

**REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY, BIHAR
IN THE COURT OF ADJUDICATING OFFICER, RERA, BIHAR
RERA/CC/422/2022**

Dinesh Kumar Yadav ----- Complainant
v.
M/s City GreensInfrastructure ----- Respondent

With
RERA/CC/459/2022

Navin Kumar ----- Complainant
v.
M/ City Greenss Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd. ----- Respondent

With
RERA/CC/466/2022

Umashankar Tiwari ----- Complainant
v.

M/s City Greens Infrastructure ----- Respondent

With
RERA/CC/467/2022

Jagdish Prasad Rewani ----- Complainant
v.

M/S City Greens Infrastructure ----- Respondent

With
RERA/CC/469/2022

Pradeep Kumar ----- Complainant
v.
M/S City Greens Infrastructure Pvt.Ltd. ----- Respondent

With
RERA/CC/536/2022

Rakesh Kumar ----- Complainant
v.

M/s City Greens Infrastructure ----- Respondent

With
RERA/CC/557/2022

Ashok Kumar Vishwakarma ----- Complainant
v.

M/s City GreensInfrastructure ----- Respondent

With
RERA/CC/590/2022

Rajesh Kumar Choudhary ----- Complainant
v.
M/s City GreensInfrastructure ----- Respondent

With
RERA/CC/477/2023

Neelam Devi ----- Complainant
v.
M/s City Greens Infrastructure and Others ----- Respondent

PROJECT: GREEN MANOR BLOCK-A

06/03/2026

PROCEEDING

Heard Shri Sumit Kumar, learned counsel for the complainants and Shri Punit Kumar, learned counsel for the respondent are present.

A petition dated 18.12.2025 on behalf of the complainants under section 39 of the RERA Act, 2016 is filed to rectify the order dated 09.12.2025 to some extent and modify the order by enhancing compensation amount by mentioning their flats number with Block and the total paid amount so that confusion may not be created by the respondents, as a chart annexed.

Learned counsel appeared on behalf of the respondent and stated that this petition is not maintainable either on facts or in law under section 39 of the RERA Act, 2016 as the petitioners have prayed to make substantive change in the order dated 09.12.2025, which is completely misconceived. The Bench has passed a reasoned order on the basis of consensus ad idem between the parties and there is no apparent mistake in the said order. He has further stated that if any dispute regarding the amount mentioned in Demand letter arises, the respondent is ready to accept the proof which may be produced by the complainants, regarding payment. The payment details made by each complainant have not been verified and admitted by the respondent, in course of hearing of the complaint case and as such if the instant rectification is allowed it would cause prejudice to the respondents. Hence, this petition is to be dismissed.

Heard both side and perused the record.

The plea of the petitioners is that as per annexures specific consideration amount is to be mentioned in the order dated 09.12.2025, whereas the order dated 09.12.2025 itself clears that the petitioners may produce their evidence (receipts) of the payment of the dues to the respondents so that rest amount is to be computed. The learned counsel of the respondent

himself has agreed to accept the receipts of the payment and on that basis, he is ready to accept the rest of the amount and this fact is already in the order dated 09.12.2025. So there is no need to interfere in the order. Moreover, the order dated 09.12.2025 was with consent of both parties and both parties were agreed on that date of order. In such a situation, there is no need to interfere in the order.

Considering aforesaid facts and circumstances, the petition of rectification is rejected.

Sd/-

(Vinod Kumar Tiwari)
Adjudicating Officer
RERA, Bihar