

BEFORE TELANGANA REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY
[Under the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016]
Complaint No. 843 of 2025

Dated: 22nd June 2026

Quorum: **Sri Laxmi Narayana Jannu, Hon'ble Member**
Sri K. Srinivasa Rao, Hon'ble Member

Between

1. Smt. K. Sravanthi

2. Smt. K. Bhanu Prakash

*(Flat 302, Skypx Oaks Apartment,
TRK Reddy Enclave, Machabollaram,
Alwal Circle, Secundrabad-500010)*

...Complainant

Versus

M/s. Ramky Estate and Farms Limited

rep. by its Authorized Signatory, K. Anil Babu

*(9th floor, Ramky Grandiose, Ramky Towers
Complex, Gachibowli, Rangareddy
District, Telangana-500032)*

...Respondent

The present matter filed by the Complainants mentioned herein above came up for hearing before this Authority in the presence of the Complainant and Respondent. Upon hearing the submissions of all the parties, this Authority proceeds to pass the following **ORDER:**

2. The present Complaint has been filed by the Complainants under Section 31 of the Real Estate (Regulation & Development) Act, 2016 (hereinafter referred to as the "Act") read with Rule 34(1) of the Telangana Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Rules, 2017 (hereinafter referred to as the "Rules") seeking appropriate relief(s) against the Respondent.

A. Brief facts of the Case as per Form M filed by Complainant

3. The Complainants, Mrs. K. Sravanthi (D/o K. Satyanarayana, aged 39 years, Private Employee) and Mr. K. Bhanu Prakash (S/o K. Ashok Kumar, aged 40 years, Private Employee), entered into an Agreement of Sale dated 26 July 2022 with the Respondent, M/s Ramky Estates and Farms Limited (through its Authorised Signatory Mr. K. Anil Babu), for the purchase of Flat No. H-307, Tower H, admeasuring 1,585 sq. ft. in the project "Ramky One Symphony", Patancheru, Hyderabad, for a total sale consideration of ₹1,03,20,623/-.

4. An amount of approximately ₹98,05,087/- was paid by the Complainants through a combination of home-loan disbursements and personal funds, the majority of which was paid within the first year after execution of the Agreement of Sale. Despite receipt of nearly the entire sale consideration, the Respondent failed to obtain the Occupancy Certificate (OC) and

failed to hand over possession by the committed date of 30 September 2025.

5. Instead of handing over lawful possession, the Respondent offered “fit-out possession”, which is not permissible under RERA.

6. During the period 2023 to 2025, the Respondent’s CRM team repeatedly assured the Complainants through email that the Occupancy Certificate was in its final stage. In one communication, the Respondent published a message stating that the OC had been received, which was later admitted by the Respondent to be a “marketing error”.

7. Relying on the above assurances and on the expectation that the promised facilities would be available upon possession, the Complainants made several financial decisions, including the purchase of an electric vehicle worth ₹16,00,000/- after being charged for an EV-charging facility in their parking space. Subsequently, the Respondent claimed that the charging points could not be installed due to fire-department restrictions, as a result of which the vehicle became largely unusable.

8. Based on similar assurances, the Complainants also admitted their child to Samishti School near the project and paid ₹2,00,000/- as non-refundable fees. As possession was delayed, the child could not join the school, resulting in further financial loss.

9. The Complainants continue to pay EMIs towards their home loan without receiving any benefit from the subject property, causing severe financial and emotional distress.

10. A formal Notice of Withdrawal and demand for refund was issued by the Complainants on 1 October 2025, invoking Clause 7.6 of the Agreement of Sale.

11. The Respondent, through its CRM Head, Mr. Rahul Hanchate, replied on 11 October 2025, admitting that the Occupancy Certificate was still pending and that the earlier claim of “OC received” was a marketing mistake. No refund and no firm timeline for possession were provided.

12. The delay and continued misrepresentation constitute violation of the provisions of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016 and entitle the Complainants to refund with interest under Section 18(1)(a) of the Act.

13. Despite service of formal notice dated 1 October 2025 and reminders dated 7 October 2025 and 11 October 2025, the Respondent failed to initiate refund or propose any lawful handover. The Respondent’s last written communication dated 11 October 2025 from the CRM Head confirmed that the Occupancy Certificate was still pending. No further updates have been provided thereafter.

B. Relief(s) Sought:

14. In view of the above-mentioned facts and circumstances, the complainant has humbly

prayed for the following reliefs:

- i. *Direct the Respondent to refund 98,05,087/- (Rupees Ninety-Eight Lakhs Five Thousand and Eighty-Seven only) paid towards the said flat.*
- ii. *Award interest on each payment made from the respective payment dates until actual refund, as per Section 18(1)(a) of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016 and the Telangana Rules framed thereunder.*
- iii. *To pass such other order or orders as this Hon'ble Authority may deem fit and proper in the interest of justice*

C. Counter filed by Respondent

15. At the very outset, the Respondent herein denies each and every allegation, averment, contention and submission made by the Complainant in the present Complaint, except those which are specifically admitted herein. The allegations made in the Complaint are false, frivolous, vexatious, misconceived and unsustainable both in facts and in law and are therefore liable to be rejected in limine. Nothing contained in the Complaint shall be deemed to have been admitted merely because the same has not been specifically traversed herein.

16. The present Complaint is filed with an ulterior motive only to harass the Respondent and to make unlawful and unjustified claims against the Respondent Company. The Complaint is devoid of merits and is liable to be dismissed with exemplary costs.

17. It is submitted by respondent that the Respondent Company had acquired development rights in respect of land admeasuring Ac.13-38 Guntas situated at Sy.Nos.843 and 844 of Patancheru Village and Mandal, Sangareddy District, vide Development Agreement-cum-General Power of Attorney bearing Document No.1735 of 2020 executed with the landowners.

18. It is submitted by respondent that pursuant thereto, the Respondent undertook development of a residential project known as "Ramky One Symphony", consisting of multiple residential towers and amenities block.

19. It is submitted by respondent that after obtaining all requisite approvals and permissions from the competent authorities, the Respondent commenced marketing and sale of apartments in the said project. During the course of such marketing, the Complainants approached the Respondent Company expressing interest in purchasing a residential apartment within the project.

20. It is submitted by respondent that after detailed discussions and interactions with the representatives of the Respondent Company, the Complainants, being fully satisfied with the project specifications, amenities and terms, booked Apartment No. BH-0307 situated on the Third Floor admeasuring 1585 Sq.ft. vide Booking Form dated 30.06.2022.

21. It is further submitted by respondent that pursuant to such booking, an Agreement of Sale dated 26.07.2022 was executed between the parties for a total sale consideration of Rs.1,03,20,623/- after the Complainants had thoroughly read, understood and accepted all the terms and conditions contained therein.
22. It is submitted by respondent that as per the terms of the Agreement of Sale, the scheduled date for completion of the project and handing over possession was September 2025. The Complainants have admittedly paid an amount of Rs.98,05,087/- towards the sale consideration.
23. It is submitted by respondent that after payment of substantial consideration, the Complainants started insisting that the Respondent should complete the apartment and hand over possession much prior to the agreed timeline mentioned in the Agreement of Sale. However, at no point of time did the Respondent or its representatives assure or undertake that possession would be delivered prior to the contractual deadline stipulated under the Agreement.
24. It is submitted by respondent that the Respondent Company had been diligently carrying out construction activities and had completed the apartment within the stipulated timeline. The Respondent had also applied for issuance of Occupancy Certificate before the competent authority. However, certain delay occurred in issuance of Occupancy Certificate due to procedural delays at the end of the concerned authorities, which was beyond the control of the Respondent Company.
25. It is submitted by respondent that despite the Respondent repeatedly informing the Complainants regarding the progress of construction and the status of Occupancy Certificate, the Complainants, vide email dated 01.10.2025, expressed their intention to cancel the booking alleging delay in completion and non-provision of EV charging points.
26. It is submitted by respondent that the Respondent Company, vide reply dated 11.10.2025, clearly informed the Complainants that the apartment construction was completed and requested them to inspect the apartment and verify the same. The Respondent further informed that Occupancy Certificate was under process and all necessary compliances had already been completed.
27. It is submitted by respondent that subsequently the Occupancy Certificate was obtained on 11.12.2025 and the Respondent thereafter requested the Complainants to take possession of the apartment. However, the Complainants failed and neglected to take possession on one pretext or another.

28. It is submitted by respondent that the mention regarding receipt of Occupancy Certificate in certain marketing material prior to actual issuance was only an inadvertent error committed by the marketing team and was never intended to mislead or deceive any customer.

29. It is further submitted by respondent that provision of EV charging points was always subject to prevailing statutory norms and governmental regulations. The Respondent Company had specifically informed the Complainants that restrictions imposed by the Government regarding installation of EV charging points in basement areas had affected all residential projects across Hyderabad and was not specific to the Respondent's project alone. Nevertheless, the Respondent had assured the Complainants that alternate solutions were being explored and, if the same could not be provided, the proportionate amount collected towards the same would be refunded.

30. It is submitted by respondent that the Respondent has at all times acted bonafide, diligently and in accordance with law and has completed the project substantially within the agreed timelines. The allegations made by the Complainants are baseless, false and devoid of any merit.

31. It is submitted by respondent that no cause of action whatsoever survives against the Respondent and the Complaint has been filed only with an intention to harass the Respondent Company and seek unjust enrichment.

32. It is submitted by respondent that the apartment construction was completed within the stipulated timeline i.e., September 2025 and the same was duly communicated to the Complainants. The Respondent Company vide email dated 11.10.2025 had informed the Complainants that the apartment was ready for inspection and possession would be handed over upon receipt of Occupancy Certificate. The delay in issuance of Occupancy Certificate occurred solely due to procedural delays on the part of the concerned authorities and not due to any lapse attributable to the Respondent. The Respondent ultimately obtained the Occupancy Certificate on 11.12.2025.

33. It is further submitted by respondent that the earlier communication regarding grant of Occupancy Certificate was merely an inadvertent marketing error and not an intentional misrepresentation. Necessary corrective measures were also undertaken by the Respondent Company.

34. It is submitted by respondent that provision of EV charging points was always subject to applicable governmental regulations and statutory permissions. The Respondent had duly informed the Complainants regarding restrictions imposed by the Government with respect to installation of EV charging points in basement areas. The Respondent Company has

nevertheless explored alternate means for providing such facility and assured refund of any amount collected towards the same in the event the facility could not be provided.

35. It is denied that the Respondent Company is liable for any personal or financial decisions allegedly taken by the Complainants, including payment of school fees or any other expenses incurred by them. The Respondent at no point assured early possession prior to the agreed timeline under the Agreement of Sale.

36. It is submitted by respondent that the Respondent Company has always maintained transparency regarding construction progress and statutory approvals. The Respondent had continuously updated the Complainants regarding the status of Occupancy Certificate and construction progress. The delay in issuance of Occupancy Certificate was beyond the control of the Respondent and therefore the allegations made in the Complaint are untenable and liable to be rejected.

37. Therefore, in view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, it is most respectfully prayed that this Hon'ble Authority may be pleased to dismiss the present Complaint with exemplary costs and pass such other order or orders as this Hon'ble Authority may deem fit and proper in the interests of justice.

D. Rejoinder filed by Complainants

38. The Complainants deny all averments made in the Counter Affidavit except those specifically admitted herein. The contents of the Complaint are reiterated.

39. At the outset, it is submitted by Complainant that the Respondent has filed its Counter Affidavit beyond the timeline granted by this Hon'ble Authority and the same was not served within the stipulated period.

40. Without prejudice, it is submitted by Complainant that as per the Respondent's own Counter Affidavit, the Occupancy Certificate was received only on 11.12.2025. This clearly establishes that possession was not ready or legally capable of being handed over as on the agreed date of 30.09.2025.

41. It is submitted by Complainant that possession under law necessarily includes obtaining the Occupancy Certificate. In the absence of the same, the project cannot be treated as complete, and possession cannot be said to have been offered in terms of the Agreement for Sale.

42. The Respondent's contention that construction was completed prior to the agreed date is irrelevant, as completion without an Occupancy Certificate does not constitute valid possession.

43. The Respondent has sought to attribute the delay to the authorities. However, no material has been placed on record to show any force majeure event, extension granted by the competent authority, or any legally permissible ground to extend the agreed possession date.

44. The delay in possession is solely attributable to the Respondent, as is evident from their own admissions.

45. The allegation that the Complainants have refused to take possession is misconceived. The Complainants exercised their statutory right to withdraw from the project upon failure of the Respondent to deliver possession within the agreed timeline, as provided under Section 18(1)(a) of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016.

46. Without prejudice, it is submitted that the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Newtech Promoters and Developers Pvt. Ltd. vs. State of UP* has held that an allottee has the right to seek refund in case of delay in handing over possession. Therefore, upon failure to deliver possession by the agreed date, the Complainants are entitled to withdraw and seek refund.

47. The allegations regarding alleged delays in payment are denied. The Complainants have paid a substantial portion of the consideration. In any event, the Respondent's own records show that the final demand was raised only in December 2025, i.e., after the agreed possession date, and therefore such allegations are irrelevant to the issue of delay.

48. The Respondent's contentions regarding EV charging facilities further demonstrate that all promised amenities were not in place at the time of the agreed possession date.

49. The averments that the Complaint is false, vexatious or filed with malafide intent are baseless and denied.

50. In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the Respondent has failed to deliver possession within the agreed timeline, and the Complainants are entitled to refund of the amounts paid along with applicable interest under Section 18(1) (a) of the Act.

51. It is further submitted that such interest is payable from the respective dates of each payment made by the Complainants until realization, in accordance with the provisions of the Act.

E. Points for Consideration

52. After considering the facts stated and submissions made by both parties, the following question arises before this Authority:

- i. Whether the Respondent has violated 11(4)(b) and Section 12 of Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016?
- ii. Whether the complainants are entitled to relief sought? If so, to what extent?

F. Observations of Authority

Point I

53. This Authority proceeds to examine whether the Respondent has violated Section 11(4)(b) of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016 (hereinafter referred to as "the RE(R&D) Act, 2016") by failing to obtain the Occupancy Certificate within the agreed timeline and by purporting to offer possession of the subject flat without a valid Occupancy Certificate

54. The factual matrix, as it emerges from the pleadings and the documents placed on record, is as follows. The Complainants, Smt. K. Sravanthi and Smt. K. Bhanu Prakash, entered into an Agreement of Sale dated 26.07.2022 with the Respondent, M/s Ramky Estates and Farms Limited, for the purchase of Flat No. H-307 (also referred to in the counter as BH-0307), Tower H, admeasuring 1,585 sq. ft., in the registered real estate project "Ramky One Symphony", situated at Patancheru, Hyderabad, for a total sale consideration of ₹1,03,20,623/- (Rupees One Crore Three Lakhs Twenty Thousand Six Hundred and Twenty-Three only). It is an admitted position that the Complainants have paid a total sum of ₹98,05,087/- (Rupees Ninety-Eight Lakhs Five Thousand and Eighty-Seven only) towards the aforesaid sale consideration, through a combination of home loan disbursements and personal funds, constituting approximately ninety-five per cent of the total agreed consideration. The agreed date for completion of the project and handing over possession was 30.09.2025, as stipulated in the Agreement of Sale.

55. Section 11(4)(b) of the RE(R&D) Act, 2016 imposes an express, mandatory, and non-derogable statutory obligation upon every promoter. The said provision reads as under::

"Section 11(4): The promoter shall: (b) obtain the completion certificate or the occupancy certificate, or both, as applicable, from the relevant competent authority as per local laws or other laws for the time being in force and to make it available to the allottees individually or to the association of allottees, as the case may be;"

The significance of the Occupancy Certificate in the context of delivery of possession cannot be overstated. An Occupancy Certificate issued by the competent authority certifies that the building has been constructed in conformity with the sanctioned plan, that it satisfies the applicable statutory requirements as to safety, structural stability, and habitability, and that it is fit for occupation. In the absence of such a certificate, a building cannot be said to be legally complete and ready for lawful occupation. The obligation cast upon a promoter under Section 11(4)(b) of the RE(R&D) Act, 2016 is, therefore, not merely directory but is a mandatory precondition to any valid offer of possession.

56. In the present case, the following facts stand conclusively established on record that the agreed date of possession under the Agreement of Sale was 30.09.2025. This is not disputed by either party. The Respondent's own CRM Head, Mr. Rahul Hanchate, vide written communication dated 11.10.2025 sent in response to the Complainants' Notice of Withdrawal dated 01.10.2025 categorically admitted that the Occupancy Certificate was still pending as on that date. This admission is made in the Respondent's own counter-affidavit filed before this Authority and is therefore binding upon the Respondent. The Respondent admittedly obtained the Occupancy Certificate only on 11.12.2025 a period of approximately two and a half months after the agreed possession date of 30.09.2025. Prior to obtaining the Occupancy Certificate, the Respondent offered "fit-out possession" to the Complainants. Such an offer is contrary to the provisions of the RE(R&D) Act, 2016. A promoter cannot discharge its statutory and contractual obligation to deliver possession by offering access to an apartment for the limited purpose of interior fit-out works, when the Occupancy Certificate has not been obtained and the building has not been declared legally complete by the competent authority. "Fit-out possession" is not a legally recognised mode of delivery of possession under the RE(R&D) Act, 2016 and cannot, in any manner, be equated with or substituted for lawful possession under the said enactment.

57. This Authority further notes with serious concern that the Respondent circulated communications to its allottees, including the Complainants, falsely representing that the Occupancy Certificate had been obtained, when, admittedly, no such Occupancy Certificate had in fact been issued by the competent authority. The Respondent has sought to characterise the same as a mere "marketing error" or an "inadvertent mistake committed by the marketing team." This Authority is unable to accept such an explanation.

58. The Preamble of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016 declares that the enactment has been brought into force to establish the Real Estate Regulatory Authority for regulation and promotion of the real estate sector and to ensure the sale of real estate projects in an efficient and transparent manner, while protecting the interests of consumers. Transparency, accuracy of disclosures and truthful representations by promoters are, therefore, not merely desirable business practices but constitute the very foundation upon which the statutory scheme of the Act rests.

59. A representation by a promoter that an Occupancy Certificate has been obtained is a statement concerning a material statutory milestone, directly affecting the allottee's rights relating to possession, financial commitments and exercise of remedies under the Act. Such a representation cannot be treated as a routine marketing communication or an inconsequential

mistake. Under the scheme of the Act, a promoter is under a continuing statutory obligation to ensure that every representation made to prospective purchasers and existing allottees is true, accurate and capable of verification.

60. This Authority further observes that Section 7 of the RE(R&D) Act, 2016 recognises the making of false statements or false representations by a promoter as an unfair practice, including making any statement, whether in writing or by visible representation, which falsely represents that the promoter has approvals, permissions or affiliations which it does not possess. A false declaration that an Occupancy Certificate has been obtained, when in fact no such certificate exists, squarely falls within the mischief sought to be prevented under the Act, as it misleads allottees regarding the legal status and completion of the project. Such conduct is wholly inconsistent with the objectives of the Act and constitutes a serious breach of the promoter's statutory obligation to maintain transparency and fairness in all communications with allottees.

61. The Respondent is hereby cautioned and directed to refrain from issuing or publishing any advertisement, circular, communication or representation containing false or misleading statements regarding the status of statutory approvals, including the grant of an Occupancy Certificate. It is made clear that, should any such instance of false or misleading representation come to the notice of this Authority in future, this Authority shall not hesitate to invoke its powers under Section 7 of the RE(R&D) Act, 2016, and taking such other action as may be warranted under the Act.

62. The Respondent has sought to attribute the delay in obtaining the Occupancy Certificate solely to procedural delays on the part of the concerned statutory authorities, implying that such delay was beyond its control. This Authority finds that this plea is wholly unsustainable as No documentary evidence whatsoever has been placed on record by the Respondent to substantiate this assertion. No correspondence with the competent authority, no application pending with the authority, no notice of deficiency or any other communication from the competent authority has been produced. Bald averments in the counter-affidavit, unsupported by any documentary proof, cannot constitute sufficient evidence to establish a defence. A promoter who undertakes a real estate project assumes the obligation to plan, pursue, and complete the statutory approval process including application for and obtainment of the Occupancy Certificate within the timeline represented to its allottees. The Respondent cannot be permitted to discharge its statutory obligations by proxy or to transfer the risk of administrative delay to its allottees.

63. Accordingly, Point I is answered in the affirmative

Point II

64. Having established the violation of Section 11(4)(b) of the RE(R&D) Act, 2016 by the Respondent, this Authority now proceeds to examine the Complainants' entitlement to refund of the amount paid along with interest under Section 18 of the RE(R&D) Act, 2016.

65. For the purpose of determining the Complainants' entitlement to relief, it is necessary to set out the relevant statutory provision. Section 18(1) of the RE(R&D) Act, 2016 reads as under:

*"18. Return of amount and compensation.— (1) If the promoter fails to complete or is unable to give possession of an apartment, plot or building,—
(a) in accordance with the terms of the agreement for sale or, as the case may be, duly completed by the date specified therein; ...
the promoter shall be liable on demand to the allottees, in case the allottee wishes to withdraw from the project, without prejudice to any other remedy available, to return the amount received by him in respect of that apartment, plot, building, as the case may be, with interest at such rate as may be prescribed in this behalf..."*

66. The right of an allottee under Section 18(1)(a) is absolute, unqualified, and exercisable as a matter of statutory entitlement. It crystallises upon the single determinative event of the promoter's failure to deliver possession within the agreed timeline.

67. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, in *Newtech Promoters and Developers Pvt. Ltd. v. State of UP & Ors.*, (2021) 2 SCC 427, has categorically held that the right of an allottee to seek refund with interest under Section 18(1) of the Act is an absolute and unconditional statutory right, and that once the promoter fails to deliver possession within the agreed timeline, the allottee is fully entitled to withdraw from the project and seek refund along with interest.

68. In the present case, the Respondent, had undertaken under the Agreement of Sale dated 26.07.2022 to hand over possession by 30.09.2025. Occupancy Certificate was obtained only on 11.12.2025, reflecting a delay of approximately two months. However, as on 30.09.2025, the Respondent admittedly had neither obtained the Occupancy Certificate nor was in a position to offer lawful possession. The Complainants accordingly issued their Notice of Withdrawal on 01.10.2025, within one day of the expiry of the agreed possession date, invoking Section 18(1)(a) of the RE(R&D) Act, 2016 and demanding refund with interest.

69. Therefore, since the Complainants initiated their withdrawal notice immediately upon expiry of the agreed possession date, on 01.10.2025, and the Respondent failed to adhere to the agreement of sale, they are entitled to refund of the entire amount paid along with interest from

the date of such notice, i.e., 01.10.2025, until the date of actual payment.

70. Accordingly, this Authority holds that the Complainants are entitled to refund of the total amount paid of Rs.98,05,087/- (Rupees Ninety-Eight Lakhs Five Thousand and Eighty-Seven only), along with interest at the rate of 10.70% per annum, being the SBI MCLR of 8.70% plus 2% as prescribed under Rule 18 of the Telangana Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Rules, 2017, calculated from the date of the agreed possession date as per the agreement of sale i.e., 30.09.2025 until the date of actual payment, in accordance with Section 18(1) of the RE(R&D) Act, 2016.

71. Accordingly, point II is answered

G. Directions of Authority

72. In exercise of the powers conferred upon this Authority under Sections 37 and 38 of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016, and in furtherance of the findings and conclusions drawn hereinabove, the following directions are hereby issued:

- i. The Respondent, M/s Ramky Estates and Farms Limited, is hereby directed to refund the total amount of ₹98,05,087/- (Rupees Ninety-Eight Lakhs Five Thousand and Eighty-Seven only) to the Complainants, Mrs. K. Sravanthi and Mr. K. Bhanu Prakash, along with interest at the rate of 10.70% per annum (SBI MCLR of 8.70% + 2%) as prescribed under Rule 18 of the Telangana Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Rules, 2017, calculated from the agreed possession date as per the agreement of sale i.e., 30.09.2025 until the date of actual payment, in accordance with Section 18(1) of the RE(R&D) Act, 2016, within a period of 45 (Forty-Five) days from the date of receipt of this Order.

73. Failing to comply with the above-said direction by the Respondent shall attract penalty in accordance with Section 63 of the RE(R&D) Act, 2016

74. The complaint stands disposed of in the above terms. There shall be no order as to costs.

Sd/-
Sri K. Srinivasa Rao,
Hon'ble Member,
TG RERA

Sd/-
Sri Laxmi Narayana Jannu,
Hon'ble Member,
TG RERA