

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

Complaint No. 269 of 2024

26th March, 2025

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

Ashok Kumar Das
Flat No 101, Shapur Elite Country
TSIIC Colony, IDA-JDM
Hyderabad, Telangana-500055

...Complainant

Versus

1. Mr. Chaitanya Reddy

S&S Constructions
Plot No. 36 and 37 Shyamlal
Layout Telecom Nagar, Gachibowli
Hyderabad, Telangana 500032
Ph-8008813256, Email: info@s-sconstructions.com

2. Mr. K Srinivasa Rao

Gowtham Sai Infrastructure
3-3-64/5, Sumitra Nagar
Near Yogitha Apartment
Kukatpally, Hyderabad
Telangana-500085

...Respondent(s)

The present matter filed by the Complainant herein came up for hearing on 21.01.2025, 11.02.2025 and 12.03.2025 before this Authority, none appeared for complainant and the Respondents, further this Authority passes the following ORDER:

2. The present 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. The matter was listed for hearing on 21.01.2025, where the Complainant and the respondents failed to appear. Accordingly, the matter was adjourned, and fresh notices were issued to the Complainant and the respondents.

4. On 11.02.2025, as the Respondents neither appeared nor filed a reply and the Complainant was also absent, this Authority adjourned the matter to the next hearing date for the filing of the Respondents' reply and directed that fresh notices be issued to both parties.

5. On 12.03.2025, despite the notice being duly served and the postal acknowledgment received for Respondent No. 2, both the Complainant and the Respondents failed to appear before this Authority. The postal record showed that the notice to Respondent No. 1 was returned un-served, while the notice to the Complainant was confirmed as delivered.

6. Upon careful consideration of the facts and the repeated absence of the parties, this Authority is of the view that sufficient opportunities have been provided to both the parties to appear and prosecute the case. The Complainant's consistent failure to maintain communication and appear for hearings demonstrates a lack of interest in pursuing the complaint.

7. In light of these facts, this Authority deems it appropriate to dismiss the complaint 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