

BEFORE TELANGANA REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY

[Under the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016]

14th of August, 2025

Quorum: **Dr. N. Satyanarayana, IAS (Retd.), Hon'ble Chairperson**
 Sri K. Srinivasa Rao, Hon'ble Member
 Sri Laxmi Narayana Jannu, Hon'ble Member

Complaint No. 218 of 2024

Sumalatha Kamireddy
H. No. B-1208, Vazhra Nirman Pratheek,
Nizampet, Hyderabad. ... Complainant

Versus

1. Googee Properties Managing Director,
Mr. Shaikh Akbar,
Googee Properties Pvt Ltd,
JMR Jagini Plaza, 2nd Floor,
Green Hills Colony, Hyderabad-500035
2. Mr. K. Narasimha Reddy,
Googee Properties Pvt. Ltd,
JMR Jagini Plaza, 2nd floor,
Green Hills Colony, Hyderabad-500035

Complaint No. 219 of 2024

Vanisree Loath
Flat No C-1409, C-Block,
Vzhra Prathik Apts,
Bloomingdale Road,
Nizampet, Hyderabad-500090 ... Complainant

Versus

1. Googee Properties Managing Director,
Mr. Shaikh Akbar,
Googee Properties Pvt Ltd,
JMR Jagini Plaza, 2nd Floor,
Green Hills Colony, Hyderabad-500035
 2. Mr. K. Narasimha Reddy,
Googee Properties Pvt. Ltd,
JMR Jagini Plaza, 2nd floor,
Green Hills Colony, Hyderabad-500035
- ... Respondents

Complaint No. 220 of 2024

Mohammed Rafi (Retd Army Officer)
Sumitra Apartments, Block A, Flat 201,
2nd floor, Srinagar Colony, Ward No. 7,
Tirumalgiri, Secunderabad-500015

... Complainant

Versus

1. Googee Properties Managing Director,
Mr. Shaikh Akbar,
Googee Properties Pvt Ltd,
JMR Jagini Plaza, 2nd Floor,
Green Hills Colony, Hyderabad-500035
2. Mr. K. Narasimha Reddy,
Googee Properties Pvt. Ltd,
JMR Jagini Plaza, 2nd floor,
Green Hills Colony, Hyderabad-500035

... Respondents

Complaint No. 221 of 2024

Gangisetty Gopi
H.No 64, Ikyatha Homes,
Beeramguda, Ameenpur Mandal,
Sangareddy Dist, Telangana-502032

... Complainant

Versus

1. Googee Properties Managing Director,
Mr. Shaikh Akbar,
Googee Properties Pvt Ltd,
JMR Jagini Plaza, 2nd Floor,
Green Hills Colony, Hyderabad-500035
2. Mr. K. Narasimha Reddy,
Googee Properties Pvt. Ltd,
JMR Jagini Plaza, 2nd floor,
Green Hills Colony, Hyderabad-500035

... Respondents

Complaint No. 222 of 2024

Kiran Dundi
H. No 10-4-771/57, Nehru Nagar,
Masab Tank, Hyderabad-500028

... Complainant

Versus

1. Googee Properties Managing Director,
Mr. Shaikh Akbar,
Googee Properties Pvt Ltd,

JMR Jagini Plaza, 2nd Floor,
Green Hills Colony, Hyderabad-500035

2. Mr. K. Narasimha Reddy,
Googee Properties Pvt. Ltd,
JMR Jagini Plaza, 2nd floor,
Green Hills Colony, Hyderabad-500035

... Respondents

Complaint No. 223 of 2024

Yedukondalu Ravana (Retd Army Soldier)
Plot No-17, New Gandhi Nagar,
RK Puram, Tirumalagiri, Secunderabad-500056

... Complainant

Versus

1. Googee Properties Managing Director,
Mr. Shaikh Akbar,
Googee Properties Pvt Ltd,
JMR Jagini Plaza, 2nd Floor,
Green Hills Colony, Hyderabad-500035

2. Mr. K. Narasimha Reddy,
Googee Properties Pvt. Ltd,
JMR Jagini Plaza, 2nd floor,
Green Hills Colony, Hyderabad-500035

... Respondents

Complaint No. 224 of 2024

Sanipalli Venkata Krishna Reddy
Plot-44, Mallikarjuna Nagar Colony,
Chitalkunta Checkpost, Hanuman Temple Backside Lane,
LB Nagar, Hyderabad, Telangana-500074

... Complainant

Versus

1. Googee Properties Managing Director,
Mr. Shaikh Akbar,
Googee Properties Pvt Ltd,
JMR Jagini Plaza, 2nd Floor,
Green Hills Colony, Hyderabad-500035

2. Mr. K. Narasimha Reddy,
Googee Properties Pvt. Ltd,
JMR Jagini Plaza, 2nd floor,
Green Hills Colony, Hyderabad-500035

... Respondents

Complaint No. 225 of 2024

Veeramalla Pavan Kalyan
H.No. 7-1-307/14F/57, Sri Ram Nagar Colony,
Sanath Nagar, Hyderabad, Telangana-500018

... Complainant

Versus

1. Googee Properties Managing Director,
Mr. Shaikh Akbar,
Googee Properties Pvt Ltd,
JMR Jagini Plaza, 2nd Floor,
Green Hills Colony, Hyderabad-500035
2. Mr. K. Narasimha Reddy,
Googee Properties Pvt. Ltd,
JMR Jagini Plaza, 2nd floor,
Green Hills Colony, Hyderabad-500035

... Respondents

Complaint No. 226 of 2024

Yedukondalu Ravana (Retd Army Soldier)
Plot No-17, New Gandhi Nagar,
RK Puram, Tirumalagiri, Secunderabad-500056

... Complainant

Versus

1. Googee Properties Managing Director,
Mr. Shaikh Akbar,
Googee Properties Pvt Ltd,
JMR Jagini Plaza, 2nd Floor,
Green Hills Colony, Hyderabad-500035
2. Mr. K. Narasimha Reddy,
Googee Properties Pvt. Ltd,
JMR Jagini Plaza, 2nd floor,
Green Hills Colony, Hyderabad-500035

... Respondents

Complaint No. 302 of 2024

B Raghava Prasad
C/o A Subramanyam, H.No.8-7-170/77
Shankar Enclave, Old HAL Colony, Old Bowenpally,
Secunderabad-500011

... Complainant

Versus

1. Googee Properties Managing Director,
Mr. Shaikh Akbar,
Googee Properties Pvt Ltd,
JMR Jagini Plaza, 2nd Floor,
Green Hills Colony, Hyderabad-500035

2. Mr. K. Narasimha Reddy,
Googee Properties Pvt. Ltd,
JMR Jagini Plaza, 2nd floor,
Green Hills Colony, Hyderabad-500035

... Respondents

Complaint No. 309 of 2024

Riya Joshi
C/o Dr Shaji Panikkar, 8-7-170/61,62,63/2,
Shankar Enclave, Old Bowenpally,
Secunderabad-500011

... Complainant

Versus

1. Googee Properties Managing Director,
Mr. Shaikh Akbar,
Googee Properties Pvt Ltd,
JMR Jagini Plaza, 2nd Floor,
Green Hills Colony, Hyderabad-500035
2. Mr. K. Narasimha Reddy,
Googee Properties Pvt. Ltd,
JMR Jagini Plaza, 2nd floor,
Green Hills Colony, Hyderabad-500035

... Respondents

Complaint No. 79 of 2025

VR Preetha
Mamatha Punjavi, Old MIG 719, Phase 1,
BHEL, Lingampally, RC Puram,
Hyderabad-502032

... Complainant

Versus

1. Googee Properties Managing Director,
Mr. Shaikh Akbar,
Googee Properties Pvt Ltd,
JMR Jagini Plaza, 2nd Floor,
Green Hills Colony, Hyderabad-500035
2. Mr. K. Narasimha Reddy,
Googee Properties Pvt. Ltd,
JMR Jagini Plaza, 2nd floor,
Green Hills Colony, Hyderabad-500035

... Respondents

The present batch of complaints came up for final hearing on 11.06.2025 in the presence of the Complainants in person and the counsel for the Respondents. Upon hearing the submissions of both the parties, this Authority proceeds to issue the following **COMMON ORDER:**

2. The Complaints at hand have been filed under Section 31 of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016, read with Rule 34 of the Telangana Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Rules, 2017, seeking redressal against M/s Googee Properties Pvt. Ltd., represented by its Managing Director, Mr. Shaik Akbar.

A. Brief facts of the case:

3. It is the case of the complainants that the Respondent Developer induced them to invest in residential plots in a venture marketed as a "Satellite Township" located in Nomula Village, Ibrahimpatnam Mandal, Ranga Reddy District, Telangana. Under what was termed a "pre-launch offer," each complainant booked a residential plot measuring approximately 200 square yards and entered into either a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) or an Agreement of sale (AoS) upon payment of substantial advance consideration.

4. Despite the lapse of more than two years from the dates of booking and execution of the agreements, the Developer has failed to initiate or undertake any meaningful development work at the project site. The plots remain undemarcated, and there is no visible progress on the ground. This inaction has resulted in significant financial hardship and mental distress to the complainants, who have been deprived of the promised residential plots.

5. The complainants further allege that the Developer made a series of misleading and exaggerated claims in promotional brochures, marketing videos, and verbal assurances. The project was advertised as a grand 1,000-acre integrated Satellite Township, with promises of modern infrastructure and expansive amenities. However, upon scrutiny, the layout plan provided by the Developer reflected only 334 acres and 29 guntas. Subsequent inquiries revealed that the Developer does not possess legal ownership or title to most of the land forming the residential portion of the project. Notably, in "Phase II – Business Class," it has come to light that the Developer owns only about 30 acres, despite having sold a disproportionately large number of plots, thereby raising serious concerns about the authenticity of the offerings.

6. Moreover, it is specifically contended that the Developer has not obtained the mandatory registration of the project under Section 3 of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016, nor secured layout approvals from the competent planning authority. These omissions are in direct contravention of the statutory framework governing real estate projects. Although the Developer repeatedly assured buyers that such approvals would be obtained within a three-month period, no such compliance has been effected to date. Nor have the

complainants received the refunds with 20% interest, as was promised in the event of failure to secure necessary permissions.

7. In light of the above, the complainants submit that the conduct of the Developer constitutes a clear and continuing violation of Sections 3 and 4 of the RE(R&D) Act, 2016 and seek appropriate action.

B. Relief Sought:

8. In view of the aforementioned facts and circumstances, the complainants respectfully pray that this Authority may be pleased to pass the following reliefs in the interest of justice:

- i. Direct the Respondent Developer to refund the total amount paid by each complainant towards booking of residential plots in the Satellite Township venture, situated at Nomula Village, Ibrahimpatnam Mandal, Ranga Reddy District, along with interest at the rate of 20% per annum from the respective dates of payment till the date of actual refund;
- ii. Declare that the actions of the Respondent Developer in selling plots under a “pre-launch offer” without obtaining requisite registration under Section 3 of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016 and without securing an approved layout plan from the competent authority, are in clear violation of the provisions of the Act and attract regulatory penalties;
- iii. Issue an appropriate direction restraining the Respondent Developer from further advertising, marketing, or selling of any plots in the said project or any part thereof, without obtaining necessary statutory approvals and registration under the RE(R&D) Act, 2016;
- iv. Award compensation to the complainants, as may be deemed fit by this Hon’ble Authority, for the financial hardship, mental agony, and loss caused due to the fraudulent and misleading conduct of the Respondent;
- v. Pass such other and further orders as this Hon’ble Authority may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case.

C. Points to be determined:

9. In the light of the facts stated and the reliefs sought by the complainants, the following questions arise for consideration before this Authority:

- I. Whether the Respondent Developer has violated Sections 3 & 4 of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016 by advertising, marketing, and selling plots without registering the project with this Authority?
- II. Whether the Complainants are entitled to the relief sought? If so, to what extent?

D. Observations of the Authority:

Point I

10. Upon a *prima facie* examination of the material placed on record and after considering the rival submissions, this Authority finds that the Respondent No.1 has engaged in the advertisement, marketing, and sale of plots in the real estate project “Satellite Township,” located at Nomula Village, Ibrahimpatnam Mandal, Ranga Reddy District, without obtaining the requisite registration from this Authority. The Respondent has admitted to launching the project under a "pre-launch" scheme and has entered into Memoranda of Understanding and Agreements of sale with multiple prospective allottees, receiving substantial consideration amounts in the process. These actions were undertaken in the absence of any registration and also, the said project spans a massive layout area of 1,620,098 square yards (equivalent to 334 Acres, 29 Guntas, and 29 square yards), as evidenced from the brochures and layout plan submitted by the Complainants. Section 3(1) of the RE(R&D) Act, 2016 unequivocally stipulates that:

“No promoter shall advertise, market, book, sell or offer for sale, or invite persons to purchase in any manner any plot, apartment or building, as the case may be, in any real estate project or part of it, in any planning area, without registering the real estate project with the Real Estate Regulatory Authority established under this Act.”

11. Additionally, under Section 3(2)(a) of the RE(R&D) Act, 2016 the requirement of registration is applicable to all real estate projects where the area of land proposed to be developed exceeds 500 square metres or the number of units proposed to be developed exceeds eight. Given that the present project is proposed over 334 acres, far exceeding the limit of 500 square metres, the project squarely falls within the mandatory registration requirement under Section 3(1). Accordingly, the Respondent’s actions are in clear and continuing violation of the RE(R&D) Act, 2016.

12. Furthermore, there is no evidence on record to show that the Respondent ever applied for registration of the project mandated under Section 4 before this Authority. Nor has the

Respondent produced any documentary proof to demonstrate that requisite approvals such as sanctioned layout plans or title documents were obtained from the competent planning authority prior to offering the plots for sale.

13. Taking due cognizance of the afore-mentioned violations, a Show Cause Notice dated 22.10.2024 was issued by this Authority to the Respondent Developer, calling upon them to explain as to why action should not be initiated against them for non-registration under the provisions of the RE(R&D) Act, 2016. Although ample opportunities were extended to the Respondent, in multiple hearings, there has been a consistent failure on their part to either respond to the Show Cause Notice or provide any legally tenable explanation indicating compliance with the mandatory requirements under the RE(R&D) Act, 2016.

14. Having taken into account the Respondent's conduct and all the other documents placed on record indicating the violation of Section 3&4 of the RE(R&D) Act, 2016, this Authority is of the considered view that the Respondent -developer is liable for imposition of penalty under Section 59 & 60 of the said Act, for non-registration of the impugned project with the Authority.

15. Point I is answered accordingly.

Point II

16 The Complainants herein, have sought relief for refund of the amounts paid by each of them towards the booking of residential plots in the “Satellite Township” project, along with interest at the rate of 20% per annum from the respective dates of payment until the date of actual refund.

17. In order to properly assess the reliefs claimed and to facilitate a comprehensive understanding of the factual details of each case, particulars of the relevant payments have been provided in the table below:

Sr. No.	Case No.	Complainant	Total Sale Consideration (₹)	Amount Paid (₹) (Principal)	Amount refunded as on date	Date of Booking
1	CC.No. 218/2024	Mrs. Sumalatha Kamireddy	31,80,000/-	5,00,000/-	5,00,000/- paid on Jan 28, 2025.	09.08.2023

Sr. No.	Case No.	Complainant	Total Sale Consideration (₹)	Amount Paid (₹) (Principal)	Amount refunded as on date	Date of Booking
					Interest remaining.	
2	CC.No. 219/2024	Mrs. Vani Sree Loath	29,80,000/-	14,90,000/-	Pending	31.03.2023
3	CC.No. 220/2024	Mr. Mohammed Rafi	25,80,000/-	13,20,000/-	Pending	13.02.2022
4	CC.No. 221/2024	Mr. Gangi Shetty Gopi	28,80,000/-	5,00,000/-	Pending	30.12.2022
5	CC.No. 222/2024	Mr. Kiran Dundi	25,80,000/-	13,20,000/-	Pending	19.02.2022
6	CC.No. 223/2024	Mr. Yedukondalu Ravana	25,80,000/-	5,00,000/-	5,00,000/- paid. Interest remaining	23.11.2021
7	CC.No. 224/2024	Mr. Sanipalli Venkata Krishna Reddy	28,40,000/-	14,20,000/-	Pending	11.05.2022
8	CC.No. 225/2024	Mr. Veeramalla Pavan Kalyan	28,40,000/-	14,20,000/-	Pending	10.06.2022
9	CC.No. 226/2024	Mr. Yedukondala Ravana	19,20,000/-	5,00,000/-	8,00,000/- paid on Jan 28, 2025. Interest remaining	12.09.2021

Sr. No.	Case No.	Complainant	Total Sale Consideration (₹)	Amount Paid (₹) (Principal)	Amount refunded as on date	Date of Booking
10	CC No 302/2024	Raghava Prasad	47,70,000/-	10,00,000/-	Pending	30.04.2023
11	CC No 309/2024	Riya Joshi	29,80,000/-	15,00,000/-	10,00,000/- paid, balance 5,00,000/- plus total interest pending	27.03.2023
12	CC No 79/2025	VR Preetha	29,80,000/-	15,00,000/-	Pending	31.03.2023

18. Based on the information from the table above, it is clear that Respondent No.1 herein has received substantial payments from each of the Complainants for the purchase of residential plots in the impugned project titled “Satellite Township”. However, despite such payments, the Respondents have failed to initiate any developmental activity or commence construction at the project site. As per the complaint and supporting documents, the plots remain undemarcated, and there is no visible progress on the ground. This factual situation squarely attracts the provisions of Section 18(1)(a) of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016, which provides as follows:

“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; ... he shall be liable on demand to the allottees, in case the allottee wishes to withdraw from the project ... to return the amount received by him ... with interest at such rate as may be prescribed in this behalf...”

19. The legislative intent of this provision is to ensure that allottees are protected from indefinite delays and have a statutory right to seek refund along with prescribed interest when a promoter fails to fulfil their contractual obligations. In the present case, the failure of the Respondents is compounded by the fact that not only has the Respondent failed to obtain requisite statutory approvals, or sanctioned plans, but the Respondents have also failed to

demonstrate any timeline, roadmap, or bona fide effort toward even commencement or completion of the project. The inaction of the Respondents, despite receipt of substantial consideration from the Complainants, reflects a clear dereliction of their duties under the RE(R&D) Act, 2016.

20. However, during the course of proceedings before this Authority, the Respondent has appeared and, on his part, had agreed to honour the request for refund. Despite such assurance, the Respondent continuously sought extensions under various pretexts. Multiple hearings were conducted, and several opportunities were granted to facilitate compliance. Nevertheless, the Respondent persisted in the same pattern of conduct by repeatedly seeking further time, without demonstrating any concrete steps towards refund or compliance with the relief sought.

21. The Respondent's continued failure to honour his commitments, despite being granted ample opportunities, leaves no justification for any further indulgence. In light of the above, this Authority is of the considered opinion that the Complainants are entitled to the reliefs claimed i.e., refund of the amounts paid towards the booking of their respective plots, in accordance with Section 18(1)(a) of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016, along with interest as prescribed under Rule 15 of the RE(R&D) Rules, 2017, to be calculated from the respective dates of booking until the date of actual refund paid by the Respondent.

22. While the Complainants have sought interest at the rate of 20% per annum on the amounts paid, this Authority notes that Rule 15 of the Telangana Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Rules, 2017 specifically prescribes the applicable rate of interest in cases of default under the RE(R&D) Act, 2016. As per the said rule, the rate of interest payable by the promoter to the allottee (or vice versa) shall be the State Bank of India's Marginal Cost of Funds based Lending Rate (MCLR) plus two percent, which is read as follows:

“The rate of interest payable by the promoter to the allottee or by the allottee to the promoter, as the case may be, shall be the State Bank of India highest Marginal Cost of Lending Rate plus two percent.”

23. Accordingly, interest shall be granted strictly in terms of Rule 15 and not at the higher rate of 20% per annum as prayed for by the Complainants. The Respondent is therefore directed to refund the amounts received from each Complainant along with interest calculated at SBI's MCLR + 2%, from the respective dates of booking until the date of actual refund. The Complainants may approach the Adjudicating Officer under Form 'N' for seeking Compensation. Point II is answered accordingly.

E. Directions of the Authority:

24. Vide its powers under Sections 37 of the RE (R&D) Act, 2016, this Authority issues the following directions:

- a. Respondent No.1 is liable to pay penalty of Rs.27,16,106/- (Twenty seven lakhs sixteen thousand one hundred and six rupees) towards violation of Sections 3 & 4 for non-registration of the Project “Satellite Township” payable within 30 (thirty) days in favour of TG RERA FUND through a Demand Draft or online payment to A/c No. 50100595798191, HDFC Bank, IFSC Code: HDFC0007036; and
- b. Respondent No.1 is hereby directed to refund the amounts paid by all 12 Complainants, as per the amounts specified in their respective payment receipts as detailed in the table under Para 17. The refund shall be made along with interest at the rate of 10.80% per annum (comprising SBI MCLR of 8.80% + 2%), calculated from the date of each Complainant's respective date of booking, until the date of actual refund. The said refund shall be done in accordance with Rule 15 of the Telangana Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Rules, 2017, within a period of 30 (thirty) days from the date of this Order.; and
- c. The Respondent No.1 is hereby directed to take steps to file an application for registration of the Project – “Satellite Township” before this Authority in accordance with Section 4 of the RE(R&D) Act, 2016 and the Rules thereunder with immediate effect and till the registration is granted by this Authority, the Respondent shall, strictly, not advertise, market, book, sell or offer for sale, or invite person/s to purchase in any manner any units of the said Project.
- d. Failing to comply with the above-said directions by Respondent No.1 shall attract penalty in accordance with Section 63 of the RE(R&D) Act, 2016.

25. The Complaints are disposed of in lieu of the above directions. No order as to costs.

Sd/-	Sd/-	Sd/-
Sri K. Srinivasa Rao,	Sri. Laxmi Narayana Jannu,	Dr. N. Satyanarayana, IAS(Retd.),
Hon'ble Member	Hon'ble Member	Hon'ble Chairperson
TG RERA	TG RERA	TG RERA

