



GOA REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY

101, 1st Floor, 'SPACES' Building, Plot No. 40, EDC Patto Plaza, Panaji 403 001

www.rera.goa.gov.in

Tel: 0832-2437655; e-mail: goa-rera@gov.in

F.No:3/RERA/Complaint (518)/2025/1547

Date: 15/10/2026

Coram: Shri Vincent D'Silva, Hon'ble Member-Goa RERA

1. Mrs. Kumud Goel,

w/o Mr. Amit Verma, aged about 35 years,

Indian National, Married, Service,

Presently residing at A 4203, Omkar Alta Monte

Off Western Express Highway, Malad

East Mumbai- 4000972.

2. Mr. Amit Verma,

S/o Shri.Prabhu Nath Verma, aged about 36 years,

Indian National, Married, Service,

presently residing at A-4203

Omkar, Alta Monte, Off Western

Express Highway, Malad, East Mumbai

400097.

..... Complainants

Versus

1. Aansav Realty &

Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd.,

A registered company having its office at

106, WDC Enclave Mabai Hotel

Complex, Near Grace Church, Margao

Salcete-Goa, represented through its

Director Mr. Siddharth Anoop

Babani, s/o Anoop Kiratrai Babani,

major in age, Indian National,

resident of Carmona, Salcete - Goa.

2. B & B Holdings,

a partnership firm,

having registered office at H-611

A (W-10) Sainik Farms New Delhi

110062, represented through its

Partner, Mr. Remun Bhutani,

major in age, Indian National,

r/o H-611 A (W-10), Sainik Farms

New Delhi-110062

.....**Respondents**

Ld. Advocate Shri Neelesh Takkekar for the complainants.

Ld. Advocate Shri Pritesh Shetty for the respondents.

ORDER

(Delivered on this 15th day of the month of October, 2026)

This order shall dispose of the application filed by the respondents at exhibit 354/c for transfer.

2. Briefly stated, the case of the respondents is as follows:

The above mentioned matter be transferred to a different adjudicating officer as they do not expect a fair adjudication. Three cases namely (i) Case No. 3/RERA/Complaint(390)/2023/1308 (ii) Case No.3/RERA/Complaint(518)/2025/1688 and (iii) Case No. 3/RERA/Complaint(485)/2025/935 have been filed with GRERA by colluding parties, all through the same advocate and all 3 matters have been placed before the same Adjudicating officer. In the first two matters, orders were passed deciding beyond jurisdiction and without proper adjudication.

3. The complainants filed a reply inter-alia contending that the present application is untenable-in-law as well as on facts of the present case. The filing of present application is an insinuation on the Presiding Officer. The statements in the application are very casual

and unmindful of law applicable on the subject. The allegations and averments made by the respondents through the application for transfer dated 17.08.2026 are false, baseless and misconceived. The respondents have failed to place on record any material or circumstances which would establish any bias or partiality on the part of Ld. Adjudicating Authority. Merely because orders have been passed against a particular party, the same cannot be construed as an indication of bias or unfairness on the part of Adjudicating Officer. The allegation that the matters have been filled by the colluding parties through the same advocate is also false and baseless.

4. Arguments heard.

5. The above matter came to the assigned to the Member on 25.11.2025 and accordingly, notice was issued to the complainant and thereafter to the respondents and the respondents appeared through his counsel and filed the reply/written statement on 23.04.2026. The matter was also fixed for written arguments of the parties and the complainants filed the written submission and matter also fixed for written submissions of respondents/oral submission. In the interregnum, the application for production of documents and other such application were also came to be filed by the parties.

6. The present application came to be filed on 17.08.2026 on allegedly two grounds namely, (i) that in three matters orders were passed and decided beyond jurisdiction and without proper adjudication and (ii) that the cases have been filed by colluding and all through the same advocate and the said matters were placed before same adjudicating officers.

7. The respondents or their advocate on record have failed to show any provision for transfer of the said matter by the Member, Goa RERA to other Member/Chairperson. The application and the statement made therein are very casual and unmindful of the law applicable to the subject and the power to transfer the said matter. The final orders were passed in two cases namely (i) Case No. 3/RERA/Complaint(390)/2023/1308 [Lakshmansandra Ravi (ii) and (ii) Case No. 3/RERA/Complaint(485)/2025/935 [Sonia Bhardwaj] which have been apparently challenged by the respondents. Needless to mention, the above said complainants have been decided after hearing both the parties and the respondents have failed to show that the said orders have been set aside by the Appellate Authority.

8. Section 38(2) of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016 requires the Authority to follow the principles of natural

justice and permits it to regulate its own procedure, subject to the Act, and applicable rules. It is nowhere the case of the respondents that the Authority had not followed the principles of natural justice. It is well settled that dissatisfaction with orders of the adjudicating officer or apprehension based on adverse outcome is not a ground for transfer. It is therefore the respondents have failed to establish any substantiation for transfer of the above matter. The application therefore lacks any merit nor there any justification for the transfer on the ground of bias.

9. The respondents have also made playful accusation against the advocates for the complainants stating that the said cases have been filed before Goa RERA by colluding parties all through the same advocate and all three matters have been placed before the same adjudicating officers. The respondents however, have failed to place on record any materials or circumstances which would establish any collusion between the parties and the advocates. Merely because certain matters are represented by the same advocate and are placed before same Adjudicating Officer, no inference of collusion or bias can be drawn as the matters are assigned by the Competent Authority. The respondents cannot seek transfer merely on the basis of their dissatisfaction with the orders passed in the previous proceedings.

10. Besides the above two cases namely, Lakshmansandra Ravi and Sonia Bhardwaj, which came to be disposed of after hearing both the parties, two different complainants had also filed cases against the respondents, one of which was filed by one Neeraj Banglorekar claiming that the respondents have failed to execute the sale deed in favour of the complainant qua the said premises even after receiving the entire sale consideration amount of ₹90,00,000/- (Rupees Ninety Lakhs only) from the complainant and that there are serious defects with regards to workmanship and quality of construction, which came to be settled on 20.5.2025. One Nandkishore Harite had also filed a complaint against the respondents which case was decided on 22.11.2013 by then Chairperson with a direction that the respondents shall seek for extension of the project beyond 30.12.2022 and also imposed penalty and the matter is presently pending before the other Member. Besides, the above complaint by Kumud Goel and another, one more case filed by Lakshmansandra Ravi is also pending before the Authority.

11. Ld. Adv. Shri Neelesh Takkekar for the complainants has relied upon the case of (i) *Subrata Roy Sahara v/s Union of India and Others (2014) 8 Supreme Court Cases 470* and (ii) *Mr. Venkatesh*

*Narayan Prabhu Moni V/s Mr. Neelesh Anant Takkekar in Writ
Petition No.46 of 2024 dated 14.02.2024* and submitted that a heavy costs be imposed upon the respondents for making unnecessary and unsubstantiated allegations for transfer of the matter with the advocate for the respondents justifying the same, which is clearly an abuse of judicial process on the part of the respondents.

12. No doubt, the application filed by the respondents appears to be the case of a 'forum shopping' and such an approach on the part of the respondents is highly depreciable. Merely because some adverse orders have gone against them, that too after hearing the parties on record, the respondents have no validation to seek transfer of the above matter. The main purpose of imposing costs is not only to compensate the opposite party, but also to deter such litigants from filing frivolous, vexatious and false claims borne out of ego or resorted to as a buying time tactic. The complainants have sufficiently made out a case for imposing costs on the respondents as it is a clear attempt on the part of the respondents to protract the proceedings and to pressurize the adjudicating officer. Nonetheless, no such costs are imposed with a hope that better sense prevails upon the respondents.

13. Having said so, I pass the following:

ORDER

- (i) The application filed by the respondents at exhibit 354/c stands dismissed.
- (ii) No order as to costs.

15-10-2026
(Vincent D'Silva)
Member, Goa RERA

Panaji, Goa.

Date: 15.10.2026.