



2026:AHC-LKO:10259-DB

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD  
LUCKNOW**

**WRIT - C No. - 1326 of 2026**

Romila Verma

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

U.P. Real Estate Regulatory Authority Rajya  
Niyogan Santhan Thru. Its Chairman And Another

..... Respondent(s)

---

|                           |   |                      |
|---------------------------|---|----------------------|
| Counsel for Petitioner(s) | : | Surangama Sharma     |
| Counsel for Respondent(s) | : | Shobhit Mohan Shukla |

---

**Court No. - 1**

**HON'BLE RAJAN ROY, J.**

**HON'BLE ABDHESH KUMAR CHAUDHARY, J.**

1. Heard Sri Amrendra Nath Tripathi, learned Senior Advocate assisted by Ms. Surangama Sharma, learned counsel for the petitioner and Sri Shobhit Mohan Shukla, learned counsel for the RERA.
2. This petition has been filed by one of the allottees to a project, which was earlier being promoted by 12 promoters, however, proceedings took place under the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code before the National Company Law Tribunal wherein resolution plan has been approved vide order dated 27.02.2023.
3. The petitioner claims that he is mentioned as an allottee in the project in said order of the NCLT and in those very proceedings the opposite party no. 2 was allowed to step into the shoes of the earlier promoters. Now the new promoter i.e. opposite party no. 2 is seeking extension of the registration of the project under Section 6 of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development), Act 2016 (in short "the Act, 2016").
4. The contention of the petitioner herein is that the opposite party no. 2 should disclose before the RERA the number of the allottees of the project so that their rights are protected by RERA.
5. Sri Shobhit Mohan Shukla appearing for RERA says that the petitioner has no locus to maintain this petition for the relief claimed. The representation disposal of which has been sought by U.P. RERA is not a

statutory representation. The U.P. RERA while considering the application of the opposite party no. 2 under Section 6 and the corresponding Rules, if any, will obviously look into all the relevant factors and law on the subject. As regards the interest and rights of the petitioner and similarly situated are concerned, if they are violated or at risk there are remedies prescribed under the Act, 2016 and the Rules made thereunder, which can be availed at the appropriate stage but the petitioner does not have a right of hearing at this stage before RERA.

6. We find merit in the submission of Sri Shobhit Mohan Shukla and **dispose of the writ petition accordingly** in terms of the statement made i.e. without prejudice to rights, if any, of the petitioner under the Act, 2016, Rules made thereunder and the law of the land.

7. Needless to say that the application, if any, of the opposite party no. 2 under Section 6 of the Act, 2016 and the Rules corresponding to it will be considered as per the prescribed parameters and in accordance with law and we cannot possibly presume that the U.P. RERA while considering and deciding the application of the opposite party no. 2 shall act contrary to the law, which it is bound to follow.

.

(Abdhesh Kumar Chaudhary,J.) (Rajan Roy,J.)

**February 10 , 2026**

Anuj Singh