

CM No. 4007 of 2025 in

Appeal No. 31 of 2018

..

**Shailendra Singh v. BPTP Ltd.**

Present: Applicant-appellant in person with  
Mr. Nitin Kant Setia, Advocate.

...

This is an application seeking review of the final order dated 13.10.2025 passed by this Bench.

2. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that no settlement was in fact arrived at between the parties. In view of Section 62 of the Indian Contract Act, settlement deed dated 20.07.2020 loses its significance, thus, order dated 13.10.2025 may be reviewed.

3. We are not convinced with the stand taken by the applicant. The order was passed after due consideration and keeping in view the statements made by counsel for both the parties. A perusal of the order would show that it is mentioned therein that Mr. Setia does not controvert the factum of settlement between the parties. Thus, no *lis* survived in the appeal. It was on his statement that prayer for dismissing the appeal as withdrawn was accepted.

4. It appears that the applicant has taken about-turn now. The entire application is mis-conceived and a result of an after-thought. In the judgment, titled as *Rokadoba Maharaj Ginning & Pressing Pvt. Ltd. v. The Sri Venkatera Mills, Company Appeal No. 424 of 2022, decided on 10.12.2025, passed by NCLT, Chennai*, the application for re-call and revival of the original appeal was dismissed holding that the appellant as free to take remedy of execution, rather than mis-using the process of law by filing review application.

5. In view of same, the present application is without any merit and deserves outright dismissal. Ordered accordingly.

Justice Rajan Gupta  
Chairman  
Haryana Real Estate Appellate Tribunal

Dr. Virender Parshad  
Member (Judicial)

Dinesh Singh Chauhan  
Member (Technical)

January 19, 2026  
mk