HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR

S.B. Civil Miscellaneous Appeal No. 3661/2026
CNR: RJHC020721642026 | URN: CMA / 6295U / 2026

Vineet Jindal S/o Ram Vilas Jindal, Aged About 47 Years, R/o 70, Devi Murti Colony, Panipat-Haryana-132103

----Appellant

Versus

1. Rajasthan Real Estate Regulatory Authority, Through Its Registrar Having Office At 2Nd And 3Rd Floor, Rsic Building, Udyog Bhavan, Tilak Marg, C-Scheme, Jaipur-302005
2. Anjali Jain W/o Amit Jain, R/o F-1201, Purva Fountain Varthur Road, Marathahalli Bridge Bangalore, North Karnataka- 560037

----Respondents

Connected With

S.B. Civil Miscellaneous Appeal No. 3817/2026
CNR: RJHC020721882026 | URN: CMA / 6485U / 2026

Ajay Singal S/o R.k. Singal, Aged About 57 Years, R/o Ar-502B, 2Nd Floor, Golf Course Road, Aralias, Sector-42, Chatarpur (74) Gurugram, Haryana-122002

----Appellant

Versus

1. Rajasthan Real Estate Regulatory Authority, Through Its Registrar Having Office At 2Nd And 3Rd Floor, Rsic Building, Udyog Bhavan, Tilak Marg, C-Scheme, Jaipur-302005
2. Anjali Jain W/o Amit Jain, R/o F-1201, Purva Fountain Varthur Road, Marathahalli Bridge Bangalore, North Karnataka-560037

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Miscellaneous Appeal No. 3819/2026
CNR: RJHC020721762026 | URN: CMA / 6487U / 2026

Ajay Singal S/o R.k. Singal, Aged About 57 Years, R/o Ar-502B, 2Nd Floor, Golf Course Road, Aralias, Sector-42, Chatarpur (74) Gurugram, Haryana-122002

----Appellant

Versus

1. Rajasthan Real Estate Regulatory Authority, Through Its Registrar Having Office At 2Nd And 3Rd Floor, Rsic Building, Udyog Bhavan, Tilak Marg, C-Scheme, Jaipur-302005
2. Ram Giri S/o N.k. Yadav, R/o E-1/408, Chitrakoot Yojna, Bharat Apartment, Bharat Marg, Ward No. 57, Jaipur, Rajasthan-12202

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Miscellaneous Appeal No. 3820/2026
CNR: RJHC020721842026 | URN: CMA / 6488U / 2026

Ajay Singal S/o R.k. Singal, Aged About 57 Years, R/o Ar-502B, 2Nd Floor, Golf Course Road, Aralias, Sector-42, Chatarpur (74) Gurugram, Haryana-122002

----Appellant

Versus

1. Rajasthan Real Estate Regulatory Authority, Through Its Registrar Having Office At 2Nd And 3Rd Floor, Rsic Building, Udyog Bhavan, Tilak Marg, C-Scheme, Jaipur-302005
2. Kapil Dev Soni S/o Om Prakash Soni, R/o H. No. 5A, Near Kids Kingdom School, Shiv Road, Ratnada, Jodhpur, Rajasthan- 342001

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Miscellaneous Appeal No. 3821/2026
CNR: RJHC020722092026 | URN: CMA / 6489U / 2026

Vineet Jindal S/o Ram Vilas Jindal, Aged About 47 Years, R/o 70, Devi Murti Colony, Panipat-Haryana-132103.

----Appellant

Versus

1. Rajasthan Real Estate Regulatory Authority, Through Its Registrar Having Office At 2Nd And 3Rd Floor, Rsic Building, Udyog Bhavan, Tilak Marg, C-Scheme, Jaipur-302005
2. Kapil Devi Soni S/o Om Prakash Soni, R/o H.no. 5A, Near Kids Kingdom School, Shiv Road Ratnada, Jodhpur, Rajasthan-342001

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Miscellaneous Appeal No. 3822/2026
CNR: RJHC020722152026 | URN: CMA / 6490U / 2026

Vineet Jindal S/o Ram Vilas Jindal, Aged About 47 Years, R/o 70, Devi Murti Colony, Panipat-Haryana-132103.

----Appellant

Versus

1. Rajasthan Real Estate Regulatory Authority, Through Its Registrar Having Office At 2Nd And 3Rd Floor, Rsic Building, Udyog Bhavan, Tilak Marg, C-Scheme, Jaipur-302005
2. Manju Oberoi W/o Upjive Singh Oberoi, R/o 40 C, Green View Apartments, Sector 15 A, Noida, Gautam Buddha Nagar, Uttar Pradesh-201301.
3. Vrinda Oberoi D/o Upjive Singh Oberoi, R/o 40C, Green View Apartments, Sector 15 A, Noida, Gautam Buddha Nagar, Uttar Pradesh-201301.

----Respondents

S.B. Civil Miscellaneous Appeal No. 3823/2026
CNR: RJHC020721922026 | URN: CMA / 6491U / 2026

Vineet Jindal S/o Ram Vilas Jindal, Aged About 47 Years, R/o 70, Devi Murti Colony, Panipat-Haryana-132103.

----Appellant

Versus

1. Rajasthan Real Estate Regulatory Authority, Through Its Registrar Having Office At 2Nd And 3Rd Floor, Rsic Building, Udyog Bhavan, Tilak Marg, C-Scheme, Jaipur-302005
2. Ram Giri S/o N.k. Yadav, R/o E-1/408, Chitrakoot Yojna, Bharat Apartment, Bharat Marg, Ward No. 57, Jaipur, Rajasthan-302021

----Respondents

Connected with

S.B. Civil Miscellaneous Appeal No. 2913/2026
CNR: RJHC020593322026 | URN: CMA / 5230U / 2026

Vineet Jindal S/o Ram Vilas Jindal, Aged About 47 Years, R/o 70, Devi Murti Colony, Panipat-Haryana-132103.

----Appellant

Versus

1. Rajasthan Real Estate Regulatory Authority, Through Its Registrar Having Office At 2Nd And 3Rd Floor, Rsic Building, Udyog Bhavan, Tilak Marg, C-Scheme, Jaipur-302005.

2. Avalon Royal Park Home Buyers Association, Through Its Secretary Vikas Verma Having Its Registered Office At 278, Mg Road, Village Sukhrali Pt. Jeet Ram Marg, Gurugram (Haryana).

----Respondents

For Appellant(s)	:	Mr. Harshal Tholia with Ms.Vidhi Maheshwari with Ms. Disha Bohra Mr. Rubal Tholia
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Harsh Khandelwal Mr. Pranav Sharma Mr. Keshav Dadhich Mr. Mohit Khandelwal

---

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANAND SHARMA

Order

07/10/2026

1. As the facts, cause of action and grievance of the appellants in all above civil miscellaneous appeals are almost identical, therefore, with the consent of learned counsel for both the parties, the matters were heard analogously and are being decided by this common order. For the sake of convenience and ease of understanding, facts stated in Civil Miscellaneous Appeal No.2913/2026 are being taken into consideration.

2. The appellant has filed this Civil Miscellaneous Appeal under Section 58 of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016 (for short 'the Act of 2016') against the order dated

28.04.2026 passed by the Rajasthan Real Estate Tribunal, Jaipur whereby appeal filed by the appellant against the order of Rajasthan Real Estate Regulatory Authority dated 19.02.2026 has been dismissed.

3. S.B. Civil Miscellaneous Appeal No.2913/2026, the proceedings have emanated from the case registered *suo motu* by the RERA with regard to irregularities and financial mismanagement in *Avalon Royal Park Project* situated at Village Saidpur, Alwar Bypass Road, Bhiwadi, Rajasthan developed by GRJ Distributors and Developers Pvt. Ltd. (in short, 'the Company). Since, merits of the complaints and grievances therein which are being considered by the RERA are not relevant for the purpose of adjudication of the dispute involved in these appeals, therefore, this Court refrains from making any observations or consideration in this regard.

4. Grievance of the appellant is that in *suo motu* petition, an application was moved by the complainants for impleading first **(i) Parsvnath Developers Limited, (ii) Gauresh Buildwell Private Limited and (iii) Mrs. Nutan Jain** as parties-respondents to the proceedings and in the application admittedly, no prayer whatsoever was made to implead the appellant Vineet Jindal and Ajay Singhal. It is submitted that on such application, without there being any authority of law, notice dated 03.12.2025 was issued by RERA to the appellants requiring them to appear before the Authority on 16.12.2025. As per appellant, on the date assigned in the notice, the appellants appeared before the RERA and raised an objection that since there was no application whatsoever for impleading the appellants, hence, notices were

erroneously issued to them. Therefore, after considering such an objection order dated 12.01.2026 was passed by RERA, wherein it was specified that in *suo motu* matter, the notices issued on 03.12.2025 to the appellants were recalled at that stage. Learned counsel for the appellants submits that thus, the intention of RERA was clear that the appellants were not required to be impleaded as parties to the proceedings, however, later on, a separate order dated 19.02.2026 was passed wherein it was wrongly mentioned that the application was moved by the complainants for impleading the appellants also as parties to the proceedings and while recording such erroneous statement, the appellants were also directed to be impleaded as party-respondent in the *suo motu* complaint pending before the authorities.

5. It is further contended that so far as other cases are concerned, the applications were although submitted by the complainants to implead the appellant as parties to the proceedings, yet the same were opposed by the appellants while raising an objection that at the relevant time when the alleged agreements were executed between the complainants and company, the petitioner-appellant Amit Jindal was not a director/promoter. It was also submitted that even otherwise there are no specific allegations in the complaint against the appellants therefore, for the sake of maintaining the corporate veil, the appellants cannot be impleaded as party to the proceedings.

6. Learned counsel for the appellants further submits that the orders passed by RERA for impleading the appellants were challenged by them by way of filing appeal before Rajasthan Real Estate Appellate Tribunal, however, all the appeals were dismissed

by separate orders dated 28.04.2026 & 26.05.2026. Details of orders passed by RERA and the Appellate Authority are being given hereunder:

Sr.No.	Case No.	Order of RERA	Order of REAT
1.	2913/2026	19/02/2026	28/04/2026
2.	3817/2026	19/02/2026	26/05/2026
3.	3819/2026	19/02/2026	26/05/2026
4	3820/2026	19/02/2026	26/05/2026
5.	3822/2026	19/02/2026	26/05/2026
6.	3821/2026	19/02/2026	26/05/2026
7.	3823/2026	19/02/2026	26/05/2026
8.	3661/2026	19/02/2026	26/05/2026

7. It is submitted that in the appeal filed by the appellant against the order passed in s*uo motu* proceedings although the Appellate Authority recorded the fact that no application whatsoever was ever filed to implead the appellants, yet while passing final order, the appellants were also impleaded by the RERA. Even after recording such factual statements, in quite mechanical manner and without recording any justified finding, the appeals filed by the appellants were also dismissed. In the other appeals preferred by the appellant, the Appellate Authority has failed to apply its judicious mind and without considering the grounds of appeal, in quite routine manner, the appeals were decided and thereby approved the orders passed by RERA to implead the appellants as parties to the proceeding before the RERA, whereas no specific allegation against the appellants are there in the complaint and merely on the basis of omnibus and general allegations, the appellants could not have been impleaded as parties to the proceedings.

8. *Per contra*, learned counsel for the respondent-complainant opposed the appeal and submitted that orders have been passed by RERA as well as by REAT after meticulous examination of material on record and law prevailing at the relevant time, hence, there is no infirmity whatsoever in the impugned orders. He submits that the appellant has utterly failed to raise or formulate any question of law warranting consideration in the present appeals. It is submitted that the jurisdiction exercised by RERA under Order 1 Rule 10 of CPC is wide enough and even in the cases where there is no application by either of the parties, in case, the authority finds that any person, firm or company is required to be impleaded for arriving at just conclusion and decision in the matter, even *suo motu*, an order can be passed for impleading that person, firm or company as party to the petition. Learned counsel for the respondents-complainant further submits that at this stage, where merely the order of impleadment of appellants as party-respondent has been passed by the courts below, the issue with regard to examining the merits and allegations of complaint and determination of objections raised by the appellants on merits, does not arise. He submits that since, the appellants have been impleaded as parties to the proceedings, before passing any final order, they shall be granted complete opportunity of hearing by the authorities and all the objections on merits can be raised by the appellants before the authority.

9. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

10. This Court is conscious of the limited scope of appeal under Section 58 of the Act of 2016 which can be entertained only where a substantial question of law arises.

11. The controversy in the present appeals essentially concerns the impleadment of the appellant in proceedings pending before RERA and, therefore, must be examined within the aforesaid limited scope.

12. This Court finds that the orders impugned herein are interlocutory in nature and merely direct the impleadment of the appellants as parties to the proceedings. Such impleadment by itself, neither determines their liability nor adjudicates the merits of the complaints. The appellants would have a full opportunity to file their replies, raise all permissible objections and establish the limits and extents of their respective roles, if any, in the affairs of the project.

13. It is not disputed that the appellant Ajay Singhal was a director/promoter of the company from its inception, whereas appellant Vineet Jindal subsequently joined the company as director/promoter. In these circumstances, the question whether their respective roles and acts warrant any liability cannot be conclusively determined at the stage of impleadment and would require consideration by the RERA upon examination of pleaings and material placed on record. The objection that no specific overt act has been attributed to the appellants can accordingly be examined by the Authority after affording them an adequate opportunity of hearing.

14. As regards the s*uo motu* proceedings, even assuming no application for specifically seeking impleadment of the

appellants had been filed, the same would not, by itself, would render the order unsustainable. The power to implead a necessary or proper party is not necessarily dependent upon an application by an existing party and in appropriate circumstances, such directions for impleadment can be granted by the Court even in absence of any such application.

15. This Court also finds that the Appellate Tribunal has also clarified that the appellants shall be afforded a complete opportunity to explain their status and role in the project and to defend themselves before RERA. Thus, no prejudice warranting interference at this interlocutory stage has been demonstrated. All questions concerning the appellants' individual roles, the applicability of corporate veil and their liability, if any, are left open for consideration by RERA in accordance with law, without being influenced by any observations made in the present order.

16. In view of above, this Court finds that no substantial question of law is involved in the instant appeal and therefore, the appeals filed by the appellants are hereby dismissed.

17. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

18. Office is directed to place one copy each of this order in the connected files.

(ANAND SHARMA),J

42-48 & 90/NEERU