



# HARYANA REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY PANCHKULA

Website: www.haryanarera.gov.in

**EXECUTION NO. 3354 OF 2022**

**IN**

**COMPLAINT NO. 2052 OF 2023**

Sumit Kumar

...DECREE HOLDER

**VERSUS**

Raheja Developers Ltd.

...JUDGEMENT DEBTOR

**Date of Hearing:** 23.12.2025

**Hearing:** 11th

**Present: -** None for the decree holder  
None for judgement debtor

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

1. Authority in separate matters pertaining to respondent has been apprised 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 C.P No. 284 of 2025 titled "Shravan Minocha and ors Vs Raheja Developers Ltd." In view of initiation of CIRP proceedings against the present judgment debtor Authority vide order dated 09.09.2025 had directed the decree holder to apprise this Authority on the next date whether or not the decree holder wishes to apply for claim with

IRP? If not, then as to why the appropriate remedy available with decree holder is not being availed in the given circumstances wherein because of legal bar to proceed with execution in this case, keeping the request to execute the order under execution pending, would not be of any help to the decree holder(s), rather a futile exercise amounting to wastage of time of the executing Forum? In case no reply is filed or otherwise if filed but not found containing any provision contrary to Section 14 of the Code, 2016, on that day, this Authority would be disposing of the execution petition with permission to file afresh, on culmination of CIRP proceedings, if so legally permissible. No request for further adjournment shall be entertained on any ground from the decree holder.

2. Today none is present on behalf of the decree holder nor reply has been filed. Also, none is presenting behalf of the judgment debtor.
3. Since no sufficient reply has been filed and none is present on behalf of the decree holder, it is presumed that the decree holder is pursuing his remedy before the NCLT. Also considering that the CIRP proceedings may continue for a substantial period of time and the statutory bar imposed under Section 14 of the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016, this Authority is precluded from proceeding with or adjudicating any execution petition against the present judgement debtor. In these circumstances, it is observed that it will be in the better interest of the decree holder to pursue his claim before the National Company Law Tribunal as against to pursuing present execution.



4. In view of the aforementioned observations, execution petition is **disposed of** without getting into merits with a liberty to the decree holder to file fresh execution at the appropriate stage.

File be consigned to record room after uploading of this order on the website of the Authority.

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