

HARYANA REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY PANCHKULA

Website: www.haryanarera.gov.in

1. EXECUTION NO. 1962 OF 2024

IN

COMPLAINT NO. 600 OF 2023

Om Prakash Sharma

...DECREE HOLDER

VERSUS

Raheja Developers Ltd.

...JUDGEMENT DEBTOR

2. EXECUTION NO. 1963 OF 2024

IN

COMPLAINT NO. 601 OF 2023

Gaurav Yadav

...DECREE HOLDER

VERSUS

Raheja Developers Ltd.

...JUDGEMENT DEBTOR

3. EXECUTION NO. 1965 OF 2024

IN

COMPLAINT NO. 603 OF 2023

Pranav Kumar Kaushik

...DECREE HOLDER

VERSUS

Raheja Developers Ltd.

...JUDGEMENT DEBTOR

Page 1 of 5



4. EXECUTION NO. 1966 OF 2024

IN

COMPLAINT NO. 604 OF 2023

Rajender Kumar Midha

...DECREE HOLDER

VERSUS

Raheja Developers Ltd.

...JUDGEMENT DEBTOR

5. EXECUTION NO. 1967 OF 2024

IN

COMPLAINT NO. 605 OF 2023

Rakesh Kumar Singh

...DECREE HOLDER

VERSUS

Raheja Developers Ltd.

...JUDGEMENT DEBTOR

Date of Hearing: 04.11.2025

Hearing:

2nd (in all execution petitions)

Present: -

Ms. Sitanshu Sharma, Learned Counsel for

Decree Holder through VC (in all execution petitions)

None for Judgment Debtor (in all execution petitions)

ORDER (DR. GEETA RATHEE SINGH- MEMBER)

1. The present petitions were adjourned for 30.09.2025. However, as per the observations made by the Hon'ble High Court in CWP No. 14937 of 2024 titled *M/s Vatika Ltd. versus Union of India and others*, in its order dated 24.04.2025, it has been directed that the execution petitions be placed before

Page 2 of 5

this Hon'ble Authority. Pursuant to the said observations and directions, the present petitions have been adjourned from the Hon'ble Adjudicating Officer and are now being taken up before this Authority for consideration today.

- 2. Today, Adv. Sanjana Yadav appeared on behalf of judgement debtor and submitted that insolvency proceedings qua the judgement debtor company i.e Raheja Developers Ltd. have been initiated before the National Company Law Tribunal vide order dated 21.08.2025 passed in <u>C.P No. 284 of 2025</u> titled "Shravan Minocha and ors Vs Raheja Developers Ltd.". 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(s) 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

Rature

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.....

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/power of attorney has been placed on record in the name of Adv Sanjana Yadav on behalf of the answering judgement debtor. Hence, the presence of Adv Sanjana Yadav is not being marked.

3. Ms Sitanshu Sharma, learned counsel for the decree holder(s), in all execution petitions, submitted that in view of the initiation of CIRP

Rature

Page 4 of 5

Execution No. 1962 of 2024 & Ors

proceedings against the present judgment debtor i.e. Raheja Developers Ltd., the decree holder(s), in respective execution petitions, wish to file their claim before the National Company Law Tribunal. She prayed that she may be allowed to withdraw the present execution petitions with a liberty to file fresh petition(s) for any remaining claim/dispute after completion of resolution proceedings respectively.

- 4. Request of the counsel for the decree holder(s) is accepted. Decree holder(s), in respective execution petitions(s), are allowed to withdraw the present complaint with a liberty to file fresh execution petition(s) at the appropriate stage.
- 5. Execution petitions are <u>disposed of</u> as withdrawn. File be consigned to record room after uploading of this order on the website of the Authority.

DR. GEETA RATHEE SINGH [MEMBER]