



**HARYANA REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY PANCHKULA**

Website: www.haryanarera.gov.in

**Execution No. 1708 of 2025**

**In**

**Complaint No. 425 of 2024**

Prateek Sharma

.....DECREE HOLDER

VERSUS

1. Aakarshak Realtors Pvt. Ltd

2. Parker Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd.

3. Javier Management Services Pvt. Ltd.

.....JUDGMENT DEBTOR(S)

**CORAM : Dr. Geeta Rathee Singh**

**Member**

**Date of Hearing:-28.04.2026**

**Hearing:- 2nd**

**Present:- Adv. Niwas Kumar, Ld. Counsel for the Decree Holder through VC**

**Adv. Gaurav Gupta, Ld. Counsel for the Judgment Debtor 1&2.**

**Adv. Yogita, Ld. Counsel for the Judgment Debtor 3.**

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

1. On the last date of hearing i.e 27.01.2026 following directions were passed :-

*Geeta Rathee*

*"5. Authority directs judgement debtor 1 & 2 to file an affidavit stating that pre-paid meter is already installed and energized in the unit of decree holder and that power will automatically resume as when the decree holder will top up the pre-paid meter.*

*6. Authority further directs the decree holder to collect the demand draft from the Authority. Decree Holder is also directed to provide fresh addresses of judgment debtor no. 3, so that notice may be duly served upon him. In the alternative decree holder may collect dasti notice of the judgment debtor no. 3 from the registry of office and then serve it upon to judgment debtor 3. He is also directed to file a service report of dasti notice before the next date of hearing."*

2. Ld. Counsel for the judgment debtor submitted that, pursuant to the order dated 27.01.2026, the requisite affidavit was filed with the Authority on 16.03.2026. It is further contended that a pre-paid meter has been duly installed and energized at Unit No. C-504 (3BHK), in project 'White Lilly', Sector-8, Sonapat, Haryana. Consequently, the electricity supply to the premises shall resume automatically upon the decree holder effecting the necessary top-up/recharge of the said meter.
3. Ld. Counsel for the decree holder acknowledged receipt of the Demand Draft amounting to ₹8,314/- from the Authority. However, Ld. Counsel for the decree holder raised a grievance regarding the exorbitant charges being levied by the judgment debtor for the activation of the pre-paid meter.

*Rathee*

4. Authority observes that present petition has been filed for execution of the order dated 07.04.2025, passed by the Authority in Complaint Case No. 425 of 2024, wherein the respondent was directed to pay an amount of ₹8,314/- within 15 days from the date of uploading of the order. Relevant para of the order is reproduced herewith:-

<i>S r. n o</i>	<i>Principal Amount</i>	<i>Deemed date of possession or payment whichever is later</i>	<i>Interest accrued till 15.04.2019</i>
1.	₹11,00,000/-	07.01.2018	₹1,55,218/-

*“As per the table in para 11 of this order complainant is liable to pay an amount of ₹1,46,904/- ( ₹87,873/-+ ₹59,031/-) to the respondent. And as per table in para 12, respondent is liable to pay an amount of ₹1,55,218/- as delay possession charges to the complainant. Therefore, after adjustment, respondent is liable to pay an amount of ₹8,314/- to the complainant.”*

5. Authority has duly considered the material on record and submission made during the course of proceedings. It is a settled principle of law that executing court cannot go beyond the decree and its strictly bound by its terms. The scope of execution is confine to enforcement of decree as it exists, and the executing court cannot vary, modify, and enlarge the relief granted therein.

*Ratna*

In present case, it stands established from record that decretal amount of ₹8,314/- has already been paid to the decree holder. There is nothing on record to indicate any subsisting liability or non-compliance with the decree. Accordingly, in view of the complete satisfaction of the decretal amount present execution petition is disposed of.



DR. GEETA RATHEE SINGH

[MEMBER]

