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

Complaint No. 154 of 2026

Dated: 17th November, 2026

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

Between:

Kommu Shyam Prasad
R/o. Flat No: B306, Sri Sairam Towers,
Vinayaknagar, Hafeezpet, Hyderabad, 500049.

…**Complainant**

Versus

1) M/s. Vasavi Realtors LLP
Rep. by its designated partner Yerram Vijay Kumar,
O/a. H.No: 8-2-703/7/1 and 8-2-703/7/1/A, 4th floor,
Road No.12, Banjara Hills, Hyderabad, Telangana 500034.

2) Paladugu Raja Rao
Rep. by its AGPA holder, M/s. Sairam Builders,
rep. by its Managing Partner, Sri Saireddy Satyanarayana Reddy
R/o. C-44, Road No-10, Film Nagar, Jubilee Hills, Hyderabad.

3) M/s. Sairam Builders
Rep. by its Managing Partner, Sri Saireddy Satyanarayana Reddy
R/o. H No:8-3-949/1/1, G-1, Sri Sairam Estate,
Nagarjuna Nagar, Yellareddyguda, Hyderabad, 500073.

...**Respondents**

The present matter filed by the Complainant mentioned herein above came up for hearing on 19.08.2026, before this Authority in the presence of the Complainant and Respondents were absent. Upon hearing the submissions of the Complainant and taking note of the pleadings placed on record by both 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 and Development) Act, 2016 (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 the Complainant:

3. The Complainant, Mr. Kommu Syam Prasad, purchased Flat No. E6408 in "Vasavi Lake City East" through a registered sale deed No. 20670/2023 dated 22 December 2023 from Sri Sairam Builders, represented by its Managing Partner Sri Saireddy Satyanarayana Reddy. The said flat falls under the landowner share belonging to Sri Paladugu Raja Rao, pursuant to a registered Agreement of Sale-cum-General Power of Attorney (No. 992/2020 dated 22 January 2020). The development of the project is governed by a Development Agreement-cum-Irrevocable GPA (No. 998/2000 dated 22 January 2020) executed between the landowner and M/s. Vasavi Realtors LLP.

4. The Complainant was induced to purchase the flat based on advertisements, representations, and assurances made by the builder and its marketing team, which projected the project as a well-planned development with timely delivery. The Complainant paid 100% of the sale consideration, believing that the project would be completed within the promised timeline of 36 months plus a 6-month grace period, i.e., by February 2024. The builder, represented by Sri Yerram Vijay Kumar, repeatedly assured that possession would be handed over by February 2024.

5. However, the project has been consistently delayed without valid justification. The builder has failed to deliver possession even after expiry of the agreed timeline and grace period. Despite repeated follow-ups, the builder has neither provided a definite completion schedule nor maintained transparency regarding delays. Construction at the site has been significantly stalled, and the builder has issued vague and misleading updates while repeatedly postponing handover dates.

6. In a meeting held on 03 January 2026 at the site office, attended by several buyers, the builder's representative orally stated that "Vasavi Group is not responsible for compensation to units purchased from landowners," and no official minutes of the meeting have been issued to date. Further, the builder has failed to respond to queries and has treated buyers of landowner share units unfairly, denying responsibility despite submission of registered sale deeds and encumbrance certificates.

7. Despite continuous assurances, as of December 2025, the project remains incomplete. The builder has been repeatedly postponing possession dates, providing false assurances, and failing to demonstrate actual progress. The Complainant, having invested his retirement

savings and personal funds, is facing financial distress and uncertainty due to the prolonged delay.

8. As on December 2025, the project is only approximately 70–75% complete, with no major construction activity observed in the preceding six months. Critical works such as interior finishing, common amenities, and supporting infrastructure remain incomplete. The builder has failed to provide any clear roadmap or completion timeline, causing anxiety among homebuyers.

9. The conduct of the builder amounts to a serious violation of RERA provisions. Despite collecting 100% payment upfront, the builder has failed to fulfil contractual obligations and deliver possession within the stipulated timeframe. This has resulted in financial strain, mental stress, and prolonged hardship to the Complainant. The lack of accountability and absence of a firm completion schedule has compelled the Complainant to approach this Hon'ble Authority seeking intervention, compensation, and appropriate action.

B. Relief(s) Sought:

10. In view of the above-mentioned facts and circumstances, the Complainant has humbly prayed for the following reliefs:

i. *Direct the Respondent/Builder to complete the construction and hand over possession of the Complainant's flat immediately, at the earliest, within a fixed and enforceable timeframe.*
ii. *Direct the Respondent to complete all remaining works strictly as per the agreed specifications, sanctioned plans, and commitments made at the time of sale.*
iii. *Impose appropriate penalties on the Respondent for failure to deliver possession within the agreed timeline and for repeated unjustified delays.*
iv. *Direct that the validity of project completion shall not be extended beyond 07.02.2026, as the delay is not attributable to reasons beyond the control of the builder.*
v. *Grant financial compensation to the Complainant for the delay in possession, financial losses, and mental agony suffered due to the Respondent's actions.*
vi. *Pass such other or further orders as this Hon'ble Authority may deem fit and proper in the interest of justice and equity.*

C. Counter filed by the Respondent

11. The Respondent first challenges maintainability, arguing that the complaint is premature because the dispute-resolution mechanism in the contract was not followed and no prior legal notice was issued. The Respondent submits that it lawfully acquired development rights over a project of about 34,704 sq. yds., obtained the necessary approvals on 7 February 2020, and registered the project with RERA in March 2020. The Respondent admits that the Complainant was allotted Apartment E.6408 (1,650 sq. ft.) for ₹49.5 lakh, which has been fully paid, and says that progress was regularly communicated to allottees.

12. On the delay, the Respondent relies mainly on force majeure, contending that such delays automatically extend timelines without entitling the allottee to compensation. The Respondent cites the COVID-19 pandemic, with its lockdowns, migrant labour exodus and the Supreme Court's limitation extensions from March 2020 to February 2022. The Respondent further cites labour shortages, cascading delays, third-party litigation (RERA cases, writ petitions and appeals), and rocky terrain that had to be broken manually rather than blasted because of nearby residences. The Respondent submits that all of the aforementioned aspects were communicated to buyers.

13. The Respondent further alleges that the Complainant suppressed material facts, since his agreement was with the landowner and not the developer, and that the complaint is exaggerated and filed with an ulterior motive. The Respondent disputes the claim of repeated delay for want of evidence, notes that the project registration remains valid until February 2026, and says it continues to work towards completion. The Respondent denies liability for interest or compensation, calling the claim for mental agony arbitrary and unsupported, and asks that the complaint be dismissed.

D. Rejoinder filed by the Complainant

14. In his rejoinder, the Complainant submits that the counter is evasive and says it diverts attention from the real issues such as the inordinate delay and an unauthorised reduction in the balcony area. The Complainant argues that the maintainability objections are misconceived, because the Authority's jurisdiction flows from the RERA Act, 2016, which overrides contractual clauses, and the Act requires no prior legal notice. The Complainant reiterates the purchase details and states that possession, contractually due by 31.08.2023, has still not been delivered.

15. On force majeure, the Complainant argues that it cannot be a blanket or indefinite excuse. The project remains incomplete even after the registration was extended to February 2026, which breaks any causal link with COVID-19, and the Respondent's labour, litigation and site-condition grounds are vague, unsupported by evidence and amount to foreseeable business risks. The Complainant also points out a contradiction, wherein the Respondent denies liability while having acknowledged the delay and offered compensation to certain buyers, as recorded in meeting minutes. In the Complainant's view, distinguishing between developer-share and landowner-share purchasers is arbitrary, as the promoter is responsible for the entire project. The Complainant finally presses for handover within a strict timeline, interest from 01.09.2023 until possession, compensation for financial loss, mental agony and the balcony reduction, and appropriate penalties.

E. Points for consideration

16. After considering the facts stated and submissions made by both parties, the following questions arise before this Authority:

1. Whether the present complaint is maintainable before this Authority?
2. Whether Respondent No.1 can avoid its obligations towards the Complainant on the ground that the flat falls in the landowner's share?
3. Whether Respondents No.2 and 3 are also jointly liable for providing delayed interest, and if so, in what manner?
4. Whether the Complainants are entitled to the reliefs as prayed for?

F. Observations of the Authority

Point no. 1:

17. The objections that the complaint is premature for want of a legal notice and of recourse to the contractual dispute-resolution mechanism are rejected, for the reasons given by this Authority in Complaint No. 453 of 2025, which are adopted. The record reinforces that view. First, the Complainant's Sale Deed contains no arbitration or dispute-resolution clause at all. Second, Section 31 of the Act provides every aggrieved person with a statutory remedy and imposes no condition of prior notice. The complaint is maintainable.

Point no. 2:

18. The Authority is unable to accept that a buyer from the landowner's share stands outside the developer's responsibility. The Act does not know of a landowner share allottee. Section 2(d) defines an allottee as a person to whom an apartment has been allotted, sold or otherwise transferred by the promoter. Section 2(zk) defines a promoter broadly, it covers a person who causes a building to be constructed or develops land for sale, as well as persons who sell the apartments. Once a project is registered, every apartment sold in it is sold in a project for which the promoter has made declarations to this Authority, and Sections 11 and 18 fix the promoter's obligations towards every allottee of that project. How a built-up area between the landowner and the developer is divided is a private commercial arrangement. It may govern their dealings with each other but cannot be set up against a homebuyer who has paid full price.

19. It is noted that Respondent No.1, in its own records submitted to this Authority during registration, that is Form B under Rule 3(4), Respondent No.1 declared to this Authority that it is the promoter of the project, that it has legal title and a development agreement with the landowner, that the project would be completed by 05.02.2025, and that it would not discriminate against any allottee. Further, in its counter it admits that it that this very subject unit was allotted to the Complainant, and that the full Rs. 49.5 lakhs have been paid.

20. Now coming to the DAGPA, the developer undertook to build the complex at its own cost and to "allot and deliver the Residential Flats to the First Party or his nominees", it kept sole discretion over, and control of, the construction as per the clause 9.2 of the said DAGPA, further it bound itself to complete within 36 months plus a 6-month grace period and it accepted in clause 18.1 that "it is fully and solely liable and responsible….to the third parties with whom it deals". Further and expressly contemplates purchasers from out of the share of the landowner paying their advance maintenance directly to the developer. Buyers from the landowner's share are therefore part of the very project the developer agreed to build and to deliver.

21. Further, the developer's conduct shows the same. Its letter dated 07.02.2025 gave a tower-wise handover schedule to all the flat owners, fixing Tower 6 for 02.06.2025. Its minutes of 22.03.2025 recorded that "all registered flats" would be handed over by the end of June 2025, that rent at ₹20 per sq. ft. would be paid to all registered flat owners, and that a separate CRM would be appointed for the landlord share. Its minutes of 19.04.2025 speak of a clearance from the landlord to be issued to the purchaser for taking over of flats from the Builder. A developer that schedules, services and hands over landowner-share flats is treating those buyers as its own customers.

22. A developer who schedules, services and hands over landowner share flats is treating those buyers as its own customers. Nothing in the Act permits promoter to contract out of its statutory duty to an allottee through an understanding with landowner. Respondent no.1 is promoter under section 2(zk), it is bound by sec 11(4)(a) and liable under sec 18 for not delivering possession on time. Whatever adjustment is due between Respondent no.1 and the landowner is for them to work out between themselves.

23. Therefore, Respondent No.1 cannot avoid its obligations towards the Complainant on the ground that the flat falls in the landowner's share. Point 2 answered accordingly.

Point no. 3:

24. Respondent Nos. 2 and 3, being the landowner and his AGPA Holder, respectively, though duly served with notice and afforded sufficient opportunity to participate in the proceedings, have neither entered appearance nor filed their respective counter-affidavits. In the absence of any response from their side, the Authority is left with no alternative but to proceed on the basis of the pleadings and documentary material available on record. Their non-appearance, however, does not dispense this Authority from the obligation to independently examine the nature and extent of their liability, in light of the statutory provisions and the contractual arrangements governing the project.

25. A perusal of the registered Sale Deed executed in favour of the Complainant reveals that Respondent No. 2 is the vendor therein, while Respondent No. 3 has executed the same in his capacity as the AGPA Holder. Under Clause 1 of the said Sale Deed, receipt of entire sale consideration of Rs.49,50,000/- has been acknowledged and under Clause 3 possession shall be delivered on completion of Tower/Project. Hence Respondent Nos. 2 and 3 who were vendors in the transaction have conveyed rights to the Complainant and cannot now escape from the obligations arising out of the said conveyance as regards protection of title of Complainant, peaceful possession and enjoyment of subject property.

26. However, the question whether such responsibility as vendors would by itself make them liable for delay in construction and consequential interest under Section 18 of Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016 needs to be addressed separately. Liability for delay cannot be imposed merely on account of their participation in execution of Sale Deed. It necessarily has to be viewed against the actual allocation of responsibilities under the development arrangement and the role attributed to each party in implementing the project.

27. In this context, the Explanation to Section 2(zk) of the Act provides that if the person who constructs or causes construction and the person who sells apartments or plots are different, both may be deemed promoters and shall be jointly liable for the functions and responsibilities specified under the Act. At the same time, liability under Section 18 especially as regards failure to complete the project and deliver possession within the stipulated period has to be considered in the light of obligations cast upon promoter by Section 11(4)(a) and (b) of the Act read with actual contractual arrangement between parties.

28. On perusal of DAGPA, it is clear that development and execution of the project has been largely and exclusively placed on Respondent No. 1, the Developer (Clause 9.2). It gives discretion and control over construction activities such as deployment of men, materials and methods of construction to Respondent No. 1 and also makes it solely responsible for acts and omissions of its contractors and workers (Clause 9.2). Clause 11.1 places responsibility for the completion of the project upon the Developer within a specified period and the agreement indemnifies the landowner against losses arising from the Developer's failure to discharge its contractual obligations.

29. These clauses leave no doubt that the responsibility for execution, supervision and timely completion of the project was on Respondent No. 1 itself, neither has the Complainant put forward any act or omission by Respondent Nos. 2 and 3 which might have caused or contributed to delay, nor has material placed on record shown such a circumstance; in the absence of such material the fact that Respondent No. 2 was the landowner and Respondent No. 3 his AGPA Holder cannot be taken as sufficient ground alone to impose them with liability for delay in construction when contractual responsibility for it was vested in Developer.

30. The Hon'ble Supreme Court, in *Sriganesh Chandrasekaran v. Unishire Homes LLP*, 2026 SCC OnLine SC 279, considered a similar development arrangement. It declined to impose liability for delay compensation on the landowners where the construction obligation rested wholly on the developer, the developer had indemnified the landowners, and no delay was attributable to any act or omission of theirs. It held the landowners jointly responsible only to ensure transfer of title, and added that joint and several liabilities must be decided on the facts of each case.

31. Applying the abovementioned principle to the facts of the present case, this Authority finds no material on record to establish that Respondent Nos. 2 and 3 had any role in the

execution, supervision or progress of construction, or that any act or omission on their part contributed to the delay in completion of the project. On the contrary, the DAGPA clearly places the developmental and construction-related obligations upon Respondent No. 1. Consequently, in the absence of any demonstrated causal connection between the conduct of Respondent Nos. 2 and 3 and the delay complained of, this Authority is not inclined to extend the liability for delayed interest on them.

32. However, this Authority feels it necessary to point out that the entrustment of development and construction to a developer cannot be taken as giving rise to an unrestricted right in favour of the landowner to totally dissociate himself from the obligations arising from the sale of units to allottees. If the landowner enters into a development arrangement, sells his share of units in the project and takes part in execution of sale deeds in favour of intending allottees, he cannot merely by entrusting construction to the developer think that his obligations towards such allottees have been discharged. The distinction between a person who carries out construction and a person who undertakes to sell the unit must be maintained, it cannot be invoked to defeat or dilute the legitimate rights of an allottee.

33. A landowner who has conveyed rights in favour of an allottee is expected to act with due diligence and remain concerned with the fulfilment of the commitments made under the transaction. This would, where the circumstances so require, include extending necessary cooperation, ensuring that no impediment is created in the transfer of title or delivery of possession, and taking appropriate steps within the scope of his contractual and statutory obligations to safeguard the interests of the allottees. A landowner cannot claim the benefit of the sale transaction while seeking to disown all attached responsibilities to the purchaser. Nevertheless, the nature and extent of such responsibility must be determined on the facts of each case, and cannot automatically be equated with liability for construction delays occasioned exclusively by the developer.

34. In the present case, while Respondent Nos. 2 and 3 cannot be held responsible for the delay in construction in the absence of any material establishing their contribution thereto, their obligations arising from the registered Sale Deed executed in favour of the Complainant remain unaffected. They are, therefore, required to extend all necessary cooperation and ensure that the Complainant's rights in respect of the subject property are not prejudiced.

35. In view of the foregoing discussion, this Authority holds that Respondent Nos. 2 and 3 are not liable for payment of interest under Section 18 of the Act on account of delay in

completion of the project, nor can the responsibility for completing the construction and delivering the subject flat be imposed upon them on the material presently available on record. The said obligations, in the facts of the present case, rest upon Respondent No. 1, the Developer. However, Respondent Nos. 2 and 3 shall remain bound by the obligations arising under the Sale Deed and shall extend all necessary cooperation in ensuring the protection of the Complainant's title, peaceful possession and enjoyment of the subject property, in terms of the directions contained in this Order.

Point no. 4:

36. A perusal of the registered Sale Deed executed in favour of the Complainant says in Clause 3 thereof that possession shall be delivered upon completion of Tower/Project but without any specific date being given. But since there is no date in the Sale deed, it cannot be said that the obligation to deliver possession has been left open-ended or that Complainant has to wait indefinite for completion of project. The date of committed possession can only be found out from representations, declarations and commitments made by promoter about project at the time when such representation, declaration and commitment was made.

37. In this regard, the Authority finds that Form B submitted by the promoter indicates the proposed date of completion as 05.02.2025. Further, Respondent No. 1, in its own communication addressed to the customers, specifically referred to 07.02.2025 as the stipulated date under the project registration. The project registration was subsequently extended until 07.02.2026. Having regard to these declarations and, more particularly, the specific date acknowledged by Respondent No. 1 itself in its communication to the allottees, this Authority considers 07.02.2025 to be the appropriate date for determining the promoter's obligation to deliver possession in the present case.

38. Further, as already examined by this Authority in Complaint No. 453 of 2025, the conduct and subsequent communications of Respondent No. 1 do not support its attempt to attribute the entire delay to the pandemic. Even after the pandemic had substantially subsided, Respondent No. 1 continued to communicate successive timelines for completion and delivery, initially indicating Dussehra 2024, thereafter 07.02.2025, subsequently 02.06.2025 in respect of Tower 6, followed by the end of June 2025, and, more recently, 30.11.2025 for obtaining the Occupancy Certificate in respect of the East Wing. These successive assurances are significant. They demonstrate that the promoter itself continued to set and communicate specific completion timelines, even well after the pandemic-related disruption. A promoter cannot

indefinitely rely upon an extraordinary circumstance which has substantially subsided, particularly when it has itself continued to hold out fresh timelines for completion thereafter.

39. This Authority is also conscious of the fact that the project registration was subsequently extended up to 07.02.2026. However, such extension, granted in exercise of the regulatory powers under Section 6 of the Act, operates in the context of the promoter's registration and its regulatory obligations before the Authority. An extension of the validity of registration, or the uploading of a revised completion timeline on the project portal, cannot, by itself, be treated as an automatic alteration of the date of possession committed to an allottee under the transaction. The regulatory relationship between the promoter and the Authority must be distinguished from the contractual and statutory rights accruing to an allottee under the Act.

40. As already held by this Authority in Complaint No. 453 of 2025, an extension of registration under Section 6 cannot, merely by virtue of its grant, operate to postpone the rights of an allottee or extinguish the consequences arising from the promoter's failure to honour its committed date of possession. The promoter cannot seek to rely upon an extension obtained from the Authority as a matter of regulatory compliance to defeat or dilute the statutory entitlement of an allottee under Section 18 of the Act.

41. In the present case, the Sale Deed does not prescribe any independent specific date of possession, and the Complainant acquired the subject flat only in December 2023. Having regard to the date declared in Form B, the specific commitment made by Respondent No. 1 in its communication to the customers, and the circumstances discussed hereinabove, this Authority adopts 07.02.2025 as the date by which possession ought to have been delivered to the Complainant. The subsequent extension of registration up to 07.02.2026 does not alter this determination.

42. Having determined the date of possession, the question that remains is the Complainant's entitlement to interest for the period of delay. The record establishes that the Complainant paid the entire sale consideration by 21.12.2023 and elected to continue in the project rather than withdraw. The Complainant is therefore entitled to invoke the proviso to Section 18(1) of the Act, which entitles an allottee who does not intend to withdraw from the project to receive interest for every month of delay until the handing over of possession at the prescribed rate.

43. Respondent No. 1 cannot avoid this statutory liability by contending that the sale consideration was received by the landowner or through the landowner's side. The question of

who received or acknowledged the sale consideration under the Sale Deed is distinct from the question of who was contractually and actually responsible for completing the project and delivering the subject flat. As already discussed while considering Point No. 3, the responsibility for development, execution and completion of the project was placed upon Respondent No. 1 under the DAGPA. The present case is not one in which the Developer has completed construction, handed over the completed units to the landowner, and the subsequent delay in delivery is attributable solely to the landowner. On the contrary, the material on record establishes that the project itself has not been completed within the committed timeline by the registered project promoter, and that the obligation to complete the construction continues to rest with Respondent No. 1 under the provisions of the Act.

44. In view of the foregoing discussion, this Authority holds that Respondent No. 1 has failed to establish any legally sustainable ground to absolve itself of the delay in completion and delivery of the subject flat. The Complainant, having paid the entire sale consideration and elected to remain in the project, is entitled to interest under the proviso to Section 18(1) of the Act, at the rate prescribed under Rule 15 of the Telangana State Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Rules, 2017, from 07.02.2025 until the actual handing over of possession of the subject flat in accordance with law.

45. Accordingly, Respondent No. 1 is liable to pay interest for the aforesaid period of delay at the prescribed rate under Rule 15 of the Rules.

G. Directions of the Authority:

46. In view of the findings and observations recorded hereinabove, this Authority proceeds to issue the following directions as per the powers vested under Section 37 of the RE(R&D) Act, 2016:

a) The preliminary objection raised by the Respondent regarding the maintainability of the Complaint on account of the Dispute Resolution clause and arbitration clause stands rejected. The Complaint is maintainable before this Authority.
b) Respondent No.1 is held liable for failure to hand over possession of the subject flat to the Complainant before 07.05.2025.
c) Respondent No. 1, being the promoter responsible for the delay in development, construction and completion of the registered project, shall pay 10.85% interest to the Complainant under the proviso to Section 18(1) of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016 read with Rule 15 of the Telangana State Real Estate

(Regulation and Development) Rules, 2017, on the Rs. 49,50,000/- paid by the Complainant, with effect from 07.02.2025 until the actual handing over of possession of the subject flat in accordance with law.

d) Respondent No.1 shall pay the arrears accrued up to the date of this Order within sixty (60) days, and shall thereafter continue to pay the accruing interest on a monthly basis, on or before the 10th day of each succeeding month, until actual possession is delivered.

e) Respondent No. 1 shall ensure completion of all pending construction and allied works pertaining to the subject flat and shall hand over lawful and peaceful possession thereof to the Complainant

f) Respondent Nos. 2 and 3, being the landowner and his AGPA Holder respectively, shall extend all necessary cooperation to the Complainant and Respondent No. 1 for facilitating the delivery of possession and completion of the formalities relating to the subject flat. They shall ensure that no act or omission on their part obstructs or prejudices the Complainant's rights arising out of the registered Sale Deed, including his right to peaceful possession and enjoyment of the subject property.

47. Failure to comply with the above directions by the Respondents shall attract penalty in accordance with Section 63 of the RE(R&D) Act, 2016.

48. As a result, the Complaint is disposed of accordingly. No order as to costs.

TG RERA
TELANGANA REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY

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

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