

BEFORE TELANGANA REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY
[Under the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016]
SUO-MOTU CASE NO. D6/860/2025/TG RERA
Date: 16th October, 2025.

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

M/s My Home Constructions Pvt Ltd,
Rep. by its Authorized signatory, Sri B Sharath,
5th Floor, My Home Jupally Complex, 6-3-865, Ameerpet Road, Green Lands,
Hyderabad 500016.

..... **PROMOTER/RESPONDENT**

My Home RAKA.

..... **PROJECT NAME**

The matter was placed for hearing before this Authority on 22.08.2025 wherein Promoter Respondent was represented by its Authorized Signatory, Sri. B Sharath. Upon hearing the submissions and upon consideration of the material available on record, this Authority proceeds to pass the following **ORDER**:

2. 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 "the RE(R&D) Act, 2016"). These proceedings are based on material placed before the Authority, including a petition dated 28.01.2025 and 15.09.2025 submitted by Sri P. Rama Gopal Rao, General Power of Attorney (GPA) holder of Smt Anandjeethkaur W/o Late Thandra Shivakumar Goud.

3. The aforementioned petition dated 28.01.2025 brings to this Authority's attention serious allegations concerning the real estate project titled *My Home RAKA*. It is alleged that the project obtained TG RERA registration by submitting fraudulent documents and suppressing material facts, including the existence of prior and ongoing litigation related to the project land. The petition cites:

- Order No. B4/986/73 dated 19.03.1980 issued by the Tahsildar, Rajender Nagar;

- Order No. P4/12913/1980 dated 09.12.1980 issued by the Joint Collector, Ranga Reddy District;
- Judgment of the Hon'ble High Court in CRP No. 6788/1980 dated 21.10.1981,
- O.S. No. 123/2021; and
- O.S.No. 71/2023,

4. It is also alleged that the builder acquired land in Survey No. 98 of Madeenaguda Village from individuals who had lost legal title prior to 1981 and unlawfully occupied the said land. In light of these claims, the petitioner has requested the Authority to initiate criminal prosecution against the builder for furnishing false information and suppressing facts, and has sought cancellation of the project's registration under TG RERA.

5. Pursuant to the aforementioned representation and accompanying court cases, this Authority, in exercising of powers conferred under Section 35(1) of the RE(R&D) Act, 2016 issued Show Cause Notice dated:05.08.2025 to the Promoter-Respondent directing them to appear for hearing on 22.08.2025 before this Authority along with documentary evidence in response to the allegations set forth in the petition.

6. Accordingly, the matter heard on 22.08.2025. On the said date, the Respondent filed a detailed reply challenging the maintainability of the petition, asserting that the Petitioner lacks locus standi as he is neither the owner, tenant, occupier, nor purchaser of any portion of the project land. The Respondent submitted that the project land was lawfully acquired through registered sale deeds and that all requisite documents were duly submitted to this Authority at the time of registration on 20.12.2021. As on that date, no litigation or adverse orders were pending against the project, and hence, allegations of suppression or fraudulent registration were denied.

7. It was further submitted that O.S. No. 71 of 2023, seeking cancellation of sale deeds executed by the landowners in favour of the Respondent, was filed only on 15.02.2023. and no interim relief has been granted therein. The Respondent also submitted that the Petitioner has filed similar complaints against other developers, resulting in criminal complaints and charge sheets against him. The purchasers of flats in the project are aware of alleged cases filed by petitioner and appropriate assurances have been extended to them.

8. It was further submitted that one Mr. Thandra Pandurangam Goud, S/o Thandra Muthaiah, along with others, had filed a petition for Ownership Certificate under Section 38-E of the Andhra Pradesh (Telangana Area) Tenancy and Agricultural Lands Act, 1950, claiming that his father was a Protected Tenant in respect of land admeasuring Ac. 7-30gts situated in Survey No. 98 of Madinaguda Village, Serilingampally Mandal, Ranga Reddy District. The said petition was dismissed by the Revenue Divisional Officer (RDO) vide order dated 24.07.1999 in Case No. G/3783/93, on the ground that no Protected Tenants were recorded in respect of the said land. Against the said order no appeals were preferred and thus the above order attained finality and binding on them.

9. It was also submitted that one Mr. Thandra Shiva Kumar Goud and others subsequently filed a petition before the Tahsildar seeking restoration of possession of the said land, claiming to be the legal heirs of the alleged Protected Tenant. The said petition was dismissed vide orders dated 18.06.2019 in Case Nos. B/1871 to B/1873 of 2015, holding that the petition was not maintainable under law. No appeal was preferred against the said dismissal, and hence, the said order also attained finality.

10. The Respondent further submitted that although the legal heirs of Late Thandra Muthaiah had no subsisting legal claim over the said land, in order to bring an end to the prolonged litigation, the landowners (Dr. Reddy's Group) and the Developer, My Home Constructions Pvt. Ltd., entered into negotiations with the Protected Tenant claimants. Pursuant to a mutual understanding, the legal heirs of Late Thandra Muthaiah, including Mr. Thandra Shiva Kumar Goud, filed petitions and sworn statements under the provisions of the Tenancy Act, 1950, formally surrendering their alleged Protected Tenancy rights before the Mandal Revenue Officer (MRO), Serilingampally, on 24.06.2017.

11. It was further submitted that Mr. Thandra Shiva Kumar Goud passed away during the COVID-19 pandemic, and the Petitioner allegedly took undue advantage of the situation by misleading the deceased's family members and obtained a General Power of Attorney (GPA). Acting on behalf of Mrs. Anandjeet Kaur and her children, the Petitioner filed a representation before the GHMC in 2021, seeking cancellation of the building permission granted to MHCPL for the "My Home RAKA" project. Upon examination, GHMC rejected the representation through its order dated 29.10.2022 in Proceeding No.

1/C21/08841/2021/1158. Subsequently, the Petitioner filed W.P. No. 36753 of 2022 before the Hon'ble High Court for the State of Telangana, which was dismissed on 28.04.2023. Aggrieved by which, the Petitioner filed W.A. No. 199 of 2024, which was later withdrawn. A Review Petition (I.A. No. 3 of 2024 in W.P. No. 36753 of 2022) was then filed, but it too was dismissed by the Hon'ble High Court on 07.01.2025, holding that no grounds had been made out for review of the earlier order dated 28.04.2023.

12 It was further submitted by the Respondent that neither they nor their predecessors-in-title were parties to the legal proceedings cited by the petitioner. The proceedings bearing No. B4/986/73 were instituted by Tandra Satyanarayana, Tandra Pandurangam, Tandra Anandam, Tandra Sharada, and Tandra Amrutha Bai against Smt. Habeebunnisa Begum, Smt. Rajeswari, and Sri K. Satyanarayana before the Mandal Revenue Officer, Rajendranagar, seeking restoration of possession over land in Survey No. 98 of Madinaguda Village. An appeal against the MRO's order was filed by Smt. Rajeswari before the Joint Collector, Ranga Reddy District (Appeal No. B4/12931/1980), followed by a revision petition (CRP No. 6788 of 1980) before the Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh. The revision was dismissed. The Respondent contends that these proceedings are unrelated to their title or ownership of the project land.

13. The Respondent submitted that Smt. Rajeswari was never a predecessor-in-title to the subject land. It was clarified that the original pattadar, Smt. Habeebunnisa Begum, sold the land to D. Sukhram in 1963, who in turn sold it to Shri V.S. Gopal Rao and others in 1966 well before the year 1980. The Respondent emphasized that neither D. Sukhram nor the subsequent purchasers were made parties to the said proceedings, allegedly due to malafide intent by the Protected Tenant claimants, who suppressed material facts and concealed the existence of prior transactions. It was further alleged that such conduct amounted to fraud, rendering the orders obtained in those proceedings against third parties non-binding and inapplicable to the Respondent's predecessor-in-title.

14. The Respondent also submitted that the suit bearing O.S. No. 123 of 2021 was filed for partition among the legal heirs of the alleged Protected Tenants and they are unaware of filing of such suit until they received a notice after court proceedings dated 07.07.2023. However, as on date, the said claimants neither possess the land nor have been declared as

tenants thereof. Consequently, the partition suit in respect of a property which is not in their possession is rendered ineffective. Furthermore, no adverse orders have been passed against the Respondent in O.S. No. 71 of 2023, pending before the Principal Junior Civil Judge, Ranga Reddy District at Kukatpally, which seeks cancellation of sale deeds executed by the predecessors of the vendors and the vendors of My Home Constructions Pvt. Ltd. (MHCPL).

15. It was further submitted that the Respondent company has completed construction of the project on 02.04.2025 and has obtained the No Objection Certificate (NOC) for Occupancy Certificate from the Fire Department and the Consent for Operation (CFO) from the Telangana State Pollution Control Board (TGPCB). An application for issuance of Occupancy Certificate was filed with the Greater Hyderabad Municipal Corporation (GHMC) on 07.04.2025, and the inspection of the project is completed within the stipulated timelines and the concerned officers recommended for issue of occupancy certificate. Further, the Respondent developer also filed Form-1 Completed Certificate.

16. By submitting the aforesaid reply, the Respondent has prayed to close the complaint, contending that the allegations made by the Complainant are false, frivolous, and vexatious. The Respondent has further requested this Hon'ble Authority to pass appropriate orders restraining the Complainant from initiating any further frivolous proceedings or actions intended to malign the reputation of the Respondent Company and its development project and misusing the process of this Hon'ble Authority for ulterior motives or wrongful gain.

17. This Court is in receipt of further submissions dated 15.09.2025 from the petitioner, stating that land measuring Ac.7.30 gts in Sy.No. 98 of Madinaguda Village, Sherilingampalli Mandal, was originally held by Smt. Habeebunnissa Begum as pattadar. of this, Ac. 4.26 guntas was held by Thandra Muttiah S/o Balaraj as a Protected Tenant. Upon his demise in 1963, his legal heirs Thandra Satyanarayana, Pandurangam, Anandam, Sharada, and Amrutha Baibecame entitled to equal shares.

18. It is further submitted that Smt. Habeebunnissa Begum and Smt. Rajeswari fraudulently procured a surrender of Protected Tenancy rights from Smt. Thandra

Erramma, wife of Late Thandra Balraj vide file No.A3/1407/1963 Dated:02.02.1963, despite her not being the Protected Tenant. Aggrieved by this, the legal heirs of Thandra Muttiah initiated proceedings under Section 32(1) of A.P(Telangana Area) Tenancy and Agriculture Act 1950 vide case No.D/986/73 seeking restoration of possession. The Tahsildar, Rajendranagar Mandal, allowed the petition on 19.03.1980 in Case No. B4/986/73, ordering eviction of Smt. Habeebunnissa Begum and Smt. Rajeswari. The appeal filed by Smt. Rajeswari before the Joint Collector (Appeal No. P4/12931/80) was dismissed on 09.12.1980, and a subsequent revision petition (CRP No. 6788/1980) before the Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh was also dismissed on 21.10.1981. Accordingly, it is contended that neither Smt. Habeebunnissa Begum nor Smt. Rajeswari, nor any other person claiming through them, hold any legal right, title, or interest over Ac. 4.26 guntas of the said land. Any sale deeds executed by them in respect of this portion are therefore invalid and unenforceable.

19. It was also stated that Smt. Thandra Pandurangam, son of Late Thandra Muttaiah, held a 1/5th undivided share in land measuring Ac. 4.26 guntas. Upon his death on 31.05.2006, his legal heirs Thandra Shivakumar Goud, Thandra Vijaya Laxmi, and Smt. P. Prasanna Rani succeeded to his share. Thandra Shivakumar Goud, entitled to a 1/3rd share of the 1/5th portion of ac4.26gts, filed O.S. No. 123/2021 for partition and separate possession before the Hon'ble XV Additional District Judge, Ranga Reddy District at Kukatpally, later transferred to the VI Additional District Judge, where it remains pending.

20. It is further submitted that during the pendency of the suit, Thandra Shivakumar Goud passed away on 29.04.2021, leaving behind his wife and two daughters as his legal heirs, entitled to his 1/3rd undivided share. In view of the inability of one of the legal heirs of Late Thandra Muttaiah to personally pursue the matter, the Petitioner herein was appointed as General Power of Attorney (GPA) holder to represent them and take necessary legal steps to safeguard their rights and secure their entitlement.

21. It was also submitted that the Petitioner, acting as GPA holder, filed a complaint before the Commissioner, GHMC, seeking cancellation of building permission granted to the "My Home RAKA" project vide Permit No. 1/C21/10154/2021 in file No.I/c21/08841/2021 dated 10.11.2021, in respect of land measuring Ac. 7.30 gts,

including Ac. 4.26 gts in Survey No. 98 of Madinaguda Village, Due to delay in disposal of the complaint, the Petitioners filed W.P. No. 19857/2022, challenging GHMC's action. The Hon'ble High Court, by order dated 20.04.2022, directed GHMC to pass an appropriate order after issuing notice to My Home Constructions Pvt. Ltd. within six weeks. Pursuant to the High Court's direction, GHMC issued notice dated 19.09.2022 to Respondent who, submitted a reply claiming ownership based on three registered sale deeds: (i) Document No. 9420/1996 dated 01.07.1996, (ii) Document No. 7921/1997 dated 11.04.1997, and (iii) Document No. 529/1998 dated 09.06.1997. Upon learning of these sale deeds, the Protected Tenants, through their GPA holder (Petitioner), instituted O.S. No. 71 of 2023 before the Principal Junior Civil Judge, Ranga Reddy District at Kukatpally, seeking declaration that the said sale deeds are null and void. Respondent No. 2 has filed a written statement, and the suit is currently pending adjudication.

22. It is further submitted that, as the developers continued construction and collected substantial amounts from homebuyers without disclosing the pending legal disputes, the Petitioners and other stakeholders issued public caution notices to alert prospective buyers. In response, they were served with legal notices by the concerned parties. Aggrieved by the Petitioner's continued efforts to reclaim the allegedly encroached land, a complaint dated 02.07.2024 was filed against him before the Commissioner of Police, Cyberabad.

23. In view of the above, the Petitioner has prayed before this Authority to revoke the RERA registration under Section 7(1) of the RE(R&D) Act, 2016. Pending such revocation, he has sought interim relief under Section 36 to restrain the Respondents from further advertisement, booking, or sale of flats/plots, and to freeze the designated project accounts under Section 7(4)(c)(d). He has also requested imposition of penalties under Section 60 and initiation of further proceedings under Section 8 of the RE(R&D) Act, 2016.

Observations of this Authority: -

24. The Authority has carefully perused the representation dated: 28.01.2025 and Dated: 15.09.2025 submitted by Sri.P Ram Gopal Rao acting as GPA Holder for Smt Anandjeethkaur W/o Late Thandra Shiva Kumar Goud, Thandra Akshaya and Tanu Sree Daughters of Late Thandra Shiva Kumar Goud, along with details, submissions from the

Promoter-Respondent, “M/s My Homes constructions Pvt Ltd”, represented by its Authorized Signatory B.Sharath.

25. The representation alleges irregularities in the Respondent’s project titled “My Home RAKA,” registered under TG RERA with registration number P02400003777. These irregularities include the submission of fraudulent documents and suppression of material facts concerning pending litigation over the project land measuring 9,915.71square meters situated at Madinaguda village, Ranga Reddy District. Specifically, the petitioner refers to historical revenue orders: (i) Order No. B4/986/73 dated 19.03.1980 passed by the Tahsildar, Rajendranagar; (ii) Case No. P4/12931/80 dated 09.12.1980 passed by the Joint Collector, Ranga Reddy District; (iii) Order in C.R.P. No. 6788/1980 dated 21.10.1981 passed by the Hon’ble High Court; as well as ongoing civil suits O.S. No. 123/2021 and O.S. No. 71/2023. It is further contended that the promoter acquired land from parties who had lost their title prior to the 1981 and unlawfully occupied it, thereby warranting criminal proceedings and revocation of project under Section 7 of the RE(R&D) Act, 2016.

26. In the interest of safeguarding the rights of allottees and upholding the principle of enshrinement as articulated in the preamble of the RE(R&D) Act, 2016 which aims to establish a regulatory framework for the promotion and regulation of the real estate sector, ensuring efficient and transparent transactions in the sale of plots and apartment buildings, and above all, protecting the interests of consumers by fostering accountability and preventing malpractices this Authority has deemed it appropriate to take *Suo motu* cognizance of the matter under Section 35(1) of the RE(R&D) Act, 2016. The allegations if substantially undermine the foundation of the said Act including mandatory disclosure of pending litigation while applying for registration before this Authority which is to empower the allottees with complete information of project.

27. The core allegations raised by the petitioner revolve around suppression of facts under Section 4 of the RE(R&D) Act, 2016 which governs the application process for registration of real estate projects. Section 3 of the RE(R&D) Act, 2016 mandates 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.”

Crucially, Section 4(2)(b) of the RE(R&D) Act, 2016 requires that a promoter applying for such registration must furnish, inter alia, brief details of the project land. Furthermore, Section 4(2)(c) of the RE(R&D) Act, 2016, obligates the promoter to submit an authenticated copy of the approvals and commencement certificate issued by the competent authority, in accordance with applicable laws. This must be accompanied by a declaration supported by an affidavit affirming, among other things, that the land is free from any encumbrances, or that full details of any encumbrances have been disclosed. Any suppression or misrepresentation of these disclosures at the time of submitting the application under Section 4 of the RE(R&D) Act, 2016 constitutes a clear violation of the statutory requirements.

28. Upon verification of records, including the TG RERA portal and submissions made by the parties, this Authority notes that the project titled “My Home RAKA” was registered with this Authority on 20.12.2021 under registration number P02400003777, valid from 20.12.2021 to 09.11.2025. At the time of application, the promoter submitted all requisite documents, including Building Permit No. 1/C21/10154/2021 dated 10.11.2021 issued by the Commissioner, GHMC, and an affidavit under Section 4(2)(c) of the RE(R&D) Act, 2016. The petitioner alleges suppression of material facts, specifically the existence of civil suits O.S. No. 123/2021 and O.S. No. 71/2023. However, the Respondent has denied any deliberate concealment, stating that O.S. No. 123/2021 pertains to a partition suit filed among legal heirs of alleged Protected Tenants over land measuring Ac. 4.26gts in Sy. No. 98 of Madinaguda village, Serilingampally Mandal, which they were unaware of such suit until receipt of notice following court proceedings dated 07.07.2023.

29. This Authority, upon independent scrutiny of the case status via the e-Courts portal of the Hon’ble High Court of Telangana and Ranga Reddy District Court, observes that although O.S. No. 123/2021 bears a 2021 filing year, it was not listed for hearing nor were

any notices issued until 07.09.2022, with the first hearing scheduled on 02.01.2023. In view thereof, and as there is nothing on record to indicate that summons or notices were duly served upon the Respondent prior to the project registration, a benefit of doubt can reasonably be extended to the Respondent that they were unaware of the said proceedings at the relevant point of time. The petitioner is also not submitted any documentary proof showing notices were served on the Promoter-Respondent in said suits prior to the registration of the project. Accordingly, no deliberate suppression of material facts under Section 4 of the RE(R&D) Act, 2016 can be established on the present record.

30. The petitioner, Sri P. Gopal Rao, has referred to certain historical orders, namely: i) Case No. B4/986/73 dated 19.03.1980 passed by the Tahsildar, Rajendranagar; (ii) Case No. P4/12931/80 dated 09.12.1980 passed by the Joint Collector, Ranga Reddy District; (iii) Order in C.R.P. No. 6788/1980 dated 21.10.1981 of the Hon'ble High Court. However, these orders pertain to disputes among the legal heirs of Sri Thandra Muthaiah, the alleged original protected tenant, which were subsequently resolved by the Revenue Authorities prior to the registration of the project. Hence, these do not constitute suppression of facts.

31. Turning to the request for revocation of the project u/S (7) of the RE(R&D) Act, 2016. This Authority must apply the provisions of Section 7 judiciously, such action must be guided by the preamble of the RE(R&D) Act, 2016, which emphasized the importance of consumer protection and sectoral transparency, without unduly disrupted the legitimate project. Section 7 of the RE(R&D) Act, 2016 empowers the Authority to revoke registration upon satisfaction that:

(a) the promoter has defaulted in compliance with the Act or rules/regulations made thereunder;

(b) the promoter has violated terms or conditions of approval granted by the competent authority;

(c) the promoter has engaged in unfair practices or irregularities.

Explanation:- For the purposes of this clause, the term unfair practice means a practice which, for the purpose of promoting the sale or

development of any real estate project adopts any unfair or deceptive practice including any of the following practices. Namely:-

Explanation.—For the purposes of this clause, the term "unfair practice means" a practice which, for the purpose of promoting the sale or development of any real estate project adopts any unfair method or unfair or deceptive practice including any of the following practices, namely:— (A) the practice of making any statement, whether in writing or by visible representation which,

- (i) falsely represents that the services are of a particular standard or grade;*
- (ii) represents that the promoter has approval or affiliation which such promoter does not have;*
- (iii) (iii) makes a false or misleading representation concerning the services; (B) the promoter permits the publication of any advertisement or prospectus whether in any newspaper or otherwise of services that are not intended to be offered; (d) the promoter indulges in any fraudulent practices.*

32. In the present case, none of the aforementioned violations envisaged under Section 7 of the the RE(R&D) Act, 2016, have been established. The promoter has complied with all essential statutory prerequisites at the time of registration, including submission of title documents, sanctioned building plans, NOC from the competent authority, and the affidavit mandated under Section 4(2)(c) of the RE(R&D) Act, 2016. The records further indicate that the Respondent has completed construction of the project and applied for issuance of the Occupancy Certificate before the Greater Hyderabad Municipal Corporation (GHMC) on 07.04.2025 and the inspection of the project is completed within the stipulated timelines and the concerned officers recommended for issue of occupancy certificate. Further, the Respondent developer also filed Form-1 Completed Certificate.

33. In these circumstances, this Authority finds no material irregularity, fraudulent representation, or continuing default that would justify invocation of the drastic power of revocation under Section 7 of RE(R&D) Act, 2016. The said provision is an exceptional

measure intended to address cases of persistent non-compliance, fraudulent activities, or grave irregularities that threaten consumer rights or project viability. It is not to be exercised as a punitive measure in the absence of substantive violation.

34. Furthermore, at this advanced stage, when the project stands substantially completed and the registration is set to expire on 09.11.2025, any order of revocation would not only be disproportionate but would also jeopardize the vested interests of numerous allottees who have invested in good faith relying on the statutory registration granted by this Authority. Such an extreme step would risk unsettling the rights of consumers and may impede completion or handover processes, thereby frustrating the very object of the RE(R&D) Act, 2016.

35. The preamble to the RE(R&D) Act, 2016, underscores a dual mandate to protect the interests of consumers while ensuring the orderly growth and completion of real estate projects. Therefore, while the Authority must remain vigilant against any act of suppression or deception, it must also exercise restraint where the facts do not disclose continuing non-compliance or fraudulent intent. The objective of the statute is to secure transparency and homebuyers protection through regulation and protect interest laid under the provisions of RE(R&D) Act, 2016 not to destabilize bona fide projects through overbroad penal action, particularly where numerous allottees are already vested in the project, unless such action is necessitated by binding judicial or competent authority orders.

36. Accordingly, this Authority holds that invocation of Section 7 of the RE(R&D) Act, 2016 for revocation of registration is neither warranted nor proportionate in the present case.

37. No sufficient grounds for revocation exist. However, in furtherance of transparency and accountability as envisaged under the RE(R&D) Act, 2016 this Authority hereby directs the Respondent, under Section 34(f) of the said Act, to forthwith update the concerned project details on the TG RERA web portal, including particulars of O.S. No. 123/2021 and O.S. No. 71/2023, and to ensure that the Quarterly Progress Reports (QPRs) are duly filed and up-to-date.

38. Furthermore, the Respondent is sternly cautioned that any adverse outcome in the aforesaid litigations which directly or indirectly affects the project land or the rights of allottees shall render them liable under the provisions of the RE(R&D) Act, 2016. The Respondent shall extend all necessary assistance and provide indemnity to the allottees to safeguard their interests, particularly in relation to title security and possession.

39. In view of the foregoing analysis and in the absence of any substantial violation warranting revocation at this stage, the *Suo motu* proceedings are hereby closed.

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

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

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

