

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

**Complaint No. 150 of 2024**

**Dated: 23<sup>rd</sup> June 2025**

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

**Anuj Raj**

*(R/o H.no.7-1.212, Shiv bagh, Ameerpet, Hyderabad)*

**...Complainant**

**Versus**

**1. Chilkamari Sateesh**

*(R/o Flat no.101, Chandra Towers, Veerabhadra Nagar, Sangareddy Town - 502001 )*

**2. Badralolu Madhusudhan Reddy**

*(R/o H.no.1-49, Pochamma Basti, Patancheru, Sangareddy Town 502001)*

**3. Rudraram Kiran Goud**

*(R/o H,no2-1-140, Bhavani Nagar, Sangareddy Town- 502001*

**4. HMDA**

*(Rep by Metropolitian Commissioner, Swarna Jayathi Complex Ameerpet, Hyderabad -16)*

**5. The District Registrar & Joint Sub registrar**

*(Sangareddy, Kani – 502285, Sangareddy District)*

**...Respondent(s)**

The present matter filed by the Complainant herein came up for hearing on 05.02.2025 before this Authority in presence of Complainant and his Counsel Sri Rakesh Sanghi and Respondents 1- 3, Counsel S.Satyanaryana Reddy; upon pursuing the material on record and on hearing arguments of the both the parties and having stood over for consideration till this day, the following order is passed:

**ORDER**

2. The present Complaint has been filed by the Complainant under Section 31 of the Real Estate (Regulation & 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”) seeking appropriate relief(s) against the Respondents.

**A. The brief facts of the case, as stated by the Complainant, are as follows:**

3. The present Complaint pertains to the project registered as “Avinya Avenues” under RERA Registration No. P01100008518, over land admeasuring 5 Acres and 29 Guntas situated in Survey No. 564 (sub-divided into 564/1 to 564/5) of Mamidipally Village, Kandi Mandal, Sangareddy District.

4. The Complainant has submitted that one Shri Shivraj Bahadur, a nobleman of the erstwhile Hyderabad State, was the recorded *Pattedar*, *Khatedar* and possessor of the entire suit scheduled land as per revenue entries in the *Shetwar*, *Khasra Pahanis (1954-55)*, and subsequent revenue documents till the year 1991.

5. It is alleged by the Complainant that the name of Late Shri Shivraj Bahadur was clandestinely and illegally deleted from the revenue records in or around 1991, and in his place, the name of Late Shri C. Malla Reddy (father of Respondent No. 1) was unlawfully inserted. The said mutation was challenged by other legal heirs of the original recorded landowner

6. The Complainant has brought on record that the Joint Collector, Medak District, in proceedings under the A.P. Rights in Land and Pattedar Pass Book Act, 1971, passed orders dated 29.03.2005 and 30.01.2006, confirming that Late Shri Shivraj Bahadur held valid title over the suit land and that Late Shri C. Malla Reddy had no lawful claim

7. It is further stated that the above orders were challenged by Late C. Malla Reddy in W.P. No. 9167/2006, and later, after Patta Pass Books were issued to legal heirs of the Bahadur family, another Writ Petition bearing W.P. No. 11117/2009 was also filed. Both Petitions were disposed of by the Hon’ble High Court of A.P. vide common order dated 31.03.2011, holding that issues of title and rival ownership claims are beyond the scope of revenue authorities and must be adjudicated by Civil Courts under the A.P. Civil Courts Act, 1972.

8. Relying on the judgment of the Privy Council (AIR 1926 PC 100) and the judgment of the Hon’ble Supreme Court in *Mahila Bajrangi v. Badribai*, (2003) 2 SCC 464, the Complainant asserts that the name of one family member being entered in the revenue record does not extinguish the legal rights of other co-owners not named therein.

9. The Complainant alleges that despite the High Court's orders, Late Shri C. Malla Reddy managed to re-insert his name into the revenue records post-2011 without due process or notice to the lawful Khatedars, i.e., the Bahadur family.

10. It is further stated that after the demise of Late Malla Reddy, his legal heirs including Respondent No. 1 obtained succession and revenue entries fraudulently, and a Sale Deed dated 17.12.2022 (Document No. 2730/2022) was executed by his widow, Smt. Lakshmi, in favour of Respondent No. 1, claiming fictitious consideration of ₹60,34,965/- allegedly paid in cash.

11. Aggrieved thereby, the Complainant and other family members filed O.S. No. 114/2024 before the Hon'ble Senior Civil Judge, Sangareddy, seeking declaration of title, cancellation of the impugned sale deed and development agreement cum GPA, and recovery of possession.

12. It is further submitted that despite pendency of the civil suit, Respondents No. 1 to 3 obtained a Draft Layout Approval bearing Permit No. 000020/LO/P1g/HMDA/2024 dated 31.05.2024, and thereafter secured RERA Registration for "Avinya Avenues" on 22.07.2024.

13. The Hon'ble High Court of A.P., vide common order dated 31.03.2011, disposed both Writ Petitions, holding that the contentious issues relating to title and ownership cannot be decided by revenue authorities and advised the parties to approach Civil Courts under the Andhra Pradesh Civil Courts Act, 1972.

14. The Complainant alleges that Respondents 1 to 3 (Promoters) are in violation of the RERA Act and have committed the following breaches that are Suppression of material facts and non-disclosure of High Court orders in violation of Section 4(2)(1)(A) & (B); Failure to deposit 70% of funds collected from plot purchasers in a dedicated account, in violation of Section 4(2)(1)(D); Non-maintenance of books of account as mandated under Section 44; Execution of sale deeds without registration of sale agreements, in contravention of Section 13; Failure to update quarterly disclosures under Section 11; Non-obtainment of project insurance and title insurance, violating Section 16; Sale of plots within tentative draft layout even before obtaining final layout and payment of applicable license fees.

15. The Complainant submits that neither Late Malla Reddy nor his legal heirs have any document or lawful title to support their claims, other than stray revenue entries that do not have evidentiary value. It is settled law that revenue entries do not confer title, especially when not supported by Shetwar or Khasra Pahanie records.

16. The Complainant has further submitted that a representation dated 15.07.2024 was also submitted to HMDA (Respondent No. 4), pointing out the illegalities in layout approval and registration of the project.

**B. Reliefs Sought:**

17. Based on the facts submitted, evidence on record, and the findings given thereon by us as discussed herein above, this Authority holds that the complainant is entitled to the relief as prayed by her, and the same is allowed in her favour, and the Respondents are hereby directed as follows:

- a. That this Hon'ble Authority may be pleased to pass an Order directing the Respondents 1st, 2nd and 3rd (Promoters) to disclose the Orders of the Hon'ble High Court passed in Writ Petition No. 9167 of 2006 and W.P. No. 11117 of 2009, both dated 31.03.2011, in respect of the scheduled land on the Project details displayed on the website of the Authority.
- b. That this Hon'ble Authority may be pleased to pass an Order directing the 1st, 2nd and 3rd Respondents (Promoters) to disclose the pendency of the Civil Suit bearing O.S. No. 114 of 2024, pending adjudication on the file of the Hon'ble Senior Civil Judge, Sangareddy, in respect of the scheduled land.
- c. That this Hon'ble Authority may be pleased to revoke the RERA Registration of the project of the 1st, 2nd and 3rd Respondents (Promoters), direct cancellation of the illegal sale deeds executed by them in respect of the plots within the tentative draft layout, and further direct refund of the sale consideration collected from each of the victimised purchasers.
- d. That this Hon'ble Authority may be pleased to direct revocation of the Tentative / Draft Layout bearing Permit No. 000020/LO/P1g/HMDA/2024 dated 31.05.2024, issued by HMDA to the 1st, 2nd and 3rd Respondents.

**C. Respondent 1-3 Reply:**

18. It is denied that these complainants are the successors of Raj Shivaraj Bahadur. These respondents are not aware that Shivaraj Bahadur was a noble person. It is denied that Raja

Shivaraj Bahadur was the pattedar, possessor of agricultural land in Sy No. 564 (Sub-divided as 564/1, 564/2, 564/3, 564/4 & 564/5) of Mamidipally (V), Kandi (M), Sangareddy District total admeasuring Ac. 5.29 Gts. The matter of fact that Shivaraj Bahadur was not holding any land in Mamidipally (V) of Kandi (M), Sangareddy District as alleged by the complainants. These respondents are denied that these complainants belong to Raja Manohar Raj Branch of Legal heirs of Raja Shivaraj Bahadur. It is also denied that these complainants are the co- owners of the entire scheduled land along with other family members. The real facts will be mentioned in the subsequent paras.

19. It is denied that as per the Sesala Pahani the name of the Raja Shivaraj Bahadur is recorded as pattedar and khatedar. The matter of fact that one Sri Siddiramappa was the possessor of the land in the Sy No. 564 admeasuring Ac. 6.19 Gts in Mamidipally (V), Sangareddy (M) now Kandi (M), Sangareddy District. Thereal facts will be mentioned in the subsequent paras.

20. It is denied that the revenue authorities illegally deleted the name of the pattedars in the revenue records towards the suit scheduled land in 1991 and interpolated the name of Sri Malla Reddy and the said illegal mutation was challenged by some of the other legal heirs of Late Raja Shivraj Bahadur belonging to the Mahboob Karan Branch falsely claimed to be the only legal heirs of Late Raja Shivraj Bahadur. It is true late Raj Shivaraj Bahadur legal heirs has filed revision petition case No. F3/9579/99-F3/1/ROR/2000 before the Joint Collector, Medak District at Sangareddy under the A.P Rights in Land and Pattedar Pass Book Act, 1971 and the Joint Collector ultimately passed two(2) Orders Dated 29.03.2005 and 30.01.2006 confirming the paramount title of Late Shivaraj Bahadur to an extent of AC. 5.29 Gts in land bearing revenue survey No. 564 of Mamidipally (v) by concluding that late Malla Reddy did not have any right over the scheduled land and both the orders were merged into one order.

21. That late Malla Reddy challenged the aforesaid Orders dated 29.03.2005 and 30.01.2006 by having preferred a Writ Petition No. 9176/2006 on the file of the Hon'ble A.P High Court, matter of fact that the Hon'ble High Court was pleased to pass the judgement in favour of Late Malla Reddy.

22. That some of the legal heirs of late Raja Shivaraja Bahadur, the branch of Mahub Karan branch applied for issuance of Patta Passbook of suit scheduled land by Tahsildar, Sangareddy Mandal vide order proceeding No. D/10885/2008 aggrieved by the order passed by

the Tahsildar Sangareddy Sri Late Malla Reddy filed Writ petition vide Writ No. 11117/2009 before the Hon'ble High Court.

23. These Respondents are not aware of benefit of the orders dated 29-03-2005 and 30-01-2006 and 06-10-2008 would also ensure to the benefits of all the family members i.e., legal heirs and successor of the late Raja Shiv Raj Bahadur including the complainants herein as per the ratio of the Judgement reported in AIR 1926 Privy Council at Page No. 100 (Confirmed and approved in the Mahila Bajrangi Case reported in 2003 (2) SCC at Page No. 464) wherein, their Lordships held that the reflection of the name of any one family member in the revenue records does not extinguish the right, title and interest of the other family members whose names are not reflected in the revenue records. The matter of fact that, the said ruling is no way concerned with the suit scheduled property if any the Complainant may put strict proof of the same.

24. The Hon'ble High Court was pleased to passed an order in Writ Petition 9167 of 2006 and WP No. 11117 of 2009 order dated 31-03-2011 where in learned judge held that contentions issued, issues of fact and law regarding to rival claims of title and ownership etc., cannot be adjudicated by the revenue authorities and both parties was advised to invoke the Jurisdiction of Civil Court under Civil Court act by filing declaratory and consequential relief suits.

25. The matter of fact that as per the directions of the Hon'ble high court Sri Late Malla Reddy filed suit for Deceleration of title before the Hon'ble Senior Civil Judge at Sangareddy praying the Hon'ble court to declare the said Sri Malla Reddy as the owner of the scheduled land. The Hon'ble Senior Civil Judge Sangareddy was pleased to verify the records and declared the Sri Malla Reddy as an owner of the suit scheduled property.

26. It is true that Respondent No.1 is the legal heir of Late. Malla Reddy. The matter of fact is that the said Sri. Malla Reddy purchased the schedule property through unregistered sale deed and same is validated and the Tahasildar, Sangareddy issued 13 (B) certificate in favour of Malla Reddy vide Proc. No. ERBROR/700/89 dated 14-03-1991 and the revenue authorities collected the stamp duty for an amount of Rs. 1100/- and the Tahasildar issued ROR the suit schedule property along with other survey numbers 562/1 adm. Ac. 5-24 Gts., 563 adm. Ac. 10-23 Gts., 564 adm. Ac. 6-00 Gts., total adm. Ac. 22-07 Gts., and entered the name of Sri. Malla Reddy in the revenue records as an owner, possessor and Pattedar and issued passbooks in the

name of Sri. Malla Reddy. Except the ruling shown in the para and remaining para is false and fabricated for the purpose of the case.

27. The matter of fact that Sri. Malla Reddy died, after demise of Malla Reddy his wife namely Lakshmi name was entered into revenue records and issued pattedar passbooks. Smt. Lakshmi executed registered sale deed in favour of 1st Respondent herein with other legal heirs of late Sri. Malla Reddy which is a genuine document not as alleged by the petitioner.

Reply to Para No. 10 of the Complainant, it is true that the Petitioner along with other family members filed a suit vide OS NO 144 of 2024 on the file of Senior Civil Judge Sangareddy with false and baseless allegation.

28. The entire para is true, the first to third respondents applied and obtained layout approval vide permit No. 000020/LO/PLG/HMDA/2024 dated 31-05-2024 for formation of layout in the scheduled land and also obtained RERA registration vide registration No. PO1100008518 by name and style of Avinaya Avenue.

29. The respondents have followed the rules and regulations of RERA act and obtained necessary permissions without violating any rules.

30. As a matter of fact, the said Malla Reddy is having valid title over the scheduled land, and he purchased scheduled land from its earlier owner and the revenue authorities enter the name Sri. Malla Reddy as processor and pattedar of scheduled land and these respondents are not violated any rules.

31. These respondents did not violate any rules and regulations of RERA Registration. This false complaint was lodged to gain money from these respondents.

32. These respondents submit that originally, one Siddi Ramappa is the owner of Sy.No.564 admeasuring Ac.6.19 Gts., of land in Mamidipally (V), Kandi (M), Sanga Reddy District. He got title to the said property by way of Adverse Possession. He sold the said land on 15-03-1974 in favour of N.Manik Reddy. He in turn sold the said property in favour of C.Malla Reddy in the year 1974 through an Un-Registered Sale Deed. C.Malla Reddy applied for Regularisation of the Un-Registered SaleDeed in the Provisions of the ROR Act. The MRO by his Proceedings dated 14-03-1991 issued proceedings regularizing the Unregistered Sale under Section 5-A of the ROR Act, and he was issued the Pattedar Passbook and Title Deed Book, and his name was carried in the Revenue Records as possessor and pattedar.

33. These respondents submit that, One Sri.Raja Iqbal Karan and others claiming to be the Legal Heirs of Late Raja Shivaraj Bahadur filed O.S.No.45 of 2009 on the file of the Principal Junior Civil Judge Court, Sanga Reddy against some third parties seeking the relief of Perpetual Injunction in respect of Sy.No.564 of Mamidipally Village. In the said Suit, the father of the Respondent No. 1, Late Sri C.Malla Reddy got impleaded as Respondent No.3. The said Suit was dismissed for default on 10-07-2015 and it became final.

34. These respondents submit that, challenging the Order of Regularization Proceedings, dated 14-03-1991, the Mosque Committee of Mamidipally Village and Raja Iqbal Karan and others filed Appeal before the R.D.O. Sanga Reddy. The R.D.O. allowed the Appeal by setting aside the Proceedings dated 14-03-1991. Challenging the same, Sri.C.Malla Reddy filed revision before the Joint Collector, Medak district at Sangareddy. However, the Revision was dismissed. Challenging the Revision Orders, Sri. C.Malla Reddy filed W.P.No.9167 of 2006 and W.P.No.11117/2009 in the Hon'ble High Court. The Hon'ble High Court by its Order dated 31-03-2011 disposed of both the Writ Petitions granting liberty to the parties to get their title declared by the Competent Civil Court and further set-aside the Mutation Proceedings dated 06-10-2008 of the M.R.O. Sanga Reddy granted in Raja Iqbal Karan and others.

35. These respondents submits that the Tahsildar issued the Proceedings dated 15-09-2012 with a direction to the Revenue Authorities to mutate the name of Sri.C.Malla Reddy in the revenue records. When Raja Iqbal Karan and others including Manju Agarwal are trying to interfere with the possession of the C.Malla Reddy, he was forced to file O.S.No.150/2016 on the file of the Court of the Senior Civil Judge, Sanga Reddy for declaration of his title and for Permanent Injunction as per the Orders passed in the above Writ Petitions. The said Suit was decreed on 25-10-2018. In the said Suit the complainants specifically pleaded that one Raja Shivaraj Bahadur died issueless and Raja Iqbal Karan and others are not his legal heirs at all. Moreover, Raja Shiva Raj Bahadur is not having any Jagir lands in Mamidipally Village, Kandi mandal, Sanga Reddy District and his name was wrongly mentioned in some old pahanis. In view of the Declaration of Title by the Civil Court, the Sale Deeds set-up by Smt.Manju Agarwal became void and not binding on Sri.C.Malla Reddy. Apart from that Smt. Manju Agarwal earlier instituted O.S.No.166/2013 seeking the relief of Perpetual Injunction against Sri. C.Malla Reddy in respect of Sy. No.564. The said Suit was also dismissed for Default. The complainants are pleaded in their pleadings stating that, Sri.C.Malla Reddy has not filed any Suit for declaration as per the orders of the writ petition.

36. The matter of fact that C. Malla Reddy filed for suit for declaration over the suit scheduled property before this Hon'ble court vide O.S. No. 150/2016 and the said suit was pleased to decree the same. The complainants or their ancestors are not claimed at any point of time for the last 60 years nor claimed any right over the property in question. The complainant's name is not reflected in the Revenue Records at any point of time. Apart from that Raja Iqbal Karan and others allegedly said to have sold the above property in favour of Smt. Manjula Agarwal way back in the year 2007 and 2009. The complainants are not challenged the said Sale Deeds. Only with a greed to knock away the valuable property they have been set-up by somebody.

37. These respondents submit that, Sri.C.Malla Reddy died in the year 2021 and his properties are mutated in the name of his wife Smt. C.Lakshmi herein who is mother of Respondent No. 1. She was also issued Pattedar Passbook and Title Deed Book. Subsequently, the legal heirs of C. Malla Reddy executed a Registered Sale Deed dated 17-12-2022 in favour of the Respondent No. 1 who is son of C.Malla Reddy in respect of Sy. Nos. 563 (Ac.1.07Gts) and Sy.No.564 (Ac.5.29 Gts) total admeasuring Ac.6.36Gts.

38. These respondents submit that, in spite of Smt. Manju Agarwal who suffered a Decree of Declaration of Title in O.S.No.150/2016 and who lost Injunction Suit in O.S.No.166/2013 and her Vendors who filed O.S.No.45 of 2009 for Injunction which has been dismissed for default, Manju Agarwal filed application to mutate her name in the Revenue Records which has been rightly rejected by the revenue authorities.

39. The Respondent No. 1 submitted his objections to the Tahsildar. Kandi Mandal, Sanga Reddy District on the application filed by Smt. Manju Agarwal. As per the Orders of the Nazim Athiyat dated 20-01-1958, late Raja Shivaraj Bahadur has no lands in Mamidipally Village, Kandi Mandal, Sanga Reddy District.

40. These respondents submit that the Respondents No. 1 is lawfully possessors in the suit scheduled property, C. Malla Reddy dies leaving behind his legal heirs are executed register sale deed in favour of Respondent No. 1 herein. Accordingly, the Respondent No. 1 executed DGPA and accordingly, he made an application before the HMDA for layout approval. Accordingly, HMDA granted LP number in respect of the scheduled land.

41. These respondents submit that, the complainants are published a public notice by threatening these respondents with unparliamentarily language and further alleged that these

respondents are land grabbers etc. The said publication is issued only to grab the money from these respondents.

42. The complainants are not the legal heirs of Raja Shivraj Bahadur, and he dies issueless. The said Raja Shivraj Bahadur have no lands in the Mamidipally (V) of Kandi (M) as such the complaint is not maintainable. Hence the complaint is liable to be dismissed.

43. The complainant filed present complaint to grab the hard-earned money from these respondents and this respondent is in legally possession without any violation, they made the application before the concerned authorities for layout approval. After thorough verification only, the HMDA. granted layout permission as such the Respondent No. 1 to 3 converted the land from agriculture to non-agriculture as such these respondents are lawfully entitled to continue the layout permission. Hence the petition may be dismissed.

44. It is submitted that the complainants are not having any prima facie case to continue the present complaint as such the complaint may be dismissed.

45. Therefore, it is prayed that this Hon'ble authority may be pleased to dismiss the complaint with exemplary cost in the interest of justice and equity.

**Observations of the Authority:**

46. The crux of the present complaint is that the Respondent 1-3 failed to disclose the existence of pending litigation concerning the title of the subject land at the time of seeking registration of the project with this Authority. The Complainant has brought on record that a civil suit bearing O.S. No. 114 of 2024 was filed before the Court of the Senior Civil Judge, Sangareddy, on 24.07.2024, by the Complainant along with other family members, asserting ownership and title over the land forming part of the Respondent's 1-3 project. It is also evident from the record that the Respondents 1-3 made an application for project registration under RERA on 22.07.2024, thereby suppressing the fact of imminent litigation that directly affects the title of the project land.

47. It is also submitted that multiple litigations are pending with regard to the title and ownership of the land on which the project is proposed. While the Respondents 1- 3 claims to have entered into a Development Agreement with the lawful heirs of the original landowners and proceeded to apply for layout approval before HMDA, the Complainants have questioned the legitimacy of such arrangements and claimed ownership themselves.

48. From the available record, this Authority finds it established that a civil suit (O.S. No. 114 of 2024) is indeed pending in the competent Civil Court, wherein the Complainants assert proprietary rights over the subject property.

49. Under Section 4(2)(b) and Section 4(2)(l)(B) of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016, every promoter is under a mandatory obligation to disclose details of any litigation pending or otherwise pertaining to the land title or the project, on the RERA registration webpage. The legislative intent underlying Section 4 is to provide a platform of complete transparency and accountability, ensuring that homebuyers and allottees are made aware of any encumbrances or disputes that may affect their rights.

50. It is immaterial whether the litigation was initiated prior to, or after, the grant of registration under RERA. The obligation to disclose continues throughout the lifecycle of the project, and non-disclosure of subsequent litigation constitutes suppression of material facts, thereby defeating the very objective of the RE(R&D) Act.

51. This Authority rejects the Respondent's 1-3 implicit justification that the litigation was either unfounded or unnecessary to disclose. It is not for the promoter to decide whether a dispute is genuine or frivolous once litigation is initiated, the obligation to disclose arises, irrespective of the promoter's subjective opinion or anticipated outcome of the case.

52. The Respondents 1-3 are further required under the Rules and conditions of registration to file Quarterly Progress Reports (QPRs), and include therein any updates or developments pertaining to title, statutory approvals, or legal disputes. The facts now disclosed through this complaint clearly show that the Respondents 1-3 had no intention of disclosing the pendency of litigation, and such concealment could have severely prejudiced the rights of potential and existing allottees.

53. While the Complainant has sought revocation of the registration, this Authority, at this stage, refrains from invoking such drastic action in the interest of existing allottees, who may have purchased units in good faith. However, this shall not preclude the Authority from initiating appropriate action under Section 7 of the Act in the future, if violations persist or if there is further suppression of material facts.

54. The Respondents 1-3 are directed to immediately notify all existing allottees, through individual written communication, informing them of the pendency of the above-mentioned

litigation. Such communication must include the case number, court details, and a summary of the dispute.

**Directions of the Authority:**

55. Based on the facts submitted, evidence on record, and the findings given thereon by us as discussed herein above, the Respondents 1-3 are hereby directed as follows:

- a. The Respondents No. 1 to 3 are directed to upload the complete details of the pending litigation in O.S. No. 114 of 2024 on the RERA project webpage bearing RERA Registration No. P01100008518, within seven (7) days from the date of this Order, without fail.
- b. The Respondents 1-3 are further directed to immediately notify all existing allottees, through individual written communication, of the pendency of the said litigation. The communication must include the case number, court in which the suit is pending, and a summary of the subject matter of the litigation.
- c. A compliance report, enclosing copies of all such communications issued to the allottees, shall be filed before the Secretary, Telangana RERA, within 45 (forty-five) days from the date of this Order.

56. Failure to comply with these directions shall attract stringent action under the provisions of the Act, including possible initiation of proceedings for penalty and/or abeyance/revocation of registration under Sections 7 and 63 of the RE(R&D) Act, 2016.

**Sd-**

**Sri. K. Srinivasa Rao,  
Hon'ble Member  
TG RERA**

**Sd-**

**Sri. Laxmi NaryanaJannu,  
Hon'ble Member  
TG RERA**

**Sd-**

**Dr. N. Satyanarayana, IAS (Retd.),  
Hon'ble Chairperson  
TG RERA**