



# HARYANA REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY PANCHKULA

Website: www.haryanarera.gov.in

**EXECUTION NO. 1634 OF 2024**

**IN**

**COMPLAINT NO. 1104 OF 2022**

Sanjay Bansal and Manisha Bansal

....DECREE HOLDERS

**VERSUS**

1. SRS Real Estate Ltd.
2. SRS Real Infrastructure Ltd.
3. Registrar cum Sub Registrar
4. Directorate of Enforcement

....JUDGMENT DEBTORS

**Date of Hearing:** 09.12.2025

**Hearing:** 3<sup>rd</sup>


**Present:** None for decree holders.  
None for judgment debtor no.1 and 2.  
None for judgment debtor no.3 (Registrar cum Sub Registrar)  
and Judgment debtor no. 4 (Directorate of Enforcement) already  
Ex-Parte vide order dated 10.03.2025.

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

1. The present case was adjourned for 04.11.2025. 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 petition be placed before this Hon'ble Authority. Pursuant to the said observations and directions, the present case has been adjourned from the Hon'ble Adjudicating Officer and is now taken up before this Authority for consideration today.

2. Today, the case is fixed for service of notice upon judgment debtor no.1, 2 and 3.
3. As per office report, notices sent to judgment debtor nos. 1 and 2 are received back unserved with a report that 'receiver shifted from address'. Notice sent to judgment debtor no. 3 has been successfully served but none appeared on behalf of it.
4. However, Adv. Pranjal P Chaudhary, appeared on behalf of judgment debtor no. 1 and stated that he will file his vakalatnama during the course of the day. Since, no vakalatnama/power of attorney has been placed on record in the name of Adv. Pranjal P Chaudhary to appear on behalf of the answering judgment debtor no. 1, hence, his presence is not being marked.
5. Further, Ms. Shubhleen, proxy for Lokesh Narang, special public prosecutor appeared on behalf of judgment debtor no. 4. Since, no vakalatnama/power of attorney has been placed on record in the name of Lokesh Narang to appear on

  
Ramesh

behalf of the answering judgment debtor no. 4, hence, her presence is not being marked.

6. None has appeared on behalf of the decree holder. Case called several times, however no one appeared even till exhaustion of the entire cause list for the day. No further wait is justified. Hence, the present execution petition is **dismissed in default** for want of prosecution in view of the provisions of Order XXI Rule 105 of CPC, as this Authority while exercising the power under Section 40 of the RERA Act, 2016 read with Rule 27 of HRERA, Rules, 2017, is competent to exercise powers of a Civil Court, in the same manner as Civil Court is dealing with execution of a civil decree.

7. **Disposed of.** Let, file be consigned to the consigned record room after uploading the order on the website of the Authority.

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