



# HARYANA REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY PANCHKULA

Website: www.haryanarera.gov.in

EXECUTION NO. 1183 OF 2025

IN

COMPLAINT NO. 859 OF 2024

Arvind Jain

...DECREE HOLDER

VERSUS

Raheja Developers Ltd.

...JUDGEMENT DEBTOR

**Date of Hearing:** 14.10.2025

**Hearing:** 1st

**Present: -** Mr. Akshat Mittal, Learned Counsel for  
Decree Holder  
None for Judgement Debtor

## ORDER (DR. GEETA RATHEE SINGH- MEMBER)

1. Upon perusal of record it reveals that notice dated 08.09.2025 was successfully delivered on 09.09.2025.
2. 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(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 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 Manika on behalf of the answering judgement debtor. Hence, the presence of Adv Manika is not being marked.

3. Mr. Akshat Mittal, learned counsel for the decree holder submitted that in view of the initiation of CIRP proceedings against the present judgment debtor i.e. Raheja Developers Ltd., he wishes to withdraw the present execution petition with a liberty to file fresh execution at the appropriate stage.
4. Request of the counsel for the decree holder is allowed. Decree holder is allowed to withdraw the present complaint with a liberty to decree holder to file fresh execution at the appropriate stage.



5. Execution petition is **disposed of** as withdrawn. File be consigned to record room after uploading of this order on the website of the Authority.



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

