions and arguments advanced by learned counsel for complainant as well as on going through the record, It appears that the complainant has paid a sum of Rs. 3,11,000/-/- to the respondent promoter for booking a flat no. 201 on 2nd floor in the said project. It also appears that no construction work in the said project been done despite the lapse of given time, meaning thereby that the said project is a lapsed one. It further appears from the plain reading of the complaint that the respondent promoter is not responding in positive manner to the query of the complainant regarding delivery of possession or refund of the paid amount. In such view of the matter, the Bench finds that the respondent promoter has adopted a dilatory tactic to deceive the complainant.

5. In the light of discussions made hereinabove, the Bench/Authority hereby directs the respondent promoter-cum-Director of the respondent company, Shri Rahul Kumar to refund the principal amount of Rs. 3,11,000/- along with interest within a period of sixty days from the date of passing of the order. The interest shall be @ 2% above the MCLR of State Bank of India, as applicable for three years, from the date of payment till the date of refund.

6. The complainant, if so advised, shall be at liberty to press other relief(s), if any, which are in the nature of compensation, before the Adjudicating Officer, RERA, Bihar.

With these observations/directions, this complaint case is disposed of.

Sd/-
(Ved Prakash)
Special Presiding Officer