

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

COMPLAINT NO.502 OF 2023

16th Day of November, 2023

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

Sri G. Venkateshwara Rao ...Complainant

Versus

Sri Surabhi Venkat Reddy ...Respondent

The present matter filed by the Complainant herein came up for hearing on 12.10.2023 and 14.11.2023 before this Authority in the presence of Counsel for the Complainant, and none for the Respondent and upon hearing the arguments, this Authority passes the following **ORDER:**

2. The present Complaint has been filed under Section 31 of the Real Estate (Regulation and 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") requesting appropriate action against the Respondent Builder.

A. Brief facts of the case:

3. The Complainant submitted that the Complainant is plot owner of survey numbers 174, 175, 176/2 at Kuntloor village, Abdulapurmet, Ranga Reddy District,

plotted by late Sri G.V. Subba Rao out of 5 acres 37 guntas. Late Sri Surabhi Jagan Mohan Reddy acquired the said land from his father Sri Late Surabhi Venkat Reddy. During his life time, he appointed Sri G.V.Subba Rao as his registered G.P.A for the said land and as such he obtained sanctioned layout and plotted the said land and subsequently sold out to various purchasers and there after registered plots also in the names of purchasers.

4. That Sri Jagan Mohan Reddy died in the year 2010 thereafter his son, the Respondent with a mala fide intention, started grabbing the said land as if he is the legal heir of the late S. Jagan Mohan Reddy. Further, no construction is being taken place in the said land. The Respondent is plotting the land and obtaining requisite layout permissions make again plots by obtaining layout as if he is the owner and therefore, the Complainant prayed that appropriate action be taken against the Respondent in this regard.

B. Observations and Directions of the Authority:

5. The matter was heard finally on 14.11.2023, wherein the Complainant reiterated the contents of his Complaint. Respondent, upon Notice was absent. Upon perusal of the Complaint and record filed, it is apparent that there is no prayer in the Complaint. The copy of the layout shown is of the year 1969. How this Authority has jurisdiction over the said matter is not mentioned in the complaint. There also appears to be boundary dispute and title dispute between the parties. The Complainant failed to plead how this Authority has jurisdiction over the subject matter and therefore, in light of this jurisdictional deficiency, the matter is hereby disposed of.

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

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

Sd/-
Dr. N. Satyanarayana, IAS (Retd.),
Hon'ble Chairperson,
TS RERA