



PROCEEDINGS OF THE DAY		68
Day and Date	Wednesday and 17.12.2025	
Complaint No.	E/2506/2023 Case titled as Sonia Mehta VS Vatika Limited	
Complainant	Sonia Mehta	
Represented through	None for DH	
Respondent	Vatika Limited	
Respondent Represented through	Mr. Venkat Rao, Advocate	
Proceeding Recorded by	Ashok Kumar and Manju Bala	

Proceedings

The cases from Serial no. **36 to 97** were taken together being similar in nature and arising out of an application dated 17.11.2025 filed by M/S Vatika seeking a general order for recall of arrest warrants and bank attachment issued. The counsel for JD stated at bar that pursuant to the judgment of the Hon'ble High Court in CWP No. 14937 of 2024, titled *M/s Vatika Limited vs. Union of India & Ors.*, decided on 24.04.2025, the execution petitions ought to be heard afresh and the earlier orders of attachment of bank accounts and issuance of arrest warrants passed by the learned Adjudicating Officer of the Authority deserve to be set aside.

However, the counsel for the DH contended that the execution petitions were filed before the Authority, which, vide a subsequent order, delegated its powers to execute the matters to the learned Adjudicating Officer under Section 81 of the Act of 2016. It was further argued that the judgment dated 24.04.2025 passed by the Hon'ble High Court does not direct initiation of the execution proceedings de novo, nor does it declare the proceedings undertaken by the learned Adjudicating Officer to be null and void. The counsel for the DH further submitted that the JD had the opportunity to raise such objections before the Hon'ble High Court in the said writ petition and could have sought appropriate directions therein but no direction to this effect have



HARERA
GURUGRAM

HARYANA REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY
GURUGRAM

हरियाणा भू-संपदा विनियामक प्राधिकरण, गुरुग्राम

New PWD Rest House, Civil Lines, Gurugram, Haryana नया पी.डब्ल्यू.डी. विश्राम गृह, सिविल लाईंस, गुरुग्राम, हरियाणा


been passed in CWP No. 14937 of 2024, titled *M/s Vatika Limited vs. Union of India & Ors.*

Additionally, counsel for the DH submitted that till date, the JD has failed to make payment of the decretal amount in accordance with orders passed by the Authority.

Upon this submission the Authority questioned counsel for the JD regarding payment of the said decretal amount. In response the JD requested for release of its bank account which have been attached in earlier orders passed by Adjudicating Officer to enable compliance orders of the Authority. Counsel for the JD further sought time to obtain instructions from the company and to file a category-wise and composite payment schedule before the Authority within a period of ten days.

After considering the submissions, it was suggested and agreed that both parties will separately file brief written submissions, clearly listing the specific issues that need to be decided in the present application before the next date of hearing and JD to file the composite schedule of payment of decretal amount. JD is further directed to file the status of completion of said unit and handing over of possession of the unit.

Matter to come up on **21.01.2026** for further proceedings/order.

v.l. 
Vijay Kumar Goyal
Member
17.12.2025