

PROCEEDINGS OF THE DAY		74
Day and Date	Friday and 31.10.2025	
Complaint No.	MA NO. 414 & 415/2025 in CR/5973/2023 Case titled as Yuvraj Arora and Vivek Arora VS Ramprastha Estate Private Limited & Ramprastha Developers Private Limited & Ramprastha Promoters and Developers Private Limited	
Complainant	Yuvraj Arora and Vivek Arora	
Represented through	Shri Garvit Gupta Advocate	
Respondent	Ramprastha Estate Private Limited & Ramprastha Developers Private Limited & Ramprastha Promoters and Developers Private Limited	
Respondent Represented	Ms. Shikha Khurana Adv. for R2	
Last date of hearing	Appl. u/s 39 of the Act/24.10.2025	
Proceeding Recorded by	Naresh Kumari and HR Mehta	
Proceedings Application under Section 39 of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016 filed on 14.05.2025 by responded no. 3. This application is preferred by the Respondent against the order dated 26.07.2024, which was passed against Respondent No. 3, i.e., Ramprashtha Promoters and Developers Pvt. Ltd. (RPDPL). It is a matter of record that Respondent No. 3 was not even incorporated on the date of the alleged transaction, i.e., 23.08.2006. As per the records of the Ministry of Corporate Affairs, RPDPL was incorporated only on 22.06.2007, nearly a year after the issuance of the receipt in question.		

The legal principle regarding the separate legal personality of incorporated companies is well established and settled in law. Therefore, it is beyond dispute that RPDPL could not have been a party to the said transaction or held liable for any obligations arising therefrom.

Despite this indisputable factual position, the Authority has erroneously treated all three respondent companies as a single entity and has imposed identical obligations and directions upon them, without recording any findings regarding their distinct legal identities or the absence of a contractual relationship between the complainants and the applicants herein.

This approach reflects a manifest error apparent on the face of the record, which warrants rectification under Section 39 of the RERA Act, 2016.

The Applicants further reserve their right to prefer an appeal under Section 44 of the RERA Act, 2016 against the impugned order, including on broader grounds than those raised in the present application, as may be deemed necessary.

Suggestion: In this regard, it has been observed by the Authority in several matters that the respondent-promoters — **Ramprastha Promoter Private Limited, Ramprastha Developer Private Limited, Ramprastha Promoter and Developer Private Limited, and Ramprastha Estates Private Limited** — though incorporated as distinct legal entities, are in effect functioning in concert and operating as a single composite unit.

A cursory perusal of the **MCA Master Data** clearly indicates that all these entities share the same registered office address and use the same official email ID, *compliances@ramprastha.com*. Furthermore, these companies have common individuals serving in various capacities, including Managing Directors and Authorised Representatives, and they operate under a unified group identity and branding.

Such a deliberate corporate structuring appears to be a calculated attempt to mislead allottees by issuing allotment letters and executing agreements for sale under different company names, thereby evading their legal obligations. This pattern of conduct constitutes an **unfair trade practice** and is contrary to the principles of **transparency, accountability, and good faith** enshrined under the applicable legal framework.



HARERA
GURUGRAM

HARYANA REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY
GURUGRAM

हरियाणा भू-संपदा विनियामक प्राधिकरण, गुरुग्राम

MAN 4142415/2025 HRA/2913/2023

New PWD Rest House, Civil Lines, Gurugram, Haryana

नया पी. डब्ल्यू. हा. विभाग गृह, सिविल लाईन, गुरुग्राम, हरियाणा

In view of the foregoing, and guided by the settled legal principle that **no person can take advantage of their own wrong**, it is evident that the respondents have employed the façade of corporate separateness to shield themselves from liability. Accordingly, all the respondent-promoters are to be treated as a **single composite entity**, and their liability shall be construed as **joint and several** for all consequences arising out of the present application.

Therefore, the application under Section 39 of the RERA Act is hereby rejected. File be consigned to the registry.

Arun Kumar
Chairman
31.10.2025