

PROCEEDINGS OF THE DAY		28-34
Day and Date	Thursday and 15.05.2025	
Complaint No.	CR/97/2024 Case titled as Upasana Mahajan VS Orris Infrastructure Private Limited & MCG & DTCP Haryana CR/138/2024 Case titled as Mudit Bhasin VS Orris Infrastructure Private Limited & MCG & DTCP Haryana CR/168/2024 Case titled as Ashish Wadhwa and Rita Wadhwa VS Orris Infrastructure Private Limited & MCG & DTCP Haryana CR/313/2024 Case titled as Perminder Singh VS Orris Infrastructure Private Limited & MCG & DTCP Haryana CR/646/2024 Case titled as Pooja Kohli VS Orris Infrastructure Private Limited & MCG & DTCP Haryana CR/658/2024 Case titled as SK Mahajan and Suman VS Orris Infrastructure Private Limited & MCG & DTCP Haryana CR/667/2024 Case titled as Bela Khanna VS Orris Infrastructure Private Limited & MCG & DTCP Haryana	
Complainant	Upasana Mahajan	
Represented through	Shri Vaibhav Mahajan Advocate	
Respondent	Orris Infrastructure Private Limited & MCG & DTCP Haryana	
Respondent Represented through	Ms. Charu Rustagi Adv. for R1 None for R2 & R3	

Last date of hearing	20.02.2025
Proceeding Recorded by	Naresh Kumari and HR Mehta
Proceedings The present complaint was filed on 30.01.2024 and registered as complaint no. 97 of 2024 and reply on behalf of respondent no.1 was received on 21.03.2024 along with application for dismissal of complaint under Order 7 Rule 11 of CPC. ... stating that the present complainant and respondent no.1 has entered into settlement agreement on 02.06.2018 and all the claim w.r.t assured return was settled in terms & conditions of the settlement agreement dated 02.06.2018. Further, the counsel for the complainant was previously engaged as counsel for respondent no.1, and the same is against the ethics and violation of the Advocates Act. On 27.11.2024, the counsel for the complainant filed reply to the application for dismissal of complaint under Order 7 Rule 11 of CPC, stating that the Authority have no power to decide any application for dismissal of complaint under Order 7 Rule 11 of CPC and can only exercise to the extent of Section 35 of the Act, 2016. Further states that the counsel for the complainant is engaged with the respondent no.1 for a period of 2-3 months and only Vakalatnama was filed on behalf of respondent no.1 and has never appeared in any matter of respondent no.1. Further states that the counsel for the complainant never represented the respondent no.1 against the present complainants. Matter be put up before the Full Bench on 05.08.2025 for arguments on the maintainability of the complaint.	
V.I. 3 Vijay Kumar Goyal Member 15.05.2025	