



HARYANA REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY PANCHKULA

Website: www.haryanarera.gov.in

EXECUTION NO. 2758 OF 2022
IN
COMPLAINT NO. 979 OF 2018

Krishan Swaroop

....DECREE HOLDER

VERSUS

M/s BPTP Ltd.

....JUDGMENT DEBTOR

CORAM: Parneet Singh Sachdev
Nadim Akhtar
Dr. Geeta Rathee Singh

Chairman
Member
Member

Date of Hearing: 12.02.2026

Hearing: 14th

Present:- Mr. Gaurav Gupta, Proxy for Adv. Ashish Chaudhary, Counsel
for the decree holder through VC.
Mr. Hemant Saini, Counsel for the Judgment Debtor through
VC

ORDER (PARNEET S. SACHDEV-CHAIRMAN)

1. The case was adjourned for 02.09.2025. 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 is now taken up before this Hon'ble Authority for consideration. Accordingly, the case was taken up for hearing on 18.09.2025 but got adjourned for today due to suspension of work by HRERA Bar Association.
2. Captioned complaint pertains to execution of order 17.03.2022 passed by Authority in complaint no. 979/2018 titled as *Krishan Swaroop vs BPTP Ltd* whereby judgment debtor was directed to refund the principal amount of Rs 44,03,336/- alongwith interest of Rs 41,09,844/-.
3. Judgment debtor had paid an amount of Rs 81,01,214/- to decree holder vide 12 cheques recorded in order dated 14.03.2023 and Rs 9,41,274/- by RTGS to decree holder, proof of which stands submitted vide application dated 05.05.2025. In total, an amount of Rs 90,42,488/- stands paid to decree holder.

2

4. The record further reveals that the Judgment Debtor had submitted, before the Registry on 13.11.2024, a detailed calculation of the payable amount in compliance of the decretal order. In the said statement, a balance sum of ₹9,41,274/- was reflected as outstanding towards the Decree Holder. The said balance amount has since been remitted to the Decree Holder through RTGS, and proof of such payment has already been placed on record vide application dated 05.05.2025. Thus, as per the calculations furnished by the Judgment Debtor and the subsequent payment made, the entire decretal liability stands discharged.
5. Despite the filing of the aforesaid statement of payable amount on 13.11.2024, the Decree Holder has neither filed any objections to the calculations nor disputed the payments effected by the Judgment Debtor. No reply for rebutting the statement of accounts or alleging any shortfall has been placed on record till date. In the absence of any challenge to the computation or the proof of payments, and considering that a substantial period has already elapsed, it can reasonably be inferred that the Decree Holder has accepted the payments without protest. Keeping in view the mandate of expeditious adjudication and execution under the RE (R&D)Act,2016, it would not be justified to keep the execution proceedings

2

pending indefinitely in anticipation of objections that have not been forthcoming.

6. Moreover, approximately 450 days have already elapsed since filing of the statement of payable amount. There is no justification on record to grant more time to decree holder.
7. In these circumstances the captioned complaint stands **disposed of as fully satisfied**. File be consigned to record room after uploading of order on website of Authority.



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

.....
NADIM AKHTAR
[MEMBER]

.....
PARNEET S SACHDEV
[CHAIRMAN]