

BEFORE TELANGANA REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY

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

SUO MOTU CASE NO. 1139/2025

Date: 21st February 2026

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

M/s Godrej Properties Limited,
Rep. by its Authorized Signatory, Shraddha Krishnan
6th Floor, Navayuga Vizva, Gachibowli,
Hyderabad, RR District, Telangana - 500032.

...PROMOTER/ RESPONDENT

ORDER

The present Suo motu proceedings have been initiated by the Telangana Real Estate Regulatory Authority (hereinafter referred to as “the Authority”), in exercise of powers conferred under Section 35(1) of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016 (hereinafter “RE(R&D) Act, 2016”), upon receiving information regarding unauthorized advertisements, promotional representations and marketing activities being circulated across online platforms in the name of a purported real estate project titled “Crown Jewel, Rajendranagar, Hyderabad”. The said advertisements projected an association with the brand identity and trademarks of M/s Godrej Properties Limited, hereinafter referred to as “the Respondent”, without the said project having obtained mandatory registration under the provisions of the RE(R&D) Act, 2016.

2. The material placed before this Authority indicated that multiple websites and digital property portals were displaying listings, brochures and promotional material for the alleged project “Crown Jewel, Rajendranagar, Hyderabad”, using the Respondent’s brand name, logo and goodwill in a manner that suggested official endorsement. These advertisements did not contain any TG RERA registration number, nor did they disclose any details of sanctioned plans, approvals or statutory compliances.

3. Accordingly, this Authority, in exercising of powers conferred under Section 35(1) of the RE(R&D) Act, 2016, issued Show Cause Notice No.1139/2025 dated 09.05.2025 to Respondent, directing them to submit an explanation within seven days from the date of receipt of the notice,

as to why this Authority should not impose a penalty under Sections 59 and 60 of the RE(R&D) Act, 2016 for contravening Sections 3(1) and 4(1) of the RE(R&D) Act, 2016 by not registering the project.

4. In response to the Show Cause Notice, the Respondent, M/s Godrej Properties Limited, submitted its reply dated 03.09.2025, submitting that it has neither launched nor proposed to launch any real estate project under the name and style of “Crown Jewel, Rajendranagar, Hyderabad”. The Respondent submitted that the only project undertaken by it in the Rajendranagar area is “Godrej Regal Pavilion”, which is duly registered with this Authority bearing TGRERA Registration No. P02400009910, and that all activities relating to advertisement, marketing, booking, or sale were commenced only after the grant of registration, strictly in compliance with Sections 3(1) and 4(1) of the RE(R&D) Act, 2016.

5. The Respondent submitted that it has not authorised, either directly or indirectly, any advertisement, marketing, or promotional activity in relation to any project under the name “Crown Jewel, Rajendranagar, Hyderabad”. It was submitted that the alleged advertisements were carried out by unauthorised third-party websites and entities, without the knowledge, consent, or approval of the Respondent. The Respondent also submitted that all its official communications and project information are disseminated exclusively through its official website, and that it has consistently advised the public not to rely upon any third-party platforms claiming to market its projects.

6. The Respondent submitted that it has been facing repeated instances of trademark and copyright infringement by certain malicious websites impersonating its brand and misleading the public. It was submitted that, in order to curb such unauthorised activities, the Respondent had instituted Civil Suit (Commercial) No. 154 of 2021 before the Hon’ble Delhi High Court, seeking various reliefs, including injunctions, damages, and directions against infringing domain names. The Respondent submitted that the Hon’ble Court, during the period between 2021 and 2022, passed multiple injunction orders restraining the operation of such infringing websites and also directed the domain name registrar, namely GoDaddy, to disclose the details of domain registrants and to explain the continued operation of certain infringing domains. The Respondent submitted that the aforesaid actions clearly demonstrate its consistent and proactive approach in safeguarding the integrity of its brand as well as the interests of consumers, by initiating timely legal proceedings

against unauthorised and misleading online platforms and by taking remedial steps to prevent misuse of its name in the real estate market.

7. The Respondent submitted that, upon becoming aware of the misuse of its brand name and unauthorised marketing activities, it acted promptly and responsibly by issuing public notices in leading newspapers cautioning the general public against such misleading advertisements and by issuing cease-and-desist notices to the owners of the infringing domain names. The Respondent further submitted that it has taken civil and legal action against such infringing websites to protect the interests of consumers and to prevent any confusion or misrepresentation in the market.

8. The Respondent also submitted that the Respondent has at all times acted in good faith, maintained strict compliance with the provisions of the RE(R&D) Act, 2016. The Respondent further submitted that, without prejudice to its rights and contentions, it is willing to cooperate with this Authority and furnish any further information as may be required.

OBSERVATIONS OF THIS AUTHORITY:

9. Upon perusal of the material placed on record, including the written reply dated 03.09.2025 submitted by the Respondent, the documents annexed thereto, and the judicial orders passed by the Hon'ble Delhi High Court in relation to infringement of the Respondent's brand, this Authority has examined the facts and circumstances of the present case. The Respondent has placed on record that it issued public notices in widely circulated newspapers cautioning prospective purchasers against engaging with unauthorised advertisements, issued cease-and-desist notices to the owners of infringing domain names, and pursued civil remedies before the Hon'ble Delhi High Court to restrain the continued misuse of its trademarks and goodwill. These actions demonstrate due diligence on the part of the Respondent and reflect a bona fide effort to protect consumer interest and prevent the perpetuation of misleading representations in the real estate market.

10. This Authority also takes note of the submission that the alleged project "Crown Jewel, Rajendranagar, Hyderabad" has not been launched by the Respondent and that no bona fide booking, allotment, sale, or solicitation of purchasers has been undertaken by the Respondent in respect of the said project. The material on record further establishes that the only project undertaken by the Respondent in the Rajendranagar area is "Godrej Regal Pavilion", which stands

duly registered with this Authority bearing TGRERA Registration No. P02400009910, and that all advertisements, marketing activities, and transactional dealings relating to the said project were commenced strictly after the grant of registration, in conformity with Sections 3(1) and 4(1) of the RE(R&D) Act, 2016.

11. The Authority observes that the alleged violation has arisen solely on account of the unauthorised and misleading acts of third-party entities, acting beyond the control and authority of the Respondent. Upon becoming aware of such acts, the Respondent has taken corrective, remedial, and preventive measures in a reasonable and prompt manner and has extended full cooperation to this Authority. The conduct of the Respondent, viewed in its entirety, does not disclose any element of deliberate intent, wilful default, or mala fide design to circumvent the statutory framework under the RE(R&D) Act, 2016.

12. This Authority also notes that the Respondent acted promptly, responsibly, and in a manner befitting a regulated entity, immediately upon being apprised of the unauthorised activities. In view of the foregoing analysis, and upon a holistic consideration of the totality of the facts and circumstances, this Authority is of the considered opinion that the Respondent has furnished a satisfactory explanation, duly supported by documentary evidence and subsequent compliance measures. Hence, no penalty is imposed under Sections 59 and 60 of the RE(R&D) Act, 2016, against the Respondent.

13. Accordingly, the Suo-motu case is 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