

BEFORE TELANGANA REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY

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

Complaint No. 441/2025/TGRERA

Dated: 22nd June, 2026

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

Between:

1. Pingili Hemalatha W/O P Manohar Reddy

2. Pingili Soumya, W/O B. Phani Kumar

(R/o H. No:2-7-257, Excise Colony,
Subedari, Hanumakonda)

...Complainants

AND

1. M/S PJMR Constructions Pvt Ltd. Rep. by Managing Director Mrs Punnam Jalaja,

2. Punnam Jalaja, W/o P Jagan Mohan Reddy

3. Punnam Jagan Mohan Reddy,

4. Punnam Rohit Reddy, S/o Jagan Mohan Reddy.

(All are Residents of H. No:2-5-746/1, Subedari,
Hanumakonda City & District)

...Respondents

The present matter filed by the Complainant mentioned herein-above came up for hearing before this Authority in the presence of the Complainants and the Respondents in person. Upon hearing the submissions of all the parties, this Authority proceeds to pass the following **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. Brief facts of the case as per the Form M filed by the Complainant:

3. It was submitted before the Authority by the Complainants that they were the absolute owners of specific plots situated at Kanakadurga Colony, Waddepally Village, Hanumakonda

District. Complainant No. 1 purchased a plot measuring 980 Sq. Yds, forming part of Sy. No. 58 (old) corresponding to Sy. No. 295 (New), through a Registered Sale Deed bearing Doc. No. 3893 of 1992, dated October 5, 1992, and was inducted into vacant possession on the same day. Complainant No. 2 purchased an adjacent and contiguous plot measuring 400.00 Sq. Yds in the same survey numbers through a Registered Sale Deed bearing Doc. No. 3918 of 1992, dated October 12, 1992, and was similarly inducted into vacant possession.

4. It was placed on record that the Complainants lost an extent of 229.00 Sq. Yds due to road widening on the eastern side, leaving them in physical possession and enjoyment of a remaining consolidated plot admeasuring 1151.00 Sq. Yds.

5. In the year 2000, after obtaining the requisite permission from the Municipal Corporation Warangal, the Complainants constructed a building consisting of a Ground and First Floor. Subsequently, they constructed a compound wall around an extent of 1086 Sq. Yds, leaving 65.00 Sq. Yds towards the northern side as per Vasthu principles. The Municipal Corporation Warangal duly assessed the house and assigned it House No. 2-7-1165. Furthermore, Complainant No. 2 executed a General Power of Attorney in favor of Complainant No. 1 to manage and deal with the said house.

6. In the year 2021, intending to sell the house, the Complainants informed their relatives and real estate agents. Upon learning of this, Respondent No. 2 (representing Respondent No. 1), along with Respondents No. 3 and 4, approached the Complainants in or about February 2021. They offered to construct an apartment complex after demolishing the existing house. The Complainants, without suspecting their bona fides, agreed to the proposal. Consequently, the Respondents obtained building permission vide Proceedings No. 3006/33400/W49/2021 from GWMC, Warangal, in the name of Complainant No. 1, and proceeded to demolish the building.

7. The Complainants submitted that the Respondents prepared a Development Agreement-cum-Irrevocable-Power of Attorney, along with a map showing the measurements of the plot encircled by the compound wall. It was averred that the extent of the plot bearing H.No. 2-7-1165 was incorrectly shown as 1151.00 Sq. Yds instead of 1086.00 Sq. Yds, although the actual existing measurements were accurately depicted on the map. The Complainants delivered vacant possession of the said plot measuring 1086.00 Sq. Yds to the Respondents.

8. The Complainants alleged severe statutory and contractual violations by the Respondents. It was submitted that the Respondents significantly deviated from the approved plan during construction. Consequently, the GWMC cancelled the building permission. The cancellation was notably based on an excess constructed area relative to the existing plot area, rather than standard deviations like setbacks.

9. The Complainants leveled a serious allegation that the Respondents were backed by a relative seated in the highest office in Hyderabad, leveraging this influence over the Municipal Authority to obtain construction permission and proceed with unauthorized structures. Assailing the cancellation of the building permission, the Complainant was forced into a legal battle at immense personal expense, filing Writ Petition W.P. No. 4981/2023 before the Hon'ble High Court of Telangana. The Hon'ble Court permitted construction to proceed, strictly mandating adherence to the approved building permission, and disposed of the writ.

10. Further compounding the legal entanglements, the GWMC issued a show-cause notice regarding deviations apparent on the spot. This necessitated the filing of another Writ Petition, W.P. No. 1017 of 2024, which was also subsequently disposed of by the Hon'ble High Court.

11. The Complainants asserted that the Respondents' unauthorized deviations from the approved plan directly resulted in the GWMC issuing punitive orders and notices. Despite being law-abiding citizens with "No Fault on their Part," the Complainants were forced to bear the financial burden of this litigation. It was further alleged that the influential Respondents were "throwing mud" on the Complainants and harassing them for ransom, unjustly claiming an extortionate amount to the tune of Rs. 53.00 Lakhs.

12. The Complainants averred that the Respondents only partially completed the construction, leaving minor works pending. Despite this, the Respondents demanded the return of the Rs. 10,00,000/- security deposit, explicitly promising to finish the entire project and hand over possession of Flat Nos. 103, 203, 301, 302, 401, 501, and 502. Believing these representations, the Complainant refunded the security deposit on March 18, 2024, under an even-dated receipt.

13. Detailing the subsequent harassment, the Complainants submitted that Complainant No. 1 travelled to the U.S.A. in September 2024, returning on January 19, 2025. Prior to her departure, she entrusted the keys for Flat Nos. 103, 301, 302, 501, and 502 to the watchman to facilitate viewings by prospective purchasers. Upon her return, Complainant No. 1 repeatedly requested the Respondents to complete the pending works in her allotted apartments.

14. In response, the Respondents initiated demands for huge sums of money without any valid claim whatsoever. Specifically, Respondent No. 3 repeatedly contacted Complainant No. 1 via telephone, demanding exorbitant amounts to which he was not entitled, prompting her absolute refusal.

15. The Complainants placed on record their dealings with the allotted flats: Flat Nos. 203 and 401 were sold to Swathi and B. Ramana Reddy, respectively, who were currently residing there despite pending works. Furthermore, an agreement to sell the 2BHK Flat No. 302 was executed with one Anusha.

16. While these arrangements were in place, the Respondents committed a brazen act of illegality. They highhandedly seized the keys from the watchman for Flat Nos. 103, 301, 302, 501, and 502, subsequently locking them without any justification. It was averred that the Respondents took undue advantage of the advanced age of Complainant No. 1 (64 years) and her husband (75 years), effectively blocking their entry into their own property. Contrastingly, the Respondents had successfully sold 5 out of their 8 allotted flats, with those purchasers peacefully residing therein.

17. The Complainants alleged a coordinated conspiracy, submitting that the Respondents were acting "hand in glove" to lock the allotted flats, threaten Complainant No. 1's life, demand ransom, and subject her to severe mental harassment and financial ruin.

18. The Complainants provided a specific inventory of the works left incomplete by the Respondents:

- i. Flat Nos. 103, 301, 302, 501, and 502 remained in an incomplete stage.
- ii. The provision of Municipal water was absent.
- iii. Out of 15 required power meters, only 8 were provided, leaving 7 meters uninstalled.

19. The situation escalated significantly when the Respondents allegedly engaged in rampant theft and vandalism within the Complainants' locked flats. It was submitted that the Respondents systematically removed all interior fixtures from Flat Nos. 103, 301, 302, 501, and 502. The stolen items included inside doors, grills, commodes, and fixtures such as taps and switchboards. This theft critically impacted the Complainants' immediate plans, as Complainant No. 1 intended to shift her residence to Flat No. 301, and Complainant No. 2 intended to retain Flat No. 501 for personal use during visits from the U.S.A.

20. As a direct consequence of this unauthorized and illegal removal of fixtures, all flats allotted to the Complainants were left entirely devoid of water facilities and power supply. In response to these egregious acts, the Complainant lodged a formal complaint with the SHO, Police Station Subedari, detailing the mischief, theft, cheating, and other illegal acts. This complaint was duly registered under FIR No. 285/2025.

21. Finally, the Complainants affirmed that no other cases were pending before any court of law, tribunal, or authority regarding this matter, save for the registered FIR at PS Subedari. Invoking the jurisdiction of the Hon'ble Authority, the Complainants submitted that they fell squarely within the definition of "allottees," and the Respondents qualified as "Promoters" under the Act. Since the property was situated at Kanaka Durga Colony, Hanumakonda City & District, the Hon'ble Authority was fully vested with the jurisdiction to try the case.

B. Relief(s) Sought

22. Accordingly, the Complainants sought the following reliefs:

- i. *Take action against the respondents as per the law and order for restoration of the facilities.*
- ii. *Pass order directing the respondents to complete the left-over works referred above pertaining to apartment Nos. 103,301,302, 501 and 502.*
- iii. *Pass order directing the respondents to pay compensation and damages to the tune of Rs. 10.00 Lakhs to the complainants for the mental agony and financial loss caused by the respondents and also to pay Rs. 10.00 Lakhs for delay of giving possession.*
- iv. *To prohibit the respondents to alienate their remaining flats, which are not sold by them, till the disposal of the case and implementation of the orders to be passed by the Hon'ble Authority.*

C. Counter filed by Respondent

23. It was submitted at the very outset that the complaint was neither maintainable on facts nor under the law and was liable to be rejected in limine. With due respect to the Hon'ble Authority, it was contended that the interse disputes between the land owners and the developer could not be entertained and adjudicated by the Authority since the land owners did not fall under the definition of "Allottees," and on this ground alone, the complaint was liable to be rejected.

24. Without prejudice to the contention regarding maintainability, it was submitted that the complaint under Section 14 of RERA regarding alleged deviations from the sanctioned plan was also liable to be rejected. It was pointed out that the complainants had failed to specify the alleged deviations. In the absence of specific allegations, it was argued that the complaint was not maintainable. It was asserted that there were no deviations from the sanctioned plans, a fact substantiated by the Occupancy Certificate issued by the Greater Warangal Municipal Corporation on 20-02-2025 after inspecting the building, which falsified the complainants' contentions.

25. Furthermore, regarding the claim for compensation under Section 18 of RERA, it was submitted that such a claim must be filed under Form "N," whereas the present complaint was filed under Form "M," rendering it liable for rejection. Even on merits, it was contended that since there was no Agreement for Sale between the Complainants and Respondents, the provision for compensation under Section 18 could not be invoked. It was submitted that the complainants had suppressed material facts and filed the complaint with false allegations for unlawful gains and to coerce the Respondents, despite the dispute falling outside the purview of RERA.

26. Regarding the extent of land shown in the Development Agreement cum Irrevocable General Power of Attorney, it was submitted that the allegation of incorrect extent was false. It was stated that the complainants had always asserted ownership of 1151 Sq. Yards and had signed the agreement without objection after scrutiny. It was pointed out that in a Writ Petition filed before the Hon'ble High Court, the complainant had specifically pleaded possession of 1151 Sq. Yards after excluding encroachments and road widening, and had applied for building permission for the same extent. The claim that the extent should have been different was termed false and malicious.

27. The allegation of deviation from the approved plan and influence over Municipal Authorities was denied as false. It was submitted that the building permission was cancelled by the GWMC solely due to the misrepresentation of facts by the complainants, who had suppressed the pendency of a civil suit regarding a boundary dispute over 65 Sq. Yards. It was argued that the Respondents were unaware of this suit until adjacent landowners complained, leading to the cancellation.

28. It was further submitted that the cancellation of permission occurred after substantial construction, including slab work and internal works, had been completed. This cancellation,

caused by the complainants' suppression of facts, resulted in a delay of almost two years for the restoration of permission. It was stated that this delay escalated construction costs, upset financial planning, and resulted in a loss of approximately Rs. 1.50 Crores for the Respondents. It was asserted that the Respondents bore the expenses for the Writ Petition and facilitated the compromise in the civil suit to resolve the dispute. It was claimed that the complainants were avoiding reimbursing these expenses and indemnifying the loss, and had filed the complaint to evade these payments.

29. Regarding possession, it was submitted that possession of certain flats had been handed over, while possession of others was withheld due to the non-payment of the corpus fund and GST by the complainants. The allegations regarding handing over keys to the watchman, illegal locking of flats, threats, and harassment were denied as false, bald, and vague. It was argued that the complainants were making contradictory claims by stating works were incomplete while simultaneously claiming possession was handed over.

30. Regarding utilities, it was submitted that municipal water connection could not be provided as property tax had not been assessed for all flats, and electricity meters were fixed only for occupied flats. The allegation of theft of fixtures was denied, with the submission that since internal fixtures like doors and grills were not fixed by the respondent, the question of removing them did not arise.

31. It was reiterated that the complainants were land owners, not allottees under RERA, and thus the complaint was not maintainable. The dispute was described as being of a pure civil nature, filed to avoid payments due to the respondents. It was concluded that the construction delay and financial burden were caused by the complainants' suppression of the civil suit, causing significant financial loss and mental agony to the Respondents. Therefore, it was prayed that the Hon'ble Authority be pleased to dismiss the complaint as not maintainable with exemplary costs.

D. Rejoinder filed by Complainants

32. The Rejoinder Affidavit was filed by the 1st Complainant, Smt. Pingli Hemaltha, acting on her own behalf and as the authorized representative of the 2nd Complainant. The Complainant solemnly affirmed the facts contained therein and denied the averments made in the Counter Affidavit filed by the Respondents, except those specifically admitted.

33. It was submitted that the complaint was fully maintainable under Section 31 read with Section 2(d) of the Real Estate (Regulation & Development) Act, 2016. The Complainant stated that the parties had entered into a Registered Development Agreement cum Irrevocable General Power of Attorney (DGPA) dated 16-02-2022 for the development of the subject property into residential apartments. Under the said Deed, specific flats bearing Nos. 103, 203, 301, 302, 401, 501, and 502 were allotted to the Complainants' share. Consequently, it was contended that the Complainants fell squarely within the definition of "Allottees" under the Act, granting this Hon'ble Authority the jurisdiction to entertain the complaint and impose compensation for violations of the registered DGPA.

34. The Complainant submitted that they were unaware of the issuance of the Occupancy Certificate No. 000341/OC/GWMC/3006/0014/2025 dated 20-02-2025 by the GWMC, as the Respondents had never brought this fact to their notice. Furthermore, it was highlighted that despite a specific direction from this Hon'ble Authority requiring the Respondents to furnish a copy of the revised building plan (stated to be obtained by revising the original permission dated 02-12-2021), the Respondents had failed to furnish the same to the Complainants to date. It was argued that this conduct demonstrated that the Respondents were suppressing material facts from both the Complainants and the Authority.

35. A detailed rebuttal was offered regarding the extent of the land and the alleged fraud played by the Respondents. It was submitted that prior to entering into the MoU and DGPA dated 16-02-2022, the Complainants had measured the house plot. After excluding the road-affected area and a disputed portion of 65 Sq. yds (subject matter of O.S. No. 61 of 2015 with neighbours), a clear extent of 1086 sq. ft. yds was physically handed over to the Respondents. It was stated that the Respondents orally agreed to maintain construction within this 1086 Sq. yds. However, it was alleged that the Respondents, without the knowledge or consent of the Complainants, submitted a building permission application on 28-04-2021 to the GWMC showing an extent of 1162.47 Sq. mtrs (approx. 1151 Sq. yds), thereby misrepresenting the Complainants' name and violating the promise to limit construction to 1086 Sq. yds.

36. It was submitted that this fraud led to a complaint by one M. Ashok Kumar, resulting in the GWMC revoking the building permission on 14-02-2023. Consequently, the Respondents compelled the Complainants to file W.P. No. 4981 of 2023 before the Hon'ble High Court challenging the revocation, which remains pending. It was contended that the

Respondents' mischief and failure to settle the boundary dispute as promised caused huge monetary expenditure and delays, for which the Complainants sought compensation.

37. The Complainant denied the allegation that they suppressed the pendency of O.S. No. 61 of 2015. It was argued that the Respondents were well aware of the dispute regarding the 65 Sq. yds, as the MoU was entered into on 20-03-2021, followed by the building application, and finally the DGPA on 16-02-2022. It was submitted that the Respondents insisted on executing the DGPA for 1151 Sq. yds under the guise of the obtained building permission, promising to settle the dispute before commencing construction, but failed to do so. The Complainant asserted that the alleged loss of Rs. 1.50 Crores claimed by the Respondents was due to their own negligence and failure, not due to the Complainants.

38. It was further submitted that the Respondents were not adhering to the DGPA dated 16-02-2022 and were delaying the delivery of possession of the allotted flats. It was alleged that the Respondents were making an illegal demand of Rs. 53 Lakhs for handing over possession and were not completing the internal fixtures as agreed. It was argued that the Complainants were entitled to compensation for the mental agony and monetary loss caused by this delay and the non-completion of amenities.

39. In response to the issue of dues, it was submitted that property tax is assessed from the date of the Occupancy Certificate. As the Respondents admitted that the OC was issued on 20-02-2025, the question of prior dues did not arise for the unsold flats or those not yet handed over. It was further submitted that under G.O.Ms. No. 168 dated 07-04-2012, electricity and water connections must be provided. The Respondents were obligated to obtain these connections and hand over Flat Nos. 103, 301, 302, 501, and 502 with all internal and external fixtures. The Complainant noted the Respondents' admission regarding pending material/fixtures and demanded that the Respondents immediately complete these works as per the DGPA dated 16-02-2022 and hand over the respective flats to the Complainants without further delay.

40. In light of the above, the Complainant prayed that the Hon'ble Authority be pleased to allow the complaint, grant the reliefs claimed under the provisions of the RERA Act, and direct the Respondents to hand over Flat Nos. 103, 301, 302, 501, and 502 after completing all internal and external fixtures and amenities as per the DGPA dated 16-02-2022.

E. Points for Consideration

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

- I. Whether the present Complaint is maintainable before this Authority, having regard to the nature of the relationship between the Complainants and the Respondents, and whether the Complainants fall within the definition of "allottees" under Section 2(d) of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016?
- II. Whether the Complainants are entitled to the reliefs sought? If so, to what extent?

F. Observations of the Authority

POINT I

42. The threshold question before this Authority is whether the present complaint is maintainable, having regard to the nature of the relationship between the Complainants and the Respondents and whether the Complainants fall within the definition of "allottees" under Section 2(d) of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016.

43. Before examining this question, it is necessary to set out the factual matrix as it emerges from the pleadings. The Complainants are the owners of land admeasuring 1151 Sq. Yds situated at Kanakadurga Colony, Waddepally Village, Hanumakonda District, as per the Development Agreement-cum-Irrevocable General Power of Attorney. Pursuant to a Development Agreement-cum-Irrevocable General Power of Attorney (DGPA) dated 16.02.2022, the Complainants handed over their land to the Respondents for the purpose of developing a residential apartment complex. Under the said DGPA, the Complainants were allotted 7 flats, bearing Nos. 103, 203, 301, 302, 401, 501, and 502, as their share of the development, out of a total of 15 flats in the project. The Complainants' share thus constitutes nearly 50% of the total built-up units in the project.

44. Crucially, the Complainants have themselves stated in their pleadings that Flat Nos. 203 and 401, forming part of their allotted share, have already been sold by them to third parties, namely Swathi and B. Ramana Reddy respectively. It is further stated that an Agreement of Sale has been executed for Flat No. 302 with a third party named Anusha. The Complainants have also placed on record that the keys to the remaining flats were left with the watchman specifically to facilitate viewings by prospective purchasers. These admissions, made in the

Complainants' own pleadings, unambiguously establish that the Complainants' intent in respect of the allotted flats was not personal occupation or end-use but commercial resale and profit.

45. This Authority now examines the definition of "allottee" under Section 2(d) of the RE (R&D) Act, 2016, which reads as follows:

"allottee", in relation to a real estate project, means the person to whom a plot, apartment or building, as the case may be, has been allotted, sold (whether as freehold or leasehold) or otherwise transferred by the promoter, and includes the person who subsequently acquires the said allotment through sale, transfer or otherwise but does not include a person to whom such plot, apartment or building, as the case may be, is given on rent."

46. The definition of "allottee" under Section 2(d) of the Act contemplates a person to whom a plot, apartment, or building has been allotted, sold, or otherwise transferred by the promoter, in the context of a real estate transaction. The statute is designed to protect genuine homebuyers and end-users who invest in real estate projects in a position of informational and bargaining disadvantage vis-à-vis the promoter. The protective ambit of the Act, including the right to approach this Authority under Section 31, is intended to safeguard such bona fide purchasers and occupants, and not to provide a forum for commercial disputes arising out of development arrangements between landowners and developers.

47. In the present case, the Complainants are not purchasers or consumers of units in a real estate project. They are landowners who contributed their land for development under the DGPA dated 16.02.2022 and received 7 flats constituting nearly 50% of the total 15 units in the project, as their share of the developed property. Their entitlement to these flats flows not from any sale or allotment made to them by the Respondents as promoters in the ordinary course of a real estate transaction, but from their own contribution of land as co-participants in the development enterprise. Furthermore, the Complainants have themselves disclosed that they have already sold 2 of the allotted flats to third parties and are in the process of selling the remaining flats, with keys being kept for prospective buyers. The intent of the Complainants in respect of the allotted flats is therefore plainly commercial, aimed at resale and to earn profit, and not at personal occupation or end-use.

48. A person who receives flats as a landowner's share under a development arrangement and proceeds to sell such flats to third parties cannot be said to be an "allottee" within the meaning of Section 2(d) of the RE (R&D) Act, 2016. Such a person is, in substance, a developer or co-developer of the project and not a consumer or end-user of the real estate product.

Extending the protective definition of "allottee" to such a person would be directly contrary to the legislative intent and purpose of the Act.

49. In this context, it is also instructive to examine the definition of "promoter" under Section 2(zk) of the RE (R&D) Act, 2016. The relevant portion of Section 2(zk) reads as follows:

"promoter" means,—

(ii) a person who develops land into a project, whether or not the person also constructs structures on any of the plots, for the purpose of selling to other persons all or some of the plots in the said project, whether with or without structures thereon; or

(v) any other person who acts himself as a builder, coloniser, contractor, developer, estate developer or by any other name or claims to be acting as the holder of a power of attorney from the owner of the land on which the building or apartment is constructed or plot is developed for sale.

Explanation.— For the purposes of this clause, where the person who constructs or converts a building into apartments or develops a plot for sale and the person who sells apartments or plots are different persons, both of them shall be deemed to be the promoters and shall be jointly liable as such for the functions and responsibilities specified under this Act or the rules and regulations made thereunder."

50. The Explanation to Section 2(zk) of the Act is directly applicable to the facts of the present case. In the present case, the Respondents are constructing the apartments, while the Complainants, being the landowners who contributed the land for development and are selling their share of flats to third parties, are the persons who are selling apartments in the project. Under the Explanation to Section 2(zk), both such persons are deemed to be "promoters" and are jointly liable as such. The Complainants, by virtue of having contributed their land for the development of a residential apartment project and having sold and entered into agreements to sell their share of flats to third parties, squarely fall within the definition of "promoter" under Section 2(zk) of the Act. The Complainants are therefore not allottees but co-promoters of the project, and the dispute between them and the Respondents is an inter se dispute between co-promoters arising out of the DGPA dated 16.02.2022.

51. Accordingly, this Authority holds that the Complainants, being landowners and co-promoters of the project under the DGPA dated 16.02.2022, do not fall within the definition of "allottees" under Section 2(d) of the RE (R&D) Act, 2016, and the present complaint arising out of inter se disputes between the Complainants and Respondents under the DGPA is not maintainable before this Authority. The Complainants are at liberty to seek appropriate relief

before the competent civil court or forum of appropriate jurisdiction, in accordance with law. Point I is answered accordingly in the negative.

Point II

52. In view of the finding recorded under Point I that the complaint is not maintainable before this Authority and that the Complainants do not fall within the definition of "allottees" under Section 2(d) of the RE (R&D) Act, 2016, the question of entitlement to the reliefs sought does not survive for consideration and is accordingly left open, without prejudice to the rights and remedies available to the Complainants before the appropriate forum.

53. Accordingly, the present complaint is dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

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

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

