HARYANA REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY PANCHKULA

Website: www.haryanarera.gov.in

COMPLAINT NO. 567 OF 2024

Vandana Jhamb and Anil Jhamb ....COMPLAINANTS

VERSUS

Raheja Developers Ltd. ....RESPONDENT

Date of Hearing: 16.09.2025

Hearing: 6th

Present: - Adv. Adv. Shubhnit Hans, Ld. Counsel for Complainants through VC

None for the Respondent

ORDER(DR. GEETA RATHEE SINGH- MEMBER)

1. Captioned complaint was listed for hearing on 02.09.2025. However, due to the re-constitution of benches, complaint is taken up today for hearing.
2. Today, Adv. Manika appeared on behalf of respondent and submitted that insolvency proceedings qua the respondent company i.e Raheja Developers Ltd. have been initiated before the National Company Law Tribunal vide order dated 21.08.2025 passed in C.P No. 284 of 2025 titled " Shravan Minocha and ors Vs Raheja Developers Ltd." filed against respondent company. As per order Mr. Brijesh Singh Bhadauriya has been appointed as

an Interim Resolution Professional (IRP) for initiation of CIRP against the judgement debtor in present petition and moratorium in terms of Section 14 of the Code has also been declared vide said order. Relevant para of said order are reproduced below for reference:

> *" 20.The applicant in Part-III of the application has proposed the name of Mr. Brijesh Singh Bhadauriya as Interim Resolution Professional, having Registration Number - IBBI/IPA-002/N01045/2020-2021/13385 having email id: bsb@bsbandassociates.in. Accordingly, Mr. Brijesh Singh Bhadauriya is appointed as an Interim Resolution Professional (IRP) for initiation of CIRP for Corporate Debtor. The consent of the proposed interim resolution profession in Form-2 is taken on record. The IRP so appointed shall file a valid AFA and disclosure about non-initiation of any disciplinary proceedings against him, within three (3) days of pronouncement of this order.*
>
> *21.We also declare moratorium in terms of Section 14 of the Code. The necessary consequences of imposing the moratorium flows from the provisions of Section 14 (1) (a), (b), (c) & (d) of the Code.*
>
> *22……*
>
> *23……*
>
> *24…..*
>
> *25….*
>
> *26….*
>
> *27….*
>
> *28…..*

Ratnee

29. We further clarify that since the Corporate Debtor's project "Raheja Shilas (Low Rise)" is already undergoing CIRP pursuant to admission in separate proceedings, the present application, upon being allowed, shall result in initiation of CIRP against the Corporate Debtor in respect of all its projects, excluding the said project "Raheja Shilas (Low Rise)". Accordingly, all directions issued by this Adjudicating Authority in the present matter shall be confined to the Corporate Debtor as a whole, save and except the project "Raheja Shilas (Low Rise)"

Upon perusal of record it is revealed that no vakalatnama has been placed on record in the name of Adv Manika on behalf of the answering respondent. Hence, the presence of Adv Manika is not being marked.

3. In view of the moratorium, learned counsel for the complainants was enquired whether they wish to continue the present complaint or wish to file a claim before the National Company Law Tribunal. Learned counsel for the complainants submitted that since moratorium is in force, he may be allowed to withdraw the present complaint with a liberty to file a fresh complaint for any remaining claim/dispute.

4. Request of the counsel for the complainants is allowed. Complainants are allowed to withdraw the present complaint with a liberty to file fresh complaint as per law.

Rattan

5. Case is **disposed of** without getting into merits. File be consigned to record room after uploading of this order on the website of the Authority.

.....
DR. GEETA RATHEE SINGH
[MEMBER]