

Minutes of the meeting of the Appellate Committee under the Chairmanship of Principal Secretary, Industries, Haryana held on 13.06.2015 in the Corporate office of the Corporation to consider the appeals against resumption of plots.

Item No.1

**M/s P & R Overseas Pvt. Ltd.
(Plot No.308-B, Sector-2, IGC, Saha)**

....Appellant

Versus

Haryana State Industrial & Infrastructure Development Corporation Limited

....Respondent

The Committee was informed that the appellant had requested for another date of hearing. As such the Committee decided that the aforesaid case may be placed before the Committee in the next meeting.

DI/Haryana

PSI/Haryana

Minutes of the meeting of the Appellate Committee under the Chairmanship of Principal Secretary, Industries, Haryana held on 13.06.2015 in the Corporate office of the Corporation to consider the appeals against resumption of plots.

Item No.2

**M/s Innovative Technologies.
(Plot No.174, Sector-2, Food Park, Saha)**

....Appellant

Versus

Haryana State Industrial & Infrastructure Development Corporation Limited

.....Respondent

1. Plot No.174, Sector-2, Food Park, Saha, measuring 450 sq. mtr. was allotted to M/s Innovative Technologies, a partnership firm of Sh. Arun Saldi-33%, Sh. Sharad Goyal-33% & Sh. Kailash Verma-33%, vide Regular Letter of Allotment (RLA) with offer of possession dated 14.01.2009, at the tentative rate of Rs.1000/- per sq. mtr, for setting up a flour mill. As per terms of allotment/ agreement, the appellant was required to implement the approved project on the said plot within a period of four years i.e. upto 13.01.2013, including one year general extension. Enhancement cost at the rate of Rs.453.70 per sq. mtr. was also payable in six half yearly installments w.e.f. 31.07.2013.

2. The allottee took physical possession of the plot on 30.06.2009, but failed to implement the project within the stipulated four years period. As per site report dated 25.06.2013, the plot was lying vacant. Further, the allottee also failed to remit the due payment towards the plot cost. Consequently, the Corporation issued a show cause notice on 13.03.2014 on account of non-start of construction within the stipulated period as well as non-payment of plot cost, as per terms of the allotment. The appellant did not respond to the said show cause notice. The appellant was also afforded an opportunity of personal hearing before the Estate Management Committee (EMC) on 29.04.2014 & 13.05.2014. Thereafter, the plot was resumed by the Corporation due to non-implementation of the project on the said plot as well as non-payment of dues towards the plot cost as well as enhancement.

3. Sh. Sharad Goyal, one of the partners of the appellant firm, appeared before the Appellate Committee and informed that the building on the said plot was constructed upto DPC level and they had also remitted the full amount of the plot cost including enhancement and requested the Committee to restore the plot and grant one year time period for implementation of the project. The Committee observed that the appellant had failed to fulfill the eligible criteria for extension as per EMP-2005 guidelines as they had

failed to start construction within the stipulated period of four years including one year extension.

4. The Committee also observed that as per applicable policy/EMP-2005, the appellant was required to construct the building and achieve construction level atleast 20% of PCA at the end of 4th year to be eligible for the 4th year extension. Since the plot was lying vacant, as per site report dated 25.06.2013 and the appellant had started construction activities after expiry of the stipulated period and that too without submission of building plans to the Competent Authority, therefore, the appellant was not eligible for grant of further extension as per terms of allotment/EMP-2005 guidelines. Hearing the appellant and finding no substance in the reasons advanced by them, the Committee was of the view that the Corporation had rightly resumed the plot in accordance with the terms and conditions governing the allotment of plot. Accordingly, the Committee did not find any merit in the appeal and decided to dismiss the same.

5. However, considering the keenness of the appellant to implement the project, the Committee decided to offer re-allotment of the plot in favour of the appellant at the current allotment rate, as applicable for the financial year 2015-16. The amount deposited by the appellant towards the principal cost of the plot, excluding interest and penal interest shall be adjusted towards the revised price of the plot. The allotment shall be governed by the provisions of EMP-2011. The appellant shall convey their acceptance to the said offer within thirty days failing which the resumption order shall remain operative.

DI/Haryana

PSI/Haryana

Before the Appellate Committee headed by Principal Secretary Industries, Haryana, constituted under the Estate Management Procedure-2011: Meeting held on 13.6.15 in the office of HSIIDC, C-13-14, Sector-6, Panchkula.

Item No. 3

Sh. Vaibhav Gupta
Plot No.671, Industrial Estate,Phase-II, Barhi

....Appellant

Versus

Haryana State Industrial & Infrastructure Development Corporation Limited

....Respondent

1. Plot No. 671, Phase-II, Indl. Estate, Barhi measuring 1800 Sq. Mtr. was allotted by the Corporation in favour of M/s Vee Gee Enterprises Prop. Shri Vaibhav Gupta, vide Regular Letter of Allotment with offer of possession dated 11.04.2007 for setting up of a project of manufacturing of fine quality knitted fabric. As per terms and conditions of allotment, the appellant was required to implement the project within three years from the date of offer of possession i.e. upto 10.04.2010 which was extended till 10.04.2011 by grant of one year general extension. The appellant had not even taken physical possession of the plot despite expiry of four years period and after issuance of a show cause notice on 20.05.2011 and grant of opportunity of personal hearing on 01.07.2011 & 01.08.2011, the plot was resumed by the Corporation on 16.08.2011 due to violations of terms and conditions of allotment.

2. The ex-allottee filed an appeal before the Appellate Committee against resumption of the plot which was considered by the Committee in its meeting held on 01.10.2013. The Committee upheld the resumption of plot and decided to dismiss the appeal. Subsequently, the ex-allottee filed a Civil Writ Petition No. 1884 of 2014 before Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court. The petitioner claimed before the Hon'ble High Court that a new policy had been notified on 19/20.09.2013, where-under further extension could be granted to a defaulter like the petitioner. The Hon'ble High Court disposed of the writ petition on 03.02.2014; the relevant portion of the orders is as under:

"Having heard learned counsel for the petitioners, while we do not find any ground to interfere with the impugned order. Suffice it to observe that if the above mentioned new policy is applicable in the case of the petitioner, he may apply to the Competent Authority who shall consider his claim in accordance with law/policy".

3. Accordingly, the case of the ex-allottee to grant further extension in accordance with the new policy was placed before the Committee for consideration. Shri Mukesh Garg, the representative of the ex-allottee also appeared before the Committee and contended that his case was decided by the Appellate Committee in the meeting held on 01.10.2013 without considering the policy of granting extension issued by the Corporation vide endst. No.HSIIDC:Estate:2013:16364 dated 20.09.2013. He contended that although he had remitted full cost of the plot in question, yet he was not allowed the benefit of general extension of one year as allowed to all the allottees of the Corporation.

4. The Committee considered the matter and observed that as per terms of the allotment, the appellant was required to implement the project within three years i.e. upto 10.04.2010. The appellant was granted benefit of one year general extension and accordingly, the stipulated period for project implementation was available upto 10.04.2011. As regards grant of general extension by way of zero period, as was being referred to by the ex-allottee, the same was available to all the existing allottees who had been allotted industrial plots/sheds till 31.12.2012; this benefit of one year general extension was not available to the plots/sheds which were already resumed/surrendered. In the present case since the plot of the ex-allottee was already resumed by the Corporation on 16.08.2011, on account of violations of terms and conditions, therefore, no further extension could be granted by the Corporation to the ex-allottee. It was also informed in no case the Corporation had granted extension on account of zero period to the resumed/surrendered plots under this policy. As such the contention of the ex-allottee to allow one year general extension to the resumed plots is not tenable as the plot of the ex-allottee stood already resumed on 16.8.2011 i.e. before announcement of the said policy. The Committee also observed that the contention of the ex-allottee that he had remitted full payment towards the plot cost/enhancement was also not correct. In fact, against the total plot cost of Rs. 32,40,000/-, the appellant had paid Rs. 23,56,376/- towards principal cost of the plot and at the time of resumption of plot, he was in the default to the tune of Rs. 8,83,624/-.

5. Considering the facts of the case, particularly that the allottee had failed to take physical possession of the plot within the stipulated four year period and there was no policy/procedure to grant further extension and also that the Corporation has not allowed zero/general extension to the already resumed/surrendered plots, the Appellate Committee reiterated its decision and was of the opinion that the Corporation had rightly resumed the plot in accordance with the terms and conditions governing the allotment of plot. Accordingly, the committee did not find any merit in the appeal/representation of the appellant/ex-allottee.

6. However, keeping in view that in a few such cases, the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court/Supreme Court of India as well as the Corporation had taken a decision to offer re-allotment of the plot at the current rate of allotment, the Appellate Committee decided to offer re-allotment of the plot in favour of the appellant at the current rate of allotment, as applicable for the financial year 2015-16. The amount deposited by the appellant towards the principal cost of the plot, excluding interest and penal interest shall be adjusted towards the revised price of the plot. The appellant shall convey his acceptance to the said offer within thirty days failing which the resumption order shall remain operative and the Corporation shall issue refund cheque in favour of the appellant, if not issued earlier.

DI/Haryana

PSI/Haryana

Minutes of the meeting of the Appellate Committee under the Chairmanship of Principal Secretary, Industries, Haryana held on 13.06.2015 in the Corporate office of the Corporation to consider the appeals against resumption of plots.

Item No.4

Sh. Bajrang Lal
Plot No.22, Industrial Estate, Tohana

....Appellant

Versus

Haryana State Industrial & Infrastructure Development Corporation Limited

....Respondent

1. Plot No.22 measuring 133 sq. mtrs. in I.E. Tohana was allotted to Shri Bajrang Lal vide Regular Letter of Allotment with offer of possession dated 24.11.2006, for setting up an industrial project of Flour Mill at the rate of Rs.300/- per sq. mtr. As per the terms of allotment/ EMP 2005 guidelines, the allottee was required to take possession of the plot, submit building plans for approval, start construction at site and implement the approved project within the four years (including one year general extension) upto 23.11.2010.

2. Although the physical possession of plot was taken-over by the appellant on 7.4.2008, but the allottee had failed to implement the approved project within the stipulated / extended time period upto 23.11.2010. As per site report dated 21.10.2011, the plot was lying vacant. Show cause notices dated 25.3.10, 10.8.2011 & 5.1.12 were issued and the appellant was also advised to appear for personal hearing on 7.3.2012, 30.3.2012 & 4.5.2012. The allottee failed to respond / appear before the Committee. Accordingly, the Corporation resumed the said plot on account of violation of terms and conditions of allotment vide resumption order dated 2.7.12 and a refund order on account of the plot cost was made on 20.05.2014.

3. Sh. Bajrang Lal, ex-allottee appeared before the Appellate Committee and informed that due to unavoidable family circumstances and losses in business, he could not implement the project within the stipulated time. He requested for restoration of the plot.

4. Considering the facts of the case, particularly that the allottee had failed to take effective steps to implement the project and the plot was lying vacant after the expiry of the stipulated four year period (including one year general extension) and moreover the allottee had also got the refund cheque encashed, therefore, the Committee was of the view that the Corporation had rightly resumed the plot in accordance with the terms and

conditions governing the allotment of plot. Accordingly, the committee did not find any merit in the appeal.

DI/Haryana

PSI/Haryana

Minutes of the meeting of the Appellate Committee under the Chairmanship of Principal Secretary, Industries, Haryana held on 13.06.2015 in the Corporate office of the Corporation to consider the appeals against resumption of plots.

Item No.5

Sh. B.D. Gupta,
Through his power of attorney holder Sh. Rajinder Kalra
(Plot No.562, Phase-V, Udyog Vihar, Gurgaon)

....Appellant

Versus

Haryana State Industrial & Infrastructure Development Corporation Limited

....Respondent

1. Plot No.562, Udyog Vihar, Phase-V, Gurgaon measuring 500 sq. meters was allotted to Sh. B.D.Gupta vide Regular Letter of allotment dated 29.4.1993, for setting up a project of Auto Parts. The agreement was executed on 15.5.1993 and the possession of the plot was taken over by the appellant on 9.6.1993. As per the terms of allotment/agreement the appellant was required to start construction within a period of six months, complete the same within a period of 1½ years and commence production within a period of two years from the date of allotment i.e. up to 28.04.1995. The appellant admittedly failed to implement the project and plot was lying vacant at the end of stipulated period. Accordingly, show cause notices were issued on 31.10.1994 & 19.10.1995, which were not replied by the Appellant. The case was placed in the meeting of Single Window Service (SWS) on 13.02.1996, which unanimously decided to recommend resumption of the plot and accordingly the respondent vide letter dated 11.03.1996 had resumed the plot.

2. The Appellant had applied for restoration of the plot on 3.4.1996 and the case was again referred to SWS on 19.4.1996. The request of the Appellant was considered by the committee constituted under IDP in its meeting held on 15/17.4.97. The committee upheld the resumption decision of the SWS, in view of the allottee having not done anything on the plot except construction of the boundary wall. The Appellant then contested the case before the Consumer Disputes Redressal Forum/Commission, which was finally decided by the State Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission, Panchkula vide orders dated 23.10.2012 in favour of the respondent. The Appellant challenged the same before the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court, which vide orders dated 17.01.2013 had dismissed the CWP as withdrawn with a liberty to the petitioner to file an appeal before the competent authority and directed the Appellate Authority to decide the same on merits.

3. In compliance of the orders dated 17.01.2013 of the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court, an appeal titled Sh. B.D. Gupta vs. HSIIDC Ltd. (Through Power of attorney holder

Sh. Rajinder Kalra) was filed on 14.02.2013 by Sh. Shalabh Singhal, Advocate against resumption order dated 11.03.1996, requesting restoration of the plot in question or to allot any other alternative plot of almost of similar size in the same phase or in any adjoining phase, subject to such terms & conditions that the Appellate Authority may deem fit and proper in the facts of the present case and also to handover possession of the same and to grant sufficient time to implement the project as per the prevailing industrial policy. The grounds of the appeal taken by the Appellant were that the allottee could not implement the project due to severe financial crises and serious ailments and that the plot was resumed without affording an opportunity of personal hearing.

4. The Appellant was called for a hearing before the Appellate Committee in its meetings held on 03.05.2013, 01.10.2013, 30.01.2014, 20.05.2014 & 27.04.2015, when either adjournments were sought or the Appellant i.e. Sh. B.D. Gupta failed to appear personally before the Committee, despite clear directions in this behalf by the Appellate Committee. In the meeting held on 20.05.2014, the Committee observed that as per information available, Sh. B.D. Gupta, Appellant, had already expired and enquired if it was correct. Sh. Rajesh Kumar, Advocate, who attended the said meeting on behalf of the Appellant, was evasive in his reply and pleaded ignorance about the death of the Appellant or his whereabouts. The committee advised him to furnish the whereabouts of Sh. B.D. Gupta and also inform whether he was alive or not, to which he requested for another date for submission of the reply of the query raised by the Appellate Committee. On the next date of hearing i.e. 27.04.2015, Sh. Rajesh Kumar, Advocate placed on record the death certificate of Sh. B.D. Gupta, a letter dated 22.04.2015 from the legal heir of the Appellant, etc. and again sought an adjournment, which the Appellate Committee had allowed.

5. Sh. Rajesh Kumar, Advocate appeared before the Committee on 13.06.2015 and informed that earlier he had been appearing before the Committee on behalf of Sh. Rajinder Kalra, GPA holder of Sh. B.D. Gupta and had now been authorized by Sh. Praveen Gupta S/o Late Sh. B.D. Gupta, as well. He informed that Late Sh. B.D. Gupta could not implement the project due to severe financial crises and serious ailments and contended that the plot was resumed without affording an opportunity of personal hearing and requested the Committee for restoration of the plot.

6. The Committee heard the contentions of Sh. Rajesh Kumar, Advocate and observed that he had admitted failure of the Appellant to implement the project within the stipulated period, which was a clear violation of the terms & conditions of allotment. The Committee also observed that his contentions that the plot was resumed without affording an opportunity of personal hearing to the Appellant were also devoid of any merit, in view of the fact that the Appellant had failed to appear before the SWS Committee in its

meetings held on 16.11.1995, 28.11.1995, 19.12.1995, 2.1.1996, 16.1.1996, 30.1.1996 and that the SWS Committee had recommended resumption of the plot after hearing Sh. S.K.Gupta, representative of the Appellant, in its meeting held on 13.2.1996. The Committee further observed that the present appeal was filed on behalf of the Appellant by his power of attorney holder namely; Sh. Rajinder Kalra, on 14.02.2013, whereas, the Appellant Sh. B.D. Gupta had expired on 03.06.2009, thereby rendering the said GPA in favour of Sh. Rajinder Kalra, infructuous. This vital fact was concealed by Sh. Rajinder Kalra & his advocate Sh. Rajesh Kumar from the Committee during all the previous hearings as well as from the Hon'ble Consumer Disputes Redressal Forum/Commission and the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No.895. Therefore, the appeal under consideration was devoid of any merit and was also not maintainable under law, being filed by an unauthorized person. Accordingly, the Committee decided to dismiss the appeal.

DI/Haryana

PSI/Haryana

Minutes of the meeting of the Appellate Committee under the Chairmanship of Principal Secretary, Industries, Haryana held on 13.06.2015 in the Corporate office of the Corporation to consider the appeals against resumption of plots.

Item No.6

**Mr. Vineet Bahl
(Shed No. 18-C, Udyog Vihar-V, Gurgaon)**

....Appellant

Versus

Haryana State Industrial & Infrastructure Development Corporation Limited

....Respondent

The Appellant vide letter dated 09.06.2015 had shown his inability to appear before the Committee due to his other business commitments and requested for an adjournment. The Committee acceded to the request of the Appellant and decided to defer the matter to the next meeting.

DI/Haryana

PSI/Haryana

Minutes of the meeting of the Appellate Committee under the Chairmanship of Principal Secretary, Industries, Haryana held on 13.06.2015 in the Corporate office of the Corporation to consider the appeals against resumption of plots.

Item No.7

**M/s JMB Fashions Pvt. Ltd.
Plot No. 427-C, Phase-I, Industrial Estate, Barhi**

....Appellant

Versus

Haryana State Industrial & Infrastructure Development Corporation Limited

....Respondent

The promoter/ directors of the appellant company failed to appear before the Committee. Accordingly, the committee decided to defer the matter and also decided that the promoter directors of the appellant company should appear before the appellate committee to explain the case.

DI/Haryana

PSI/Haryana

Minutes of the meeting of the Appellate Committee under the Chairmanship of Principal Secretary, Industries, Haryana held on 13.06.2015 in the Corporate office of the Corporation to consider the appeals against resumption of plots.

Item No. 8

**Sh. Dalmeet Saini & Sh. Gurwinder Saini
(Plot No. 617, Sector-8, phase-IV, IMT-Manesar)**

....Appellant

Versus

Haryana State Industrial & Infrastructure Development Corporation Limited

....Respondent

The appellant vide letter dated 10.06.2015 had shown his inability to appear before the committee due to his traveling during this period and returned back by end of this month and requested for an adjournment. The committee acceded to the request of the appellant and decided to defer the matter to the next meeting.

DI/Haryana

PSI/Haryana

Minutes of the meeting of the Appellate Committee under the Chairmanship of Principal Secretary, Industries, Haryana held on 13.06.2015 in the Corporate office of the Corporation to consider the appeals against resumption of plots.

Item No. 9

**M/s. Paradise Knitwears Pvt. Ltd
(Plot No. 411, Sector-7 (II) Phase-IV, IMT-Manesar)**

....Appellant

Versus

Haryana State Industrial & Infrastructure Development Corporation Limited

....Respondent

1. Plot No. 411, Sector-7, Phase-IV, IMT Manesar measuring 4050 sq. mtr. was allotted to M/s Paradise Knitwear Pvt. Ltd., under prestigious project category, vide RLA with offer of possession dated 01.07.2010 for setting up an industrial project of manufacturing of fabric and garments with project cost of Rs. 33.79 crore, at the then prevailing allotment rate of Rs. 9,000/- per sq. mtrs. As per terms & conditions of allotment/agreement, the allottee was required to pay balance 75% cost of plot in eight equal half yearly installments with applicable interest starting from 1st Jan., 2011 to 1st July, 2014. The allottee did not deposit the 1st installment of plot cost on due date. On request of the allottee, the outstanding principal amount (including principal amount in default) was rescheduled vide letter dated 05.07.2011, to be remitted in balance seven equal installments, subject to the condition that the allottee shall pay the outstanding interest/penal interest amount of Rs. 18,55,739/- before 15.07.2011.

2. The allottee did not remit the payment towards penal interest/interest as well as 1st installment toward cost of plot, due on 01.07.2011 as per re-schedulement and also did not pay any of the subsequent instalments. Subsequently, the entire pocket in which the allotted plot was situated, was re-planned by the Corporation to accommodate some of the allottees of Sector 8, IMT Manesar who could not be handed over possession of the allotted plots due to litigation by villagers and accordingly, revised offer of possession of the plot, for the purpose of project implementation was made w.e.f. 17.10.2012. The allottee took possession of plot on 06.12.2012. On 17.12.2012 the allottee represented against revised offer of possession on ground of lack of basic infrastructure facilities. The matter was examined and offer of possession was withdrawn vide letter dated 31.05.2013. In the meantime a notice for payment

of enhanced cost @ Rs. 2687/- per sq. mtrs, was issued on 31.12.2012, which was payable either in lumpsum within a period of 30 days from the date of issuance of the notice or in 5 (five) equal half yearly installments falling due on 31.01.2013, 31.07.2013, 31.01.2014, 31.07.2014 and 31.01.2015 alongwith interest @ 12% p.a. w.e.f. 01.01.2013 on the outstanding amount.

3. After completion of basic infrastructure facilities, the physical possession of the plot was again offered w.e.f. 17.12.2013 vide letter dated 23.12.2013 advising the allottee to implement the project within three years i.e. by 16.12.2016 and clear the dues of plot cost and enhanced cost as per the schedule conveyed in the RLA/demand notice.

4. Subsequently, as per the report of field office, due to objections by villagers and other related factors, there was variation in dimensions of some of the plots falling in this pocket including plot no. 411 and it was decided to handover revised possession of the plot as per actual dimensions and also revise the time period for project implementation. Accordingly, vide letter dated 25.02.2014, the allottee was advised to take revised possession of the plot and implement the project by 24.02.2017.

5. The appellant neither came forward for taking over revised possession nor deposited any payment towards installments of plot cost and enhanced cost. Accordingly, a show cause notice was issued to the appellant on 24.06.2014 with an opportunity of personal hearing on 08.07.2014. The appellant neither replied to the notice nor appeared for personal hearing and therefore, another opportunity of personal hearing was afforded on 05.08.2014 and 16.09.2014. Sh. Lalit Gupta, authorized representative of the appellant, appeared for hearing before EMC on 16.09.2014. He submitted that due to economic slowdown, they could not pay the due amount and sought further time to pay the dues in six bi-monthly installments. The contention of the representative was not found tenable and it was observed that the allottee had not deposited any amount towards 75% cost of the plot and had defaulted in payment of enhanced cost dues. Accordingly, the plot was resumed by MD/HSI IDC on 26.09.2014 on account of violation of terms and conditions of allotment and the same was conveyed to allottee on 07.10.2014.

6. Sh. Vinod Jindal, Managing Director of the appellant company appeared before the Committee and had informed that although the plot was allotted with offer of possession, but there were no infrastructure facilities in the area and they had been representing against the same from time to time. Resultantly, they could not utilize the plot for setting up their industrial project. He further contended they were willing to deposit the entire dues provided

encumbrance free plot is handed over to them with requisite facilities. He requested to set aside the resumption order and restore the plot in their favour.

7. The Committee observed that as per applicable policy/EMP-2005, the appellant was required to deposit the balance 75% cost of plot as per schedule given by the Corporation. The offer of possession was revised by the Corporation from 01.07.2010 to 25.02.2014. The appellant did not even deposit the principal amount of plot cost on scheduled dates and entire 75% amount of plot cost as well as enhanced cost demanded subsequently was in default. As per terms and conditions of allotment, the plot was liable for resumption in the event of non-payment of dues of the Corporation. Accordingly, the plot was rightly resumed by the Corporation,

8. However, considering the keenness of the appellant to implement the project, the Committee decided to offer re-allotment of the plot in favour of the appellant at the current allotment rate, as applicable for the financial year 2015-16, plus applicable enhancement. The payment deposited by the Corporation towards principal cost would be adjusted against the revised price and the allotment shall be governed by the provisions of EMP-2011. The appellant shall convey their acceptance to the decision of the Appellate Committee within 30 days failing which, the resumption order shall remain operative and the payment deposited by the appellant shall be refunded by the Corporation after deduction, as per policy of the Corporation.

DI/Haryana

PSI/Haryana

Minutes of the meeting of the Appellate Committee under the Chairmanship of Principal Secretary, Industries, Haryana held on 13.06.2015 in the Corporate office of the Corporation to consider the appeals against resumption of plots.

Item No.10

**M/s. Crimsoi Pvt. Ltd
(Plot No. 169, Sector-3, IMT Bawal)**

....Appellant

Versus

Haryana State Industrial & Infrastructure Development Corporation Limited

....Respondent

None appeared before the Committee. However, a message was received from the promoter of the allottee company that they had met with a road accident on their way to Panchkula and therefore, were not able to appear before the Appellate Committee. The Committee decided to defer the case and call the promoters in the next meeting.

DI/Haryana

PSI/Haryana