IN THE KARNATAKA REAL ESTATE APPELATE TRIBUNAL, BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 20th DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2020

PRESENT

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE B SREENIVASE GOWDA, CHAIRMAN

AND

HON'BLE SRI K P DINESH, JUDICIAL MEMBER

APPEAL (K-REAT) NO.53/2020

(OLD RERA. APL No. 55 of 2019)

BETWEEN:

M/s Unishire Skyscapes LLP,
A Limited Liability Partnership concern,
Having its registered office at
No.36, Railway Parallel Road,
Nehru Nagar,
Kumara Park West,
Bengaluru – 560 020
Rep. by its Designated Partner
Sri N Suhas,
S/o S Narayana Gowda,
Aged about 41 years **:APPELLANT**

(By G S Venkat Subbarao, Adv)

AND

1. The Karnataka Real
Estate Regulatory Authority
2nd floor, sliver Jubliee Block ,
Unity Building, CSI Compound,
3rd Cross, Mission Road,
Bengaluru-560 027
Represented by its Secretary.

NOT AN OFFICIAL COPY

2. Mr Avinash S
S/o. Mr B Sivansubramanian
Aged about 33 years,
R/a: No.5, Paramount Regency,
Flat No. 003, Hennur Main Road,
Jyothi School, Kacharakanahalli,
Bengaluru – 560 084.

:RESPONDENTS

(Sri M V Prashanth Advocate for Respondent-1)

This Appeal is filed under Section 44 of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016 before the Karnataka Appellate Tribunal, Bengaluru, to set aside the order dated 19th January 2019 in CMP/180129/0000428 passed by the Adjudicating Officer, RERA Respondent-1. This appeal was transferred to this Tribunal on 02.01.2020 and renumbered as Appeal No.(K-REAT) 53/2020.

This appeal coming on for orders this day, the Chairman, made the following:

JUDGMENT

As there was no representation for the appellant on 3.1.2020, the appeal was adjourned to 21.1.2020, as a last chance for compliance of office objections. Even on 21.1.2020, there was no representation for the appellant. Therefore, the appeal was adjourned to today giving one more opportunity to the appellant to comply office objections with a condition that failing to comply office objections before this day, why appeal should not be dismissed for non-prosecution and further directed the office to intimate the said facts to the appellant and his counsel. Accordingly, office has

NOT AN OFFICIAL COPY

intimated the same to the appellant's counsel over phone as well as by e-mail, as could be seen from the records. In spite of that, neither the office objections have been complied with nor there is no representation for the appellant.

Hence, the appeal is dismissed both for non-prosecution and for non-compliance of office objections.

Sd/-
HON'BLE CHAIRMAN

Sd/-
HON'BLE JUDICIAL MEMBER

NOT AN OFFICIAL COPY