

**BEFORE TELANGANA REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY**

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

**Date: 17<sup>th</sup> October, 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. 313/2024/TGRERA**

1. Smt. Bhattar Madhavalatha  
2. Mr. Pradeep Bhattar  
*H.No: 2-3-685/5 & 5/1, Flat 103, Sheela apts,  
Venkateswara Nagar, Amberpet, Hyderabad-500013.*

**...Complainants**

**Versus**

1. Bhuvanteza Infra Projects Pvt Ltd,  
#201, 2nd floor, Lumbini Amruta Chambers,  
Nagarjuna circle, Rd:3,  
Banjara Hills, Hyderabad-500082  
2. Mr. Jerripothula Phane Bhushana Rao,  
Flat # 301, SR Mansion Apartments, Road No. 70,  
Plot 75, HUDA Enclave, Aswini Layout,  
Prashasan Nagar, Jubilee Hills,  
Hyderabad, Telangana- 500096.

3. Mr.Chekka Venkata Subramanya,  
Flat C-110, Jayabheri orange county, Road; 2,  
Financial district, Nanakramguda,  
Telangana- 500032.

4. Mrs. Bhagya Lakshmi Chekka,  
Flat C-110, Jayabheri orange county, Road; 2,  
Financial district, Nanakramguda,  
Telangana-500032.

5.Mr. Jerripothula Raj Kumar,  
Flat # 301, SR Mansion Apartments, Road No. 70,  
Plot 75, HUDA Enclave, Aswini Layout,  
Prashasan Nagar, Jubilee Hills,  
Hyderabad, Telangana- 500096.

**...Respondents**

The present matter filed by the Complainant herein came up for hearing on 11.07.2025 before this Authority, none appeared for Complainant and the Respondents, further this Authority passes the following **ORDER**:

2. This Complaint has been filed under Section 31 of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016 (hereinafter referred to as the “RE(R&D) Act” read with Rule 34(1) of the Telangana Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Rules, 2017 (hereinafter referred to as the “Rules”) seeking directions from this Authority to take action against the Respondents.

3. When the matter was taken up for hearing on 04.02.2025, the Complainant appeared and the Respondents were absent. The Complainants were directed to effect personal service of notice upon the Respondents. The matter was next listed on 11.03.2025, on which date the Complainants, appearing online, submitted that they had served notice upon Respondents No. 3 and 4. It was further stated that the remaining Respondents, namely No. 1, 2, and 5, had either refused to accept the notice or were not found at the given addresses. It is pertinent to note that no proof of service was filed by the Complainants on the said date.

4. The matter was subsequently listed on 09.04.2025, on which date none appeared for either of the parties. In view of the non-representation, the hearing was adjourned, and directions were issued for fresh notice to be served upon all parties. Thereafter, the Complaint was again listed on 10.06.2025. On this subsequent date as well, there was no representation from either side. The record indicates that no written submissions were filed, nor was any explanation furnished to this Authority for the continued non-appearance.

5. As a matter of due process, this Authority granted a final opportunity and again directed issuance of fresh notices to both parties.

6. The matter was finally posted for hearing on 11.07.2025. On the said date also, there was no appearance from the complainant or any of the respondents. The records reveal that notice issued to the complainant was served. However, notices addressed to the respondents were returned unserved.

7. Despite being aware of the scheduled hearings and having been served with notice, the complainant has consistently failed to appear before this Authority or to take any steps toward prosecuting the matter. The repeated non-appearance, without explanation, despite being afforded multiple opportunities, indicates a clear lack of interest and diligence on the part of the complainant.

8. In view of the above factual circumstances and in the interest of judicial discipline and fairness, this Authority is of the considered opinion that adequate and reasonable opportunities have already been extended to the complainant. No further purpose will be served by keeping the matter pending indefinitely.

9. Accordingly, the complaint is dismissed for non-prosecution.

**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**

