BEFORE TELANGANA REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY
[Under the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016]

SUO MOTU CASE NO. D6/5056/2024
Date: 10th November 2026

Quorum: **Sri. K.S. Sreenivasa Raju, I.A.S., (Retd.), Hon'ble Chairman**
Sri Laxmi Narayana Jannu, Hon'ble Member
Sri K. Srinivasa Rao, Hon'ble Member

1. M/s. Venkata Praneeth Developers Pvt. Ltd.,
2. The Commissioner, HMDA
3. The District Collector, Malkajgiri

… **RESPONDENTS**

ORDER

The present Suo motu proceedings have been initiated by the Telangana Real Estate Regulatory Authority (hereinafter referred to as "the Authority"), in exercise of the powers conferred under Section 35(1) of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016 (hereinafter referred to as "RE(R&D) Act, 2016"), in respect of the project "Praneeth Pranav Grove Park", developed by M/s. Venkata Praneeth Developers Pvt. Ltd. (Respondent No.1), situated at Gagilapur Village, Dundigal-Gandimaisamma Mandal, Medchal-Malkajgiri District, and registered with this Authority vide Registration No. P02200004882.

2. A representation dated 07.12.2024 was received from Sri Katipally Venkata Ramana Reddy, Hon'ble MLA, Kamareddy, submitting that the subject project involved encroachment upon the notified lake area of Md. Osman Kunta (Lake ID: 2800/EN/16-MD), situated in Survey No.203 of Gagilapur Village, having an extent of Ac.20-09 guntas. It was alleged that the said lake area had been included within the project and was being utilised as a private amenity for the residents of the gated community. The Informant further alleged that the project fell within the FTL and buffer zone of the lake and that the survey particulars and official records had been manipulated to facilitate the grant of permissions and approvals. It was also alleged that the existing water body was being represented as "Grove Park Lake" and that the development activities were being undertaken in violation of the applicable lake protection norms.

3. In view of the allegations raised in the representation, the Secretary, TG RERA, vide Letter No.5056/TGRERA/2024 dated 23.12.2024, forwarded the representation to the Metropolitan Commissioner, HMDA (Respondent No.2), and the District Collector, Medchal-

Malkajgiri District (Respondent No.3), requesting them to examine the allegations and furnish their factual reports. A further representation dated 24.12.2024 was received reiterating the allegations. The Informant also addressed a communication dated 17.01.2025 to the Metropolitan Commissioner, HMDA, with a copy to TG RERA, seeking the status of the matter. Subsequently, the Secretary, TG RERA, vide Letter No.5056/TGRERA/2024 dated 28.01.2025, issued a reminder to Respondent Nos.2 and 3 to examine the allegations and submit their reports.

4. While the aforesaid proceedings were pending, a further representation dated 28.11.2025 was received from Sri Mohd. Shamshuddin, Vice Chairman, TPCC (Minority Department), raising objections in respect of the project "Praneeth Pranav Grove Park" and alleging encroachment of the lake area, construction within the Full Tank Level (FTL) and buffer zone of Medla Kunta, and irregularities in the permissions and approvals obtained by the promoter. Upon examination, it was observed that the allegations and particulars contained in the subsequent representation substantially corresponded with and reiterated the allegations already raised in the earlier representation submitted by Sri Katipally Venkata Ramana Reddy. Accordingly, the subsequent representation was also taken into consideration in the pending suo motu proceedings in Suo Motu Case No. 5056/2024/TGRERA, concerning the subject project.

5. Respondent No.1, M/s. Venkata Praneeth Developers Pvt. Ltd., filed its Counter dated 22.04.2026, denying the allegations. It was submitted that the Irrigation and CAD Department had issued a No Objection Certificate vide Letter No.SE/IC/RR/DSE/DEE-1/TS-3/NOC/2021/348 dated 08.06.2021, permitting development over an extent of Ac.60-10.5 guntas after excluding the areas falling within the FTL and buffer zones of Md. Osman Kunta. It was further submitted that the District Collector, Medchal-Malkajgiri District, vide Letter No.E1/1952/2021 dated 16.09.2021, forwarded the proposal to HMDA, recording the exclusion of the affected areas. Thereafter, HMDA granted approval vide Proceedings No. 2975/MED/PLG/HMDA/2021 dated 13.05.2022, after examining the relevant documents and the clearances issued by the competent authorities.

6. Respondent No.1 submitted that the allegations of encroachment upon the lake area and construction within the FTL and buffer zones were baseless. It was submitted that the promoter had undertaken maintenance and development of the lake as part of its Corporate Social Responsibility activities and that the nomenclature "Grove Park Lake" was merely descriptive and did not alter the identity or status of the existing water body, namely Md. Osman Kunta.

Respondent No.1 maintained that the project was being developed in accordance with the approved layout and the permissions granted by the competent authorities and prayed for closure of the proceedings.

7. Respondent No.3, the District Collector, Medchal-Malkajgiri District, submitted its report dated 30.01.2026, stating that the matter had been examined on the basis of the available Revenue records and the joint inspection conducted by the concerned authorities. It was reported that, as per the 1960-61 Pahani records, the subject lands were classified as patta lands. Out of the total extent of Ac.70-21 guntas, an extent of Ac.10-10.5 guntas was found to be affected by the FTL, buffer zones, feeder channels and other restricted areas, while the remaining extent of Ac.60-10.5 guntas was considered for water body clearance. The District Collector further reported that the proposal had been forwarded to HMDA on 16.09.2021 and that, upon subsequent ground verification, the water body was found intact, with no constructions within the FTL or notified buffer zones. It was also stated that HMDA was the competent authority to examine matters relating to layout permissions and approvals.

8. Respondent No.2, the Hyderabad Metropolitan Development Authority (HMDA), vide Letter No.5056/Suo-Moto Case/HMDA/2026 dated 14.10.2026, submitted its report stating that the subject layout was approved over a total extent of Ac.70-20 guntas. After excluding the areas affected by Md. Osman Kunta, FTL, buffer zones, feeder channels and surplus channel, the net layout area was determined as Ac.60-09.5 guntas, equivalent to 243,771.03 square metres, comprising 884 residential units and a clubhouse. HMDA further submitted that the layout approval was granted vide Proceedings No.2975/MED/PLG/HMDA/2021 dated 13.05.2022, after examination of the applicable Government Orders and the No Objection Certificates issued by the Revenue and Irrigation Departments. It also reported that, as per the report of the Tahsildar, Gandimaisamma-Dundigal Mandal, dated 29.01.2026, based on the joint inspection and the Revenue and Irrigation Department records, no constructions were noticed within the FTL or buffer area of Md. Osman Kunta. It was also reported that HMDA officials inspected the site on 28.09.2026 and observed that the villas were under construction in accordance with the approved layout and that the water body remained intact, with no constructions within its FTL or buffer area.

9. On 29.10.2026, the matter was taken up for final arguments. The counsel appearing on behalf of Respondent No.1 reiterated the submissions made in the Counter, contending that the subject project had been developed pursuant to valid statutory permissions and clearances, that the areas falling within the FTL and buffer zones of Md. Osman Kunta had been excluded from

TG RERA
TELANGANA REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY

the approved layout, and that no construction had been undertaken within the restricted areas. It was also submitted that the allegations of lake encroachment and manipulation of official records were baseless. Upon hearing the arguments and perusing the material available on record, the matter was reserved for orders.

Observations of the Authority:

10. This Authority, upon examination of the material available on record, has considered the allegations raised in the present Suo motu proceedings. At the outset, this Authority notes that the project "Praneeth Pranav Grove Park" was registered with the Authority under Registration No. P02200004882 on 23.08.2022, and the registration is valid up to 13.05.2028. The principal allegation requiring consideration is whether the subject project was developed upon or within the FTL or buffer zone of Md. Osman Kunta. The said allegation has to be examined on the basis of the material placed before this Authority, including the official reports and permissions issued by the competent statutory authorities.

11. Respondent No.1 has submitted and specifically denied the allegation and relied upon the No Objection Certificate issued by the Irrigation and CAD Department vide Letter No.SE/IC/RR/DSE/DEE-1/TS-3/NOC/2021/348 dated 08.06.2021, the communication of the District Collector dated 16.09.2021 and the HMDA approval Proceedings No.2975/MED/PLG/HMDA/2021 dated 13.05.2022. This Authority notes that the issue relating to the FTL and buffer zone of Md. Osman Kunta was examined by the District Collector, Medchal-Malkajgiri District, vide Letter No.E1/1952/2021 dated 16.09.2021, who forwarded the proposal to HMDA, recording the exclusion of the affected areas.

12. Also, Respondent No.3, in its report dated 30.01.2026, submitted that the area affected by the FTL, buffer zones, feeder channels, and other restricted areas had been excluded, and that subsequent ground verification revealed that the water body remained intact, with no construction within the FTL or notified buffer zones. The record, therefore, demonstrates that the project was proceeded with on the basis of permissions and clearances issued by the competent authorities and not in disregard of the statutory approval mechanism.

13. This Authority notes that HMDA, in its report dated 14.10.2026, stated that the areas affected by Md. Osman Kunta, FTL, buffer zones, feeder channels and surplus channels were excluded while determining the net layout area. HMDA further reported that the Tahsildar, on the basis of the joint inspection and the Revenue and Irrigation Department records, had confirmed that no constructions were noticed within the FTL or buffer area. The site inspection conducted by HMDA officials on 28.09.2026 also revealed that the water body remained intact

and that no constructions had been undertaken within its FTL or buffer area. The project was thereafter registered with TG RERA on 23.08.2022.

14. This Authority notes that there is no material before this Authority demonstrating that the registration was obtained by furnishing false particulars or by suppressing any material fact in violation of Section 4 of the RE(R&D) Act, 2016. The Authority also notes that the object of Section 35 of the RE(R&D) Act, 2016, is to ensure compliance with the statutory framework and to protect the interests of allottees and stakeholders by examining violations falling within the jurisdiction of the Authority. Having undertaken such examination in the present case, and upon consideration of the representation, the Counter filed by Respondent No.1, the reports submitted by HMDA and the District Collector, and the statutory permissions placed on record, this Authority finds that the allegations raised against Respondent No.1, insofar as they relate to violation of the provisions of the RE(R&D) Act, 2016, are not established.

15. Upon comprehensive consideration of the material available on record, this Authority notes that the subject project was undertaken pursuant to the permissions and approvals placed on record and that no contravention of the provisions of the RE(R&D) Act, 2016, is established against Respondent No.1. Consequently, no penalty or adverse regulatory action under the said Act is warranted against Respondent No.1. It is, however, clarified that the findings recorded herein are confined to the jurisdiction of this Authority under the RE(R&D) Act, 2016, and shall not be construed as an adjudication upon any independent issue relating to title, survey boundaries, revenue records, environmental compliance, lake protection or FTL/buffer zone demarcation, which may fall within the statutory jurisdiction of the competent authorities under the respective laws.

16. Accordingly, the present Suo motu Case No. 5056/2024 is hereby disposed of.

Sd/-	**Sd/-**	**Sd/-**
Sri K. Srinivasa Rao,	**Sri Laxminarayana Jannu,**	**Sri. K.S. Sreenivasa Raju, I.A.S., (Retd.),**
Hon'ble Member,	**Hon’ble Member,**	**Hon'ble Chairperson,**
TG RERA	**TG RERA**	**TG RERA**