

**REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY, BIHAR**

**Before the Bench of Mr. Naveen Verma, Chairman**

**Case No. RERA/CC/1033/2021**

**Umesh Prasad Thakur**

**.....Complainant**

**Vs**

**M/s Shyline Villa Ltd.**

**.....Respondent**

**Project: Grand Plaza**

**23/05/2022**

**ORDER**

Hearing taken up. Mr Ishtiyaque Hussain, Advocate for the complainant is present. Mr. Abhishek Kumar Pandey, Advocate for the respondent is present.

The learned counsel for the respondent pleads that one more opportunity may be given to file his reply. The Bench observes that the counsel is seeking time to file reply for the last two dates and hence, the request for more time is rejected.

The learned counsel for the complainant mentions that there are deviations from the approved map. This is a matter to be dealt by the competent authority. However a copy of the specific complaint of deviation may be forwarded to the competent authority for action as appropriate.

Bench heard both the learned counsels. The Bench notes that the M.D. of the respondent company during the hearing dated 07/02/2022 had submitted that he has allotted six flats to the complainant and that he is willing to pay the market value for the extra area. The learned counsel for the complainant submits that although he has got his share his request is for specific flat numbers.

The Bench observes that the parties have not been able to establish that the grievance of the complainant fit to be addressed by the Authority. The matter of additional value for the shortfall in area is in the nature of compensation which should be best addressed by the Adjudicating Officer. Nevertheless, an attempt may be made to redress the grievances through the conciliation process.

Place this matter before the **Conciliation Bench**.

**Sd/-**

**Naveen Verma  
Chairman**