

**IN THE KARNATAKA REAL ESTATE APPELATE TRIBUNAL,  
BENGALURU**

**DATED THIS THE 6<sup>th</sup> DAY OF OCTOBER 2020**

**PRESENT**

**HON'BLE SRI K P DINESH, JUDICIAL MEMBER**

**AND**

**HON'BLE SRI P S SOMASHEKAR, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER**

**APPEAL (K-REAT) NO.180/2020**

**(OLD RERA. APL No. 251 of 2019)**

**BETWEEN:**

M/s NHDPL Properties Pvt. Ltd,  
Earlier Nitesh Housing Developers Pvt. Ltd,  
Having its registered office at  
No.110, Andrews Building, M.G.Road,  
Bengaluru-560 001.  
Represented by its authorized representative  
Sri. Prasad Badhya,  
Son of Sri. Seetarama Badhya,  
Aged about 40 years.

**:APPELLANT**

(By Sri Samarth Sridhar for M/s Shety & Hegde Associates, Adv)

**AND**

- 1) Sri. Sandeep Pandey,  
Son of Sri. Ashok Kumar Pandey,  
Aged about 43 years, Residing at No.A303,  
Salapuria Sanctity, Sarjapur Road,  
Bangaluru- 560 035.
- 2)Adjudicating Officer,  
Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Authority,  
NO.1/14, Ground floor, Silver Jubilee Block,  
Unity Building, CSI Compound,  
3<sup>rd</sup> Cross, Mission Road,  
Bengaluru-560 027.

**:RESPONDENTS**

(Sri Basavaraj V Sabarad., Adv for R2)

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 10.10.2019 in CMP/190325/0002497 passed by the Adjudicating Officer RERA- Respondent. This appeal was transferred to this Tribunal on 02.01.2020 and renumbered as Appeal No.(K-REAT)180/2020.

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

**JUDGMENT**

Sri Samarth Sridhar learned counsel for the Appellant is present and submitted that the appellant requires another 8 weeks time to comply with the office objection regarding statutory deposit of 30% of the penalty amount. Sri Gopinath, vice president (Legal) of the appellant company is also present.

Learned counsel Sri Sudhindra appears on behalf of Sri Basavaraj V Sabarad for R2 and submits that sufficient opportunity has been given to the appellant to comply with the office objection. In spite of giving sufficient opportunity, the appellant has not complied with the provision of Section 43 (5) of the Act and the appeal is liable to be rejected for non-compliance of office objection.

Admittedly, the appeal was filed on 18.11.2019 before the Interim Tribunal (KAT) Bangalore and subsequently transferred to this Tribunal. The learned counsel for the appellant goes on praying

time to comply the office objection regarding the deposit of 30% of the penalty amount on one pretext or the other. However till date the office objections has not been complied and case is today posted as last chance to comply with Section 43 (5) of the Act. Hence, we are of the view that there is no good ground to grant further time and accordingly, appeal is rejected for non compliance of Section 43 (5) of the Act.

**Sd/-**  
**HON'BLE JUDICIAL MEMBER**

**Sd/-**  
**HON'BLE ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER**

NOT AN OFFICIAL COPY