

AIPL BHARAT INFRASTRUCTURE PRIVATE LIMITED

CIN: U68100HR2024PTC124408

Registered Office: AIPL Business Club, Fifth Floor, Badshahpur, Gurgaon – 122 101, Haryana

Tel. No: +91 92111 60000, Email: rera-haryana@aipl.com

Date: 25.11.2025

To,

The Chairman,
Haryana Real Estate Regulatory Authority,
New PWD Rest House,
Civil Lines, Gurugram,
Haryana -122001

Subject: Reply to Representation (Complaint) dated 10.06.2025 and Intimation regarding status quo order dated 31.07.2025, filed by Glorii Education Technology Pvt. Ltd. on 08.08.2025

Ref: Representation dated 10.06.2025 filed vide Dak No. 92876 dated 10.06.2025 and Intimation regarding status quo order filed vide Dak No. 95952 dated 08.08.2025, by Glorii Education Technology Pvt. Ltd.

The Applicant-Promoter most humbly showeth:

- A. That AIPL Bharat Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd. (hereinafter referred to as the “*Applicant-Promoter*”) and Babblers Projects Pvt. Ltd. obtained a **License bearing No. 62 of 2025 dated 01.05.2025**, for the development of Residential Group Housing Colony namely “**The Riviera at AIPL Lake City**” over an area admeasuring **5.1375 acres** (hereinafter referred to as the “*Licensed Land*”) in the revenue estate of village Daultabad, Tehsil Kadipur, Sector - 103, Gurugram Manesar Urban Complex. That the Applicant-Promoter after

AIPL BHARAT INFRASTRUCTURE PRIVATE LIMITED

CIN: U68100HR2024PTC124408

Registered Office: AIPL Business Club, Fifth Floor, Badshahpur, Gurgaon – 122 101, Haryana

Tel. No: +91 92111 60000, Email: rera-haryana@aipl.com

obtaining the requisite approvals from the Competent Authorities, had submitted an application under the provisions of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016 (hereinafter referred to as the “RERA Act, 2016”) for registration the project.

B. That during the pendency of the approval of the registration of the aforementioned Project, certain representations and letters dated 31.01.2025, 06.08.2025, 10.06.2025 were filed by M/s Glorii Education Technology Pvt. Ltd. (Hereinafter referred to as “Glorii”) before the Hon’ble Authority inter alia seeking intervention in the proceedings of registration and objecting to the registration of the project and thereon Ld. Authority *vide* its Letter bearing No. HARERA/GGM/RPIN/983 dated 25.11.2025, wherein the deficiencies were intimated to the Applicant-Promoter, has directed the Applicant-Promoter to provide its reply to the above referred Representation.

C. That at the outset it is to be noted that the present intervention is maliciously motivated, absolutely frivolous and seems to be an effort by the competitors to delay/ derail the process of registration of the project in order to gain undue advantage and disturb the competitive market.

D. That in compliance with the directions of the Ld. Authority, the Applicant-Promoter seeks leave of this Ld. Authority to bring on record the facts and

AIPL BHARAT INFRASTRUCTURE PRIVATE LIMITED

CIN: U68100HR2024PTC124408

Registered Office: AIPL Business Club, Fifth Floor, Badshahpur, Gurgaon – 122 101, Haryana

Tel. No: +91 92111 60000, Email: rera-haryana@aipl.com

detailed response to various malicious and motivated representations dated, 10.06.2025 and 08.08.2025:

- i. That M/s Desert Moon Realtors Pvt. Ltd. and Glorii were joint owners of the land comprised in Khewat No. 107, Khata No. 114, Mustil No. 40, Killa No. 16/1 (2-0), 16/2 (6-0) and Mustil No. 41, Killa No. 20 (8-0), Kitaa 3 total land admeasuring 16 Kanals 0 Marla, situated at village Daulatabad, Sub Tehsil Kadipur, District Gurugram.
- ii. That out of 16 Kanals 0 Marla land mentioned hereinabove, M/s Desert Moon Realtors Pvt. Ltd. had a share of 7 Kanals 15 Marlas. That M/s Desert Moon Realtors Pvt. Ltd. for getting its share of land partitioned and construct a separate Khewat, submitted an Application before the Hon'ble Court of Assistant Collector IIND Grade, Sub-Tehsil Kadipur, District Gurugram. That vide the Partition Application a request was also made that during the partition, the land falling in the share of M/s Desert Moon Realtors Pvt. Ltd. be adjoined with the share of other khewat of M/s Desert Moon Realtors Pvt. Ltd. so that one contiguous parcel of land can be formed for M/s Desert Moon Realtors Pvt. Ltd.
- iii. That the mode of partition was sanctioned on 28.06.2024, Naksha B was approved on 02.07.2024, Naksha Zim was issued on 02.08.2024, and Sanad Takseem was issued on 05.08.2025. The partition was implemented both on the spot and in the revenue records. Mutation No. 4078 was



AIPL BHARAT INFRASTRUCTURE PRIVATE LIMITED

CIN: U68100HR2024PTC124408

Registered Office: AIPL Business Club, Fifth Floor, Badshahpur, Gurgaon – 122 101, Haryana

Tel. No: +91 92111 60000, Email: rera-haryana@aipl.com

sanctioned on 30.08.2024 in favour of the M/s Desert Moon Realtors Pvt. Ltd., and subsequently the land was lawfully sold to Ms Babler Projects Pvt. Ltd., vide sale deed (Vasika No. 7476) and mutation No. 4084 was sanctioned accordingly. Rapat No. 1403 dated 12.08.2024 records the delivery of possession in favour of the Babler Projects Pvt Ltd, thus negating the M/s Glorii Education Technology Pvt. Ltd.'s claim that the proceedings were not implemented. That, Subsequent to Partition a portion of land admeasuring 0.968 acres was sold to M/s Babler Projects Pvt. Ltd. through registered sale deed vasika no. 7476 dated 30.08.2024.

- iv. That thereafter Glorii had filed a Revision Petition against the Partition Order/S dated 28.06.2024 and Takseem. However, Revision Court vide its order dated 11.07.2025 upheld the Partition and dismissed the Revision Petition of Glorii. A copy of the same is attached herewith
- v. That, M/s Babler Projects Pvt. Ltd., in collaboration with the Applicant-Promoter and the Applicant- Promoter, applied for the issuance of a License for developing a Group Housing Colony on the Licensed Land (23 Kanals and 9 Marla owned by Applicant-Promoter and 17 Kanal and 13 Marla owned by Babler Projects Pvt. Ltd.). During the pendency of the approval of the License, Glorii raised similar frivolous objections in DTCP. License No. 62 of 2025 was issued on 01.05.2025.
- vi. Thereafter after obtaining the requisite approvals from the Competent Authorities, had submitted an application under the provisions of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016 (hereinafter

AIPL BHARAT INFRASTRUCTURE PRIVATE LIMITED

CIN: U68100HR2024PTC124408

Registered Office: AIPL Business Club, Fifth Floor, Badshahpur, Gurgaon – 122 101, Haryana

Tel. No: +91 92111 60000, Email: rera-haryana@aipl.com

referred to as the “RERA Act, 2016”) for registration of a real estate project, namely, “Riviera at AIPL Lake City” (hereinafter referred to as the “Project”).

- vii. The applicant made an application before the RERA Regulation and Development) Act, 2016 dated 03.11.2025.
- viii. That after issuance of the License and during the process of registration, Glorii also filed a Representation on 10.06.2025, on false and frivolous grounds, raising the same issues which were raised in the Revision Petition and requested the Ld. Authority not to grant any registration to Applicant-Promoter, with respect to License No. 62 of 2025. Furthermore, after the dismissal of the Revision Petition, Glorii filed a CWP challenging the revision court’s order dated 11.07.2025 bearing no. CWP No. 21373 of 2025 titled as “*Glorii Education Technology Pvt. Ltd. vs Commissioner, Gurugram, Division, Gurugram, and Ors.*”. That in the said CWP, M/s Desert Moon Realtors Pvt. Ltd. and M/s Babler Projects Pvt. Ltd. were also made parties. That the Hon’ble High Court *vide* its Order dated 31.07.2025 directed the parties thereto to maintain status quo qua the land under partition (as existing on that day) till the next date of hearing i.e., 19.08.2025.
- ix. It is pertinent to note that the Hon’ble High Court neither granted any stay

AIPL BHARAT INFRASTRUCTURE PRIVATE LIMITED

CIN: U68100HR2024PTC124408

Registered Office: AIPL Business Club, Fifth Floor, Badshahpur, Gurgaon – 122 101, Haryana

Tel. No: +91 92111 60000, Email: rera-haryana@aipl.com

on the revision court order dated 11.07.2025 nor granted any stay with respect to the license or approval qua the project.

- x. However in the garb of intimating the Ld. Authority about the order dated 31.07.2025, Misinterpreting the above referred order Glorii had filed a Letter dated 06.08.2025 *vide* Dak Receipt No. 95952 on 08.08.2025, to intimate the Ld. Authority about the Order dated 31.07.2025 passed by the Hon'ble High Court, Glorii requested the Ld. Authority not to issue or renew any approvals/ permissions/ NOC in relation to License No. 62 of 2025 or register the Project.
- xi. It is pertinent to mention herein that both the Representation dated 10.06.2025 and the Letter dated 08.08.2025 were filed by Glorii with a *malafide* intention of hampering the development of the Project and in order to delay and derail the process of registration for its Competitive benefits.
- xii. It is reiterated herein that the Representation dated 10.06.2025 was filed by Glorii on similar grounds that were taken in the Revision Petition. That the Revision Petition has already been dismissed, and the Partition/ Sanad Takseem was upheld by the Hon'ble Revisional Court. Therefore, it is safe to say that as on date the Representation date 10.06.2025 has become infructuous. Furthermore, *vide* Order dated 31.07.2025, the

AIPL BHARAT INFRASTRUCTURE PRIVATE LIMITED

CIN: U68100HR2024PTC124408

Registered Office: AIPL Business Club, Fifth Floor, Badshahpur, Gurgaon – 122 101, Haryana

Tel. No: +91 92111 60000, Email: rera-haryana@aipl.com

Hon'ble High Court has directed the parties to maintain the status quo as of that day. It is further submitted that the aforementioned CWP is filed by Glorii against the Order of the Hon'ble Revisional Court wherein the Partition/Sanad Takseem was upheld by the Hon'ble Revisional Court.

xiii. It is pertinent to bring it to the knowledge of the Ld. Authority that Glorii in its Letter filed on 08.08.2025, is trying to mislead the Ld. Authority by stating that the Hon'ble High Court has

directed the parties to maintain the status quo as existing on the said date with respect to License No. 62 of 2025. It is important to clarify herein that the said CWP was filed by Glorii against the Order passed by the Hon'ble Revisional Court. That with a *malafide* intention of extracting unjust enrichment from the Applicant-Promoter, Glorii has raised issues with respect to partition/sanand takseem only. That no issues were raised involving the License No. 62 of 2025, nor any reliefs are sought against License No. 62 of 2025.

xiv. It is further pertinent to mention herein that as per the Order dated 31.07.2025, the status quo was to be maintained as existing on the said date. Since, the issues were only with respect to partition/sanad takseem, therefore, as per the directions of the Hon'ble High Court the Parties

AIPL BHARAT INFRASTRUCTURE PRIVATE LIMITED

CIN: U68100HR2024PTC124408

Registered Office: AIPL Business Club, Fifth Floor, Badshahpur, Gurgaon – 122 101, Haryana

Tel. No: +91 92111 60000, Email: rera-haryana@aipl.com

thereto, were obligated to maintain the status quo only with respect to partition of the land which was already approved by Assistant Collector, 2nd Grade, Kadipur and further upheld by the Hon'ble Revisional Court vide its Order dated 11.07.2025.

- xv. However, Glorii using and misinterpreting the order of the Hon'ble High court filed the above referred representation before the Ld. Authority seeking intervention in the proceedings of registration and objecting to the registration of the project.
- xvi. It is further submitted herein that the Hon'ble High Court *vide* its Order dated 14.11.2025, has already mentioned that **the Interim Order dated 31.07.2025 shall continue only with respect to the land under partition till the next date of hearing, i.e., 02.12.2025.** Relevant extract of the order is reproduced herein below:

“List on 02.12.2025.

To be taken up at 2.00 pm.

Interim order dated 31.07.2025 shall
continue in respect of land under partition, till next date of
hearing.”

A bare perusal of the aforementioned Order, it is evident that the Hon'ble High Court has directed the parties to the said CWP to maintain the status

AIPL BHARAT INFRASTRUCTURE PRIVATE LIMITED

CIN: U68100HR2024PTC124408

Registered Office: AIPL Business Club, Fifth Floor, Badshahpur, Gurgaon – 122 101, Haryana

Tel. No: +91 92111 60000, Email: rera-haryana@aipl.com

quo only with respect to land under partition, i.e., as per the sanad takseem. That said, Order nowhere mentions that there is any status quo on the License bearing No. 62 of 2025. That by misinterpreting and misrepresenting the Order of the Hon'ble High Court, Glorii only wants to create hurdles in the registration proceedings of the Project.

- xvii. It is also pertinent to note that the Hon'ble High Court while considering the CWP No. 21373 of 2025 on 14.11.2025, post approval of the Zoning plans and Building plans, have reiterated their order for continuation of interim orders dated 31.07.2025 and stated that the said status quo pertains to **“status quo of the land under partition”**.

A copy of the Order dated 14.11.2025 is enclosed herewith and marked as Enclosure – A.

- xviii. It is most respectfully submitted that
- (a) Such kind of issues of land are subject to the outcome of the proceedings before civil courts whereby Glorii is already under litigation
 - (b) The issue is not a subject matter or in the jurisdiction of the Hon'ble Authority.

AIPL BHARAT INFRASTRUCTURE PRIVATE LIMITED

CIN: U68100HR2024PTC124408

Registered Office: AIPL Business Club, Fifth Floor, Badshahpur, Gurgaon – 122 101, Haryana

Tel. No: +91 92111 60000, Email: rera-haryana@aipl.com

- xix. It is also pertinent to note that with respect to Section 4 of the RERA, it is the obligation of the promoter to disclose such litigations, which the applicant has duly made.
- xx. It is further pertinent to mention herein that in many other matters, the Ld. Authority has duly taken the said stand and have granted registration to the promoters subject to due disclosures.
- xxi. It is reiterated herein that in the present matter, there is no dispute with respect to the License and the Land, the only issue is with respect to Sanad Takseem, with respect to land under partition which is only less than one acre of the entire project and the same is pending before the Hon'ble High Court. The Hon'ble Court also did not pass any order with respect to License No. 62 of 2025, which itself signifies that the License has been obtained by following the due procedure of the law with respect to any such approvals thereof / registration thereof of the project.
- xxii. Thus, it is evident that the Representation dated 10.06.2025 and the Letter dated 08.08.2025 were filed by Glorii with a malafide intention of hampering the registration of the Project in order to extract unjust

AIPL BHARAT INFRASTRUCTURE PRIVATE LIMITED

CIN: U68100HR2024PTC124408

Registered Office: AIPL Business Club, Fifth Floor, Badshahpur, Gurgaon – 122 101, Haryana

Tel. No: +91 92111 60000, Email: rera-haryana@aipl.com

enrichment from the Applicant-Promoter. Therefore, the same deserves to be dismissed for wasting the time and resources of the Ld. Authority. It is further reiterated that such kind of issues of land are subject to the outcome of the proceedings before civil courts.

- xxiii. It is reiterated that due disclosures of litigation, according to section of the RERA has duly made by the applicant. It is reiterated that DTCP while considering the license have sanctioned the zoning plans and building plans which have been done much subsequent to the orders of the Hon'ble High court which shows that there is no stay on the approvals qua the project.
- xxiv. It is most humbly submitted that the Applicant-Promoter/ applicant undertakes to abide by any such requirements / compliances as deem fit by this Hon'ble Authority while granting the registration of the Project.

PRAYER

In view of the aforementioned submissions, it is most humbly requested that this Ld. Authority be pleased to:

- a. Take on record the present Reply.
- b. Grant the Registration of the Project.
- c. Dismiss the Representation dated 10.06.2025 and 08.08.2025.

AIPL BHARAT INFRASTRUCTURE PRIVATE LIMITED

CIN: U68100HR2024PTC124408

Registered Office: AIPL Business Club, Fifth Floor, Badshahpur, Gurgaon – 122 101, Haryana

Tel. No: +91 92111 60000, Email: rera-haryana@aipl.com

- d. Pass any such other order(s)/direction(s) in favor of the Applicant-Promoter as may be deemed fit and proper in view of the facts and circumstances explained hereinabove.

APPLICANT-PROMOTER

List of Enclosures:

1. *Enclosure A - A copy of the Order dated 14.11.2025 passed by the Hon'ble High Court.*
2. *Enclosure b – A copy of Revision Court order dated 11.07.2025*

CWP-21372-2025 (O/M)
CM-15702-CWP-2025 in/and CWP-21373-2025 (O/M)

Glori Education Technology Private Limited
Versus
Commissioner, Gurugram Division, Gurugram and others

Present:- Mr. R.S. Rai, Senior Advocate,
Mr. Aashish Chopra, Senior Advocate with
Ms. Rubina Vermani, Ms. Rupa Pathania,
Mr. Ashish Kundu, Advocates
for the petitioner in both cases.

Mr. Abhimanyu Antil, DAG Haryana.

Mr. Chetan Mittal, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Sahil Sehrawat, Advocate
for respondent No. 3 in CWP-21372-2025
for respondent No. 4 in CWP-21373-2025.

Mr. Amit Jhanji, Senior Advocate with
Ms. Eliza Gupta, Advocate
for respondent No. 3 in CWP-21373-2025.

Mr. Gurminder Singh, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Nitish Bansal, Mr. R.S. Gill, Advocates
for respondents No. 4 , 8, 9, 16, 22.

-.-

-.-

As per office report, notices issued to respondents No. 4
to 6, 8, 9, 12, 13, 16 to 22 have been received back served.

Mr. Gurminder Singh, Senior Advocate (with Mr. Nitish
Bansal, Advocate) appears on behalf of respondents No. 4 , 8, 9, 16, 22.

Further, respondent No. 7 is stated to have expired. It
transpires that respondent No. 9 is son of respondent No. 7, accordingly,
learned senior counsel appearing for respondents No. 4, 8, 9, 16, 22
submits that he would file necessary application for bringing on record
legal representatives of respondent No. 7.

Further, notices issued to respondents No. 10, 11, 15 are reported to have been received back unserved on account of incomplete/incorrect address, whereas notice issued to respondent No. 14 has been received back unserved with the report that respondent No. 14 has shifted to somewhere in Delhi.

Learned senior counsel appearing for petitioner submits that service upon respondents No. 14 and 15 may not be required at this stage as they are impleaded as proforma respondents.

Respondents No. 5, 6, 7, 12, 13 are stated to be served, however, none has put in appearance on their behalf, accordingly, they are proceeded against ex-parte.

Learned State counsel is directed to produce records pertaining to the partition.

List on 02.12.2025.

To be taken up at 2.00 pm.

Interim order dated 31.07.2025 shall continue in respect of land under partition, till next date of hearing.

Photocopy of this order be placed on connected case file.

(HARSH BUNGER)
JUDGE

14.11.2025
sjks

**IN THE COURT OF SH. RAMESH CHANDER BIDHAN, IAS, COMMISSIONER,
GURUGRAM DIVISION, GURUGRAM.**

Case ID: 03501R0120445025
Case No.: ER: 115 of 2025
Date of Institution: 30.05.2025
Date of Decision: 11.07.2025

M/s Glorii Education Technology Pvt. Ltd., Registered Office: 12A Floor, Tower-2, M3M International Financial Center, Sector-66, Gurugram – 122002.

...Petitioner.

Versus

M/s Desert Moon Realtors Pvt. Ltd., Registered Office: 153, Okhla Industrial Area, Phase-2, New Delhi, through Authorized Representative Sh. Pawan Kumar (Now M/s Babier Projects Pvt. Ltd., Regd. Office AIPL Business Club, 5th Floor, Golf Course Ext. Road, Sector 62, Gurugram).

...Respondent

Counsels: Sh. Rajneesh Aggarwal, Counsel for the petitioner.
Sh. Satyender Kumar Goyal, Counsel for the respondent.

Judgement:

This revision petition under the provisions of the Haryana Land Revenue Act, 1887 has been filed by the revisionist challenging the legality and validity of the orders dated 24.06.2024, 28.06.2024, 02.07.2024, 02.08.2024 and 05.08.2024 passed by the Assistant Collector 2nd Grade, Kadipur in Partition Case No. 13/NT, whereby the petitioner was proceeded ex parte, the mode of partition was sanctioned, partition maps (Naksha Kha and Naksha Ga) were approved, and the final Sanad Takseem was issued, thereby concluding the partition proceedings. The petitioner alleges that the entire proceedings were undertaken in an unlawful, hasty, and collusive manner without compliance with the principles of natural justice or statutory requirements, thereby causing grave prejudice to its rights over the land in question.

2. During the course of hearing, an application was moved on behalf of M/s Babier Projects Pvt. Ltd., stating that they had acquired an interest in the subject land through the said registered sale deed and sought impleadment as a necessary party. Keeping in view that they were directly affected by the outcome of these proceedings and their name had been duly recorded in the revenue records, they were impleaded as respondents in the case. The parties were accordingly directed to file amended memos of parties. On the joint request



ATTESTED

EXAMINER

37

ER 115 of 2025

M/s Glorii Education Technology Pvt. Ltd. Vs. M/s Desert Moon Realtors Pvt. Ltd.

of both sides, the matter was fixed for final arguments on 08.07.2025. On the said date, the petitioner's arguments were heard in detail. However, Sh. Azad Singh, counsel for the respondent, despite having filed his memo of appearance, remained absent and did not advance oral arguments. The respondents were therefore granted three days' time to submit their written arguments. The matter was reserved for orders, and subsequently, on 10.07.2025, written submissions were filed on behalf of the respondents through their newly appointed counsel Sh. Satyender Kumar Goyal, and the same were duly placed on the record.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner in his arguments submitted that the impugned orders dated 24.06.2024, 28.06.2024, 02.07.2024, 02.08.2024 and 05.08.2024, passed by the Assistant Collector 2nd Grade, Kadipur, suffer from material irregularities, procedural lapses, and are liable to be set aside in the interest of justice. It was vehemently argued that the entire partition proceedings were conducted ex parte against the petitioner without effecting proper service of summons and without affording any opportunity of hearing, thereby violating the fundamental principles of natural justice. The learned counsel emphasized that although the petitioner's registered office address is clearly mentioned in the partition application, the summons were issued to a different and incorrect address at Village Daultabad, and no effort was made to serve the petitioner through Registered A.D. or by pasting. The subsequent step of Munadi was initiated without any speaking order justifying the same and without exhausting other statutory modes of service, which clearly vitiates the legality of the proceedings.

4. It was further contended that the speed with which the partition proceedings were concluded raises serious concerns of collusion and malafide intent. The partition application was filed on 03.06.2024, the petitioner was proceeded ex parte on 24.06.2024, the mode of partition was sanctioned on 28.06.2024, and Naksha B was approved on 02.07.2024—all within an unreasonably short span of time. It was submitted that no opportunity was granted to the petitioner to file objections to the proposed mode of partition, and the ex parte approval of the mode and plans on the same day as their preparation is contrary to the mandatory procedural safeguards under the Punjab Land Revenue Act, 1887 and the rules framed thereunder.

ATTESTED



EXAMINER

5. The petitioner also submitted that a civil suit concerning the title of the land is pending between the petitioner and third parties, and therefore, the partition proceedings should have been kept in abeyance till the decision in the said civil suit. It was further argued that the petitioner only came to know about the partition orders on 23.05.2025 when the respondent attempted to take possession of the subject land. The petitioner alleged that the entire proceedings are merely paper transactions and were never actually implemented on the ground. It was finally submitted that the impugned orders were passed behind the back of the petitioner and are not sustainable in law and hence liable to be set aside. The petitioner prayed that the entire matter be remanded to the Assistant Collector for fresh adjudication after giving a proper opportunity of hearing to both parties.

6. In response, learned counsel for the respondent submitted written arguments contending that the present revision petition is legally not maintainable and deserves to be dismissed at the threshold. It was argued that under the Haryana Land Revenue Act, 1887, there is no provision permitting a revision against the final order of partition, i.e., Sanad Takseem. Once Sanad Takseem is issued, the partition proceedings attain finality and cannot be reopened by way of revision. It was submitted that the only remedy available, if at all, lies before the Hon'ble High Court in writ jurisdiction under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, as held in *Hoshiar v. State of Haryana* [2020(2) RCR (Civil) 606], *Raja Ram v. Tehsildar* [2001(2) RCR (Civil) 739], and *Lala Ram v. Financial Commissioner, Haryana* [1992(1) RRR 231].

7. It was further argued that the present revision petition is hopelessly barred by limitation. The Sanad Takseem was issued on 05.08.2024, and the revision was filed on 30.05.2025, after a delay of over nine months. No application for condonation of delay has been filed, nor have any sufficient grounds been pleaded to explain such an inordinate delay. The respondents relied upon *Ragho Singh v. Mohan Singh* [2003(1) RCR (Civil) 40 SC], wherein it was held that in the absence of an application for condonation of delay, a time-barred appeal or revision cannot be entertained.

8. On merits, it was argued that the partition proceedings were conducted in strict compliance with law. The address of the petitioner mentioned in the revenue records was that of Chennai, which was used for issuance of summons. Upon failure of service, Munadi was conducted in accordance with Section 20 of the Act and Rapat No. 1261 dated



M/s Glorii Education Technology Pvt. Ltd. Vs. M/s Desert Moon Realtors Pvt. Ltd.

24.06.2024 was duly recorded in the Roznamcha. It was only after this procedure was followed that the petitioner was proceeded against ex parte. The contention that the petitioner had no knowledge of the proceedings is completely unsubstantiated and an afterthought aimed at stalling the lawful process.

9. It was submitted that the partition was implemented both on the spot and in the revenue records. Mutation No. 4078 was sanctioned on 30.08.2024 in favour of the respondent M/s Desert Moon Realtors Pvt. Ltd., and thereafter the land was lawfully sold to M/s Babler Projects Pvt. Ltd., vide sale deed (Vasika No. 7476) and mutation No. 4084 was sanctioned accordingly. Rapat No. 1403 dated 12.08.2024 records the delivery of possession in favour of the respondent, thus negating the petitioner's claim that the proceedings were not implemented.

10. The respondent further submitted that the land has been equitably partitioned and allotted as per share and quality. The petitioner was allotted 8 Kanai 5 Marla with 18.5 Karam frontage, while the respondent was allotted 7 Kanai 15 Marla with 17.5 Karam frontage. The partition was done in accordance with the approved mode, and condition No. 8 was followed by considering adjacency to other land held by the parties. There was no variation in the quality or location of the land, and hence no prejudice was caused to the petitioner.

11. Lastly, it was contended that the present petition is motivated by mala fide intent to obstruct the respondent's development project. The respondent has already secured License No. 61 of 2025 dated 01.05.2025 from the competent authority for construction of a group housing project. The filing of the present revision petition thereafter is nothing but an attempt to blackmail and harass the respondent under the garb of procedural objections. The revisionist has also filed Civil Suit No. CS/2093/2025, challenging the partition proceedings on similar grounds, thereby abusing the process of law. The respondent prayed for dismissal of the revision with costs.

12. After hearing the arguments and perusal of the records it is observed that the land subject to partition comprises Khewat No. 107, Khata No. 114, situated in the revenue estate of Village Daultabad, Sub-Tehsil Kadipur, District Gurugram, and includes Mustill No. 40, Killa Nos. 16/1 (2-0) and 16/2 (6-0), and Mustill No. 41, Killa No. 20 (8-0), measuring a total of 16 Kanai. The respondent initiated partition proceedings before the Assistant Collector 2nd Grade, Kadipur on 03.06.2024. Upon referral to the Assistant Collector 1st Grade,

sh

ATTESTED
[Signature]
EXAMINER

notices were issued to the petitioner on 12.06.2024. Following non-service of summons, Munadi was ordered and conducted on 24.06.2024, duly recorded in Rapat No. 1261 by the Halqa Patwari. As the petitioner failed to appear, it was proceeded against ex parte. The mode of partition was sanctioned on 28.06.2024, Naksha B was approved on 02.07.2024, Naksha Zim was issued on 02.08.2024, and Sanad Takseem was ultimately issued on 05.08.2024. Subsequent to partition, mutation No. 4078 was sanctioned in favour of the respondent, and a portion of the land was sold to M/s Babler Projects Pvt. Ltd. through registered sale deed bearing Vasika No. 7476 dated 30.08.2024, which led to the entry of Mutation No. 4084

13. Having considered the pleadings, arguments, and material placed on record, it is evident that the petitioner has raised a plausible concern regarding the service of notice. The record indicates that while the summons were issued on 12.06.2024, the same were addressed to the petitioner's Chennai address as recorded in the revenue entries. Upon failure of personal service, the Assistant Collector proceeded to order Munadi, which was conducted on 24.06.2024 and recorded in Rapat No. 1261. While it may be argued that service through registered post or pasting could have been additionally undertaken, the fact remains that the Munadi was legally permissible under Section 20 of the Punjab Land Revenue Act, 1887, and the revenue file reflects compliance with that procedure. Thus, although there appears to have been scope for more exhaustive efforts at service, the procedural deficiency, if any, is not sufficient to vitiate the entire proceedings in the absence of demonstrable prejudice.

14. This brings the Court to the substantive core of the matter—whether any injustice or prejudice has been caused to the petitioner in the actual outcome of the partition. On this aspect, it is noteworthy that the petitioner was allotted land measuring 8 Kanal 5 Marla with 18.5 Karam road frontage, while the respondent was allotted 7 Kanal 15 Marla with 17.5 Karam frontage. The distribution of land is proportionate, equitable, and conforms to the sanctioned mode of partition. Condition No. 8 of the mode of partition provided for adjustment of land adjoining other holdings of the parties, which was duly considered. The Naksha B and Naksha Zim do not indicate any disparity in quality or value of the land allotted to either party. Moreover, the partition has been duly implemented on ground and in the revenue records with mutation No. 4078 and Rapat No. 1403 reflecting delivery of possession.



M/s Glorii Education Technology Pvt. Ltd. Vs. M/s Desert Moon Realtors Pvt. Ltd.

15. Even if there were some procedural lapses in service, the overall fairness and finality of the partition must weigh heavily in the balance. Courts have consistently held that mere technical defects cannot undo administrative proceedings where substantive justice has been done. In the present case, no evidence has been led to suggest that the petitioner suffered a loss of share, denial of road access, or qualitative disadvantage in the land allotted. On the contrary, the partition ensured a fair and proportionate division.

16. On the issue of limitation, the revision petition has been filed nearly nine months after the issuance of Sanad Takseem, without any application for condonation of delay or reasonable explanation. This alone renders the petition liable to dismissal. Moreover, in terms of legal maintainability, it is now well settled by judicial precedent, including *Hoshiar v. State of Haryana* [2020(2) RCR (Civil) 606] and *Raja Ram v. Tehsildar* [2001(2) RCR (Civil) 739], that once a Sanad Takseem is issued, partition proceedings attain finality.

17. In conclusion, while the petitioner's concern regarding notice service is acknowledged, the same does not eclipse the broader finding that the partition proceedings were substantively fair, equitably implemented, and duly concluded under law. No evidence of malafide, collusion, or inequitable division has been shown. The procedural irregularity, even if presumed, has not caused actual prejudice that would justify setting aside a concluded partition. Hence, no interference is warranted in exercise of revisional jurisdiction. Accordingly, the revision petition is hereby dismissed.

18. To be communicated.

Dated: 11.07.2025
Place: Gurugram



VCH
Commissioner, Gurugram Division
Gurugram

ATTESTED

SA
EXAMINER

Recd. CD 2 No. 1759
Date of Application 22/11/25
No. of Pages 8
Copying Fees 10
Urgent Fees -
Search Fees -
Name of Copyist Om
Date of Preparation 20/11/25
Date of Issuance 29/11/25
Date of Delivery 30/11/25

Certified to be A true copy

AB 20/11/25
Copying Agent
Authorized by section 75 of The
Bhartiya Sakshya Adhiniyam 2023