

BEFORE TELANGANA REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY

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

Complaint No. 349 of 2025

Dated: 24th March, 2026

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. 349/2025

Between

Ms. Lavanya Naram,
R/o. Flat No. A4-713,
Janapriya Sitara,
Yellareddyguda,
Sainikpuri, Secunderabad- 500062.

...Complainant

And

M/s. Janapriya Projects Private Ltd.
Represented by Director Sri. K. Ravinder Reddy,
R/o. 8-2-120/86/1, Plot Nos. 11 & 12,
Keerthi & Pride Towers, Near Road No.2
Banjara Hills, Hyderabad, Telangana- 500034.

...Respondent

The present matter filed by the Complainant mentioned herein-above came up for hearing before this Authority in the presence of the Complainant, and the Respondent's counsel M. Naga Deepak and V. Ravi Kiran. Upon hearing the submissions of all the parties, this Authority proceeds to pass the following **ORDER**:

1. 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 Respondent.

A. Brief facts of the Case as per Form M filed by Complainant

2. It is submitted that the present complaint arises out of the arbitrary and unfair actions of the Respondent, Janapriya, in withholding possession of the Complainant's flat on the alleged ground of delay charges, which are neither justified nor attributable to the Complainant.

Despite completion of payments, the possession has been kept on hold, causing financial loss including loss of rental income, and undue hardship to the Complainant.

3. It is submitted that the Respondent, through its salesperson, had induced the Complainant to purchase two flats by promising certain benefits, including a 2% referral bonus and a complimentary car parking space. These representations were false and misleading, as the referral bonus was later denied on untenable grounds and the car parking allotment was only agreed to after prolonged negotiations spanning several months, thereby evidencing deficiency in service and unfair trade practice.

4. It is submitted that the alleged delay charges are wholly arbitrary and unjust, as the delays were primarily occasioned due to the Respondent's own actions, including prolonged internal decision-making, delay in confirming car parking allocation, and failure to timely provide the necessary CF NOC documentation required for home loan disbursement. The Respondent cannot attribute such delays to the Complainant and seek to impose unwarranted financial liability.

5. It is submitted that the Complainant had, at various stages, engaged with the Respondent in good faith, including during discussions for cancellation and subsequent negotiations, as well as during the loan processing stage. However, the Respondent failed to communicate any alleged payment defaults or delay-related obligations at the relevant time, and no demand for such payments was made despite multiple interactions and visits, thereby violating principles of transparency and fairness.

6. It is submitted that the Respondent further acted unfairly by completing the registration process without duly informing the Complainant and subsequently raising claims of delay. The delay charge sheet, which was furnished only after repeated requests, contains discrepancies, duplications, and exaggerated periods of delay, rendering it unreliable and arbitrary.

7. It is submitted that the entire course of conduct of the Respondent demonstrates a pattern of misleading representations, lack of timely communication, and shifting of responsibility for delays onto the Complainant, despite such delays being attributable to the Respondent's own lapses. The Complainant, having already invested substantial sums, was left with no option but to continue with the transaction under financial stress, and cannot be penalized further by imposition of unjustified delay charges or withholding of possession.

B. Relief(s) Sought

8. The Complainants accordingly sought the following reliefs:
- a) To immediately handover the possession of apartment and NOC without imposing any delay charges.
 - b) To provide the promised 2% referral bonus, quantified as ₹75,000 per eligible referral booking.
 - c) To provide compensation for the inconvenience caused due to the delays and deficiency in service and the stress of communications and visiting the Janapriya office repeatedly over the past year.
 - d) To provide compensation for loss of rental income arising from withholding of possession from February 2025.
 - e) To provide the flat in liveable conditions.

C. Counter filed by the Respondent

9. It is submitted by respondent that the present complaint is denied in its entirety save and except those averments expressly admitted herein, and is stated to be vexatious, misconceived, factually incorrect, and liable to be dismissed with costs. The Respondent submits that it has at all times acted in accordance with the Agreement for Sale, the provisions of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016, and principles of fairness.

10. It is submitted by respondent that the alleged promises of a “2% referral bonus” and “free car parking” were never unconditional or contractual in nature and were always subject to eligibility and availability. It is contended that such offers do not form part of the Agreement for Sale and cannot override the express contractual terms. The Respondent further submits that the referral bonus scheme was not applicable where both flats were booked in the same name, and this position was communicated to the Complainant. It is further contended that no enforceable evidence of such a promise has been produced by the Complainant.

11. It is submitted by respondent that the car parking allotment was not part of the standard entitlement for the subject flat and was subsequently offered as a goodwill gesture upon negotiation, subject to availability and additional payment. It is contended that the Complainant accepted this arrangement, thereby concluding the issue.

12. It is submitted by respondent that the delay in handing over possession is solely attributable to the Complainant’s failure to adhere to the payment schedule as set out in the Agreement for Sale. It is contended that against a payable amount of ₹26,97,000/- due by June

2024, the Complainant paid only ₹4,08,593/-, thereby committing a material default. Consequently, delay charges amounting to ₹1,48,910/- were levied in accordance with the Agreement, out of which a substantial portion was waived as a gesture of goodwill, and the Complainant was called upon to pay the reduced amount. It is further contended that possession can be lawfully withheld until all dues are cleared.

13. It is submitted by respondent that all communications, including those relating to CF/NOC documentation and registration, were duly carried out and the sale deed was registered on 14.02.2025 to the knowledge of the Complainant. It is denied that any action was taken unilaterally or without intimation. It is further contended that the Respondent cooperated with both the Complainant and the financing bank and provided the required documentation within a reasonable time.

14. It is submitted by respondent that the allegations attributing delay to the Respondent are incorrect and misleading. It is contended that the timeline was impacted by the Complainant's own actions, including prolonged negotiations over non-contractual benefits, delay in arranging finances, and postponement of decisions. It is further contended that any minor delay on the part of the Respondent was acknowledged and suitably accommodated through waiver of charges.

15. It is submitted by respondent that the claim for loss of rental income is untenable in law, as compensation under the statutory framework requires clear proof of delay solely attributable to the promoter, which is absent in the present case. It is contended that the delays were mutual and cannot give rise to a claim for compensation.

16. It is submitted by respondent that the allegations regarding lack of communication and procedural irregularities are denied, and it is contended that the Respondent has acted transparently and in compliance with statutory obligations. It is further contended that the Complainant cannot rely on alleged communication gaps to justify non-payment or delay.

17. It is submitted by respondent that the claims for compensation towards mental stress, inconvenience, and speculative rental loss are exaggerated and not supported by evidence. It is contended that such claims fall outside the scope of relief contemplated under the Act in the absence of proven breach by the Respondent.

18. It is submitted by respondent that the allegations relating to construction defects are premature, as possession has not yet been taken. It is contended that minor snags identified

prior to handover are part of routine finishing work and are attended to in due course, and do not constitute grounds for withholding payments or seeking relief at this stage.

19. It is submitted by respondent that the Complainant has suppressed material facts, including her own defaults in payment, delays in loan processing, and prolonged negotiations, and has approached this Authority without clean hands. It is contended that the complaint is an attempt to shift contractual obligations onto the Respondent and to enforce alleged oral assurances which are not legally binding.

20. It is submitted by respondent that the complaint is not maintainable either in law or on facts, as it seeks to enforce non-contractual claims and fails to establish any breach on the part of the Respondent. The Respondent therefore prays that the complaint be dismissed with costs.

D. Rejoinder filed by the Complainant

21. It is submitted that the Respondent has handed over only symbolic possession of the flat as per the Sale Deed and has itself admitted that physical possession would be granted only upon completion of pending works. In such circumstances, the Respondent is precluded from claiming any delay charges. It is further submitted that the payment schedule under the Agreement to Sell clearly stipulates that the final payment is due only at the stage of completion/finishing, whereas the flat was admittedly incomplete even as on the date of execution of the Sale Deed. The execution of the Sale Deed without completion of the flat and without obtaining the Occupancy Certificate is illegal, contrary to the Agreement, and amounts to coercing the Complainant into making payments under a schedule not adhered to by the Respondent. Such conduct disentitles the Respondent from raising any claims against the Complainant.

22. It is submitted that the existence of multiple defects and snags in the flat, including issues affecting habitability such as locking system failure, water leakage, dampness, and structural finishing defects, clearly establishes that the flat was not in a livable condition at the time of execution of the Sale Deed. The Respondent's refusal to hand over physical possession despite executing the Sale Deed, on the ground of alleged delay charges, demonstrates selective compliance with law and further evidence lack of bona fides.

23. It is submitted that the Respondent has admitted that the promise of a 2% referral bonus and car parking was made by its sales representative, and such representations formed the basis on which the Complainant proceeded with the second booking. The subsequent denial of such

benefits at a belated stage, after execution of the Agreement and part payment of consideration, amounts to misrepresentation. The Respondent cannot evade liability for assurances made by its own representative, especially when such assurances created a legitimate expectation and induced the transaction.

24. It is submitted that the Complainant was initially assured of free car parking along with the referral benefit, and only upon failure of the Respondent to honor these assurances did the Complainant consider cancellation. Thereafter, upon prolonged negotiations initiated and delayed by the Respondent, a car parking space was eventually agreed to for additional consideration, which the Complainant accepted in good faith solely to proceed with the transaction and mitigate losses.

25. It is submitted that the Respondent has failed to adhere to the agreed payment schedule and has instead raised demands inconsistent with the Agreement to Sell. The requirement of payment prior to completion of the flat and without obtaining the Occupancy Certificate is in direct contravention of the Agreement and applicable law. The alleged delay charges are based on a flawed and inconsistent calculation, containing discrepancies and duplications, and therefore cannot be sustained.

26. It is submitted that the Respondent cannot withhold physical possession while simultaneously relying on contractual provisions relating to delay charges, especially when the Respondent itself has failed to fulfil its obligations, including completion of construction and obtaining requisite approvals. The Respondent cannot take advantage of its own wrong and is, in fact, liable to compensate the Complainant for failure to hand over possession within the agreed timeline.

27. It is submitted that the delay in completion of the transaction was primarily caused by the Respondent's own conduct, including prolonged negotiations, delayed decision-making, and failure to provide essential documentation such as the CF NOC certificate in a timely manner. The Complainant had acted in good faith and was constrained from proceeding further until clarity was provided by the Respondent. The delay in loan disbursement was directly attributable to the Respondent's failure to furnish required documentation.

28. It is submitted that the claim of loss of rental income is valid and sustainable, as the Complainant had completed payment and yet was denied physical possession from February 2025 onwards. The Respondent's failure to deliver possession despite receipt of consideration entitles the Complainant to compensation for such loss.

29. It is submitted that the Respondent's reliance on principles of causal attribution is misplaced, as the facts clearly demonstrate that the delay was caused by the Respondent's own acts and omissions. The partial waiver of delay charges itself constitutes an admission of the Respondent's contribution to the delay.

30. It is submitted that the Respondent's contention that oral assurances are unenforceable is untenable in the present case, as the Complainant was induced into the transaction based on representations made by the Respondent's authorized representatives. Such conduct amounts to misrepresentation and unfair trade practice, for which the Complainant cannot be penalized.

31. It is submitted that the Respondent has acted in violation of the Agreement to Sell and statutory provisions by demanding payments prior to completion, executing a Sale Deed for an unfinished flat, and offering only symbolic possession without requisite approvals. The Respondent has consistently failed to discharge its obligations and is attempting to mislead this Hon'ble Authority to avoid liability. The present complaint is therefore bona fide and maintainable, and the Respondent is liable for the reliefs sought.

32. It is submitted that the Respondent's contentions regarding construction defects are false and misleading, and in fact amount to an admission that physical possession has not been handed over in compliance with the RERA Act and the Agreement to Sell. The Respondent has admittedly executed a Sale Deed and offered only symbolic possession without obtaining the Occupancy Certificate, which is illegal and evidences an attempt to mislead the Complainant. The flat remains incomplete and uninhabitable with multiple serious defects, which cannot be termed as minor snags or deferred for post-possession rectification. The Respondent cannot misuse statutory provisions to justify handing over an unfinished unit, nor can it shift the burden of its own failures onto the Complainant, who has not defaulted in payments. Further, the material relied upon by the Respondent does not establish any genuine rectification of defects and is merely superficial, thereby reinforcing the Respondent's lack of bona fides and continued non-compliance with its obligations.

33. The Complainant therefore prays before this Authority to direct the Respondent to hand over "ready-to-move-in" physical possession of the Flat after rectifying all identified defects, waiving the delay charges imposed on the Complainant and obtaining the occupancy certificate as envisioned under the RERA Act and Rules, and as per the Agreement to Sell. It is also requested to direct the Respondent to pay interest as per applicable law, for every month of delay in the handover of ready-to-move-in physical possession from 20.08.2024, towards delay

compensation, along with applicable compensation for the loss of rental income, as envisioned under the Act.

E. Point for Consideration

34. After considering the facts stated and submissions made by both parties, the following question arises before this Authority:

- i) *Whether the Complainant is entitled to the relief sought? If so, to what extent?*

F. Observations of the Authority

35. Upon a careful examination of the pleadings, documents, and submissions placed on record by both parties, this Authority finds it necessary to address the central issue relating to the entitlement of the Complainant to physical possession of Flat No. A2-716, situated on the 7th Floor in Block A2 of the project “SITARA at Janapriya Lake Front”, located at Kapra Village, Keesara Mandal, Medchal–Malkajgiri District, (hereinafter “Scheduled property”) as the determination of this issue directly impacts the Complainant’s entitlement to the primary relief sought.

36. This Authority notes that the project “SITARA at Janapriya Lake Front” is duly registered under TG RERA bearing Registration No. P02200001232 for the project SITARA A2, with the registration period commencing from 05.10.2019 and valid up to 20.08.2024. It is an admitted position that the Complainant entered into an Agreement for Sale dated 29.04.2023 with the Respondent for purchase of the Scheduled Property and, pursuant thereto, made substantial payments towards the sale consideration. Subsequently, the parties executed a registered Sale Deed dated 14.02.2025 in respect of the Scheduled Property.

37. It has also been noted that as per the Sale Deed dated 14.02.2025, a total sum of Rs. 30,47,000/- (Rupees Thirty Lakh Forty-Seven Thousand Only) has been duly paid by the Complainant towards the purchase of the Scheduled property. Thereby, making a full payment of the obligations towards the sale consideration. Thus, the Respondent has acknowledged receipt of the total sale consideration under the registered Sale Deed.

38. It has been contended by the Complainant that the physical possession of the Scheduled property has been withheld on account of alleged delay in payments by the Complainant and the consequent levy of delay charges. It is further contended that, the Respondent has not obtained the Occupancy Certificate in respect of the Scheduled property till date. As per the

material placed on record, it is evident that the Respondent has itself admitted that only symbolic possession has been offered to the Complainant for the said Scheduled property. That, as per Clause 6.2 of the Sale Deed dated 14.02.2025, the physical possession of the Scheduled property along with the possession of common areas and facilities shall be provided upon completion of construction of the Scheduled property. The clause 6.2 of the Sale Deed dated 14.02.2025 is extracted below:

“ 6.2. The Vendors shall deliver the actual physical possession of Schedule Property to the Purchaser together with the possession of the common areas and facilities, to be shared with other Purchasers of the Apartments in the Project, upon the completion of construction of the Schedule Property in accordance with the terms and conditions of the Construction Agreement (defined herein), subject to the Purchaser having completed the payments as scheduled in the Construction Agreement, Upon possession thus being handed over, the Purchaser is entitled to enjoy the same without any obstruction from the Vendors or any one claiming through them.”

39. It is further observed that the Agreement for Sale dated 29.04.2023, entered into between the parties, specifically stipulates under Clause 1.8 that the date of completion of the Scheduled property is 20.08.2024. However, despite the lapse of the said stipulated date, the Respondent has failed to hand over physical possession of the apartment to the Complainant.

40. This Authority notes that despite execution of the Sale Deed and receipt of the said consideration, the Respondent has admittedly not handed over physical possession of the flat and has only offered symbolic possession. The Respondent has attempted to shift the burden onto the Complainant by justifying such withholding of possession on the ground of alleged delay charges which remain outstanding and payable by the Complainant. It is contended by the Respondent that, the Complainant failed to make the payment of Rs. 26,97,000/- (Rupees Twenty-Six Lakh Ninety-Seven Thousand Only) by June 2024 as per the payment plan in the Agreement of Sale and had only paid a sum of Rs. 4,08,593/- (Rupees Four Lakh Eight Thousand Five Hundred and Ninety-Three Only). As per the Respondent's contention this resulted in delay charges amounting to a sum of Rs. 1,48,910/- (Rupees One Lakh Forty-Eight Nine Hundred and Ten Only). However, upon perusal of the material on record, it is evident that the Respondent itself has reduced 25% of the delay charges, expressly acknowledging that there was delay on Respondent's part in obtaining the CF NOC.

41. It is further observed that the sequence of events, as evidenced through the email correspondence between the parties, placed before this Authority, clearly demonstrates that the delay in payments did not occur solely due to default on the part of the Complainant, but was intrinsically linked to the processing of home loan disbursement, which in turn was dependent upon actions required to be completed by the Respondent. The record reflects that the Complainant, vide email dated 23.01.2025 and subsequent follow-up dated 27.02.2025, had sought necessary documentation from the Respondent, and further, on 16.03.2025, specifically highlighted that there had been a delay of approximately two months attributable to the Respondent in furnishing such requirements, which resulted in the home loan disbursement being put on hold. It is also evident as per the Sale Deed dated 14.02.2025 that, the entire sale consideration has been paid by the Complainant which has been acknowledged by the Respondent thereby evidencing that the balance payments stood completed in due course.

42. The Respondent, in its reply dated 19.03.2025, while attributing delay to the Complainant, has simultaneously admitted to a delay of two months on its part and, on that basis, reduced the delay charges by 25%. This admission is significant, as it establishes that the delay was not unilateral but arose due to circumstances involving the Respondent itself. In such a scenario, the Respondent cannot selectively enforce consequences against the Complainant while disregarding its own contributory role in the delay.

43. The Complainant, having acted diligently in pursuing the loan process and having effected payment immediately upon resolution of the impediment, cannot be termed as a wilful defaulter. The levy of delay charges in such circumstances is arbitrary and inequitable.

44. Moreover, the Respondent's own conduct in partially waiving the delay charges indicates acknowledgment of its contributory lapse, and once such acknowledgment is made, there remains no legal basis to sustain even the balance portion of such charges. The partial waiver of 25% by the Respondent, is insufficient. Accordingly, this Authority holds that the reduction of delay charges by 25% by the Respondent is neither justified nor legally tenable, and that the delay charges, having arisen in circumstances where the Complainant cannot be held solely responsible, are liable to be waived in entirety. The imposition of any portion of such delay charges is therefore set aside, and the Respondent is directed not to demand or recover any delay charges whatsoever from the Complainant.

45. This admission clearly establishes that the delay was not solely attributable to the Complainant, and consequently, the Respondent cannot rely upon such delay charges to justify withholding possession of the Scheduled Property. It is pertinent to note that once the Sale Deed stands executed and sale consideration acknowledged therein, the obligation to hand over lawful, physical possession of the property assumes paramount importance and cannot be defeated.

46. Accordingly, in exercise of its powers under the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016, this Authority has unequivocally held that the imposition of such delay charges is unjustified and unsustainable in the facts of the present case, and the same stands waived off in entirety. Consequently, the Respondent is estopped from raising or enforcing any claim towards delay charges, either as a precondition for handing over possession or otherwise, and any insistence in this regard shall be construed as non-compliance with the directions of this Authority.

47. It is further observed that the Agreement for Sale dated 29.04.2023, entered into between the parties, specifically stipulates under Clause 1.8 that the date of completion of the Scheduled property is 20.08.2024. However, despite the lapse of the said stipulated date, the Respondent has failed to hand over physical possession of the apartment to the Complainant.

48. It is also pertinent to note that, it is the promoter's responsibility to obtain Occupancy Certificate as per Section 11(4)(b) of the RE(R&D) Act, 2016. Respondent's failure to secure the Occupancy Certificate, despite execution of the Sale Deed, receipt of substantial sale consideration and RERA registration being lapsed dated 28.08.2024, clearly evidences non-compliance with statutory requirements and reinforces the conclusion that the Scheduled property is not in a habitable condition for handover. Section 11(4) is extracted below:

*“Section 11 (4) The promoter shall-
(a) be responsible for all obligations, responsibilities and functions under the provisions of this Act or the rules and regulations made thereunder or to the allottees as per the agreement for sale, or to the association of allottees, as the case may be, till the conveyance of all the apartments, plots or buildings, as the case may be, to the allottees, or the common areas to the association of allottees or the competent authority, as the case may be:*

(b) be responsible to obtain the completion certificate or the occupancy certificate, or both, as applicable, from the relevant competent authority as per local laws or other laws for the time being in force and to make it available to the allottees individually or to the association of allottees, as the case may be;

(c) be responsible to obtain the lease certificate, where the real estate project is developed on a leasehold land, specifying the period of lease, and certifying that all dues and charges in regard to the leasehold land has been paid, and to make the lease certificate available to the association of allottees;

(d) be responsible for providing and maintaining the essential services, on reasonable charges, till the taking over of the maintenance of the project by the association of the allottees;

(e) enable the formation of an association or society or co-operative society, as the case may be, of the allottees, or a federation of the same, under the laws applicable.”

49. It is noted from the material placed on record that the Complainant was unable to make the full and final payment towards the sale consideration due to the delay in obtaining CF NOC which led to a delay in home loan disbursement. This proves that the Complainant had only made part payment of the entire sale consideration.

50. With regard to the subsequent relief sought by the Complainant in respect of the alleged referral bonus, the same arises out of a purported promotional assurance, and does not emanate from the Agreement for Sale or the Sale Deed. Such claims, fall outside the purview of this Authority.

51. Insofar as the reliefs sought by the Complainant towards claim for compensation, this Authority, notes that jurisdiction for adjudicating compensation lies with the Adjudicating Officer under Section 71 of RE(R&D) Act in Form 'N'. Accordingly, the Complainant is directed to file a separate application in Form 'N' for adjudication of the aforesaid compensation claims, in accordance with the RE(R&D) Act, 2016. The Complainant is at liberty to pursue such remedy separately.

52. Accordingly, this Authority hereby cautions the Respondent promoter that any further default, non-compliance, or failure to complete the project and deliver possession in a habitable condition within the stipulated timelines, or any fresh grievances brought to the notice of the Authority by the allottee, shall attract Section 63 of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016.

53. It is clarified that mere execution of the Sale deed shall not be construed as fulfilment of the promoter's obligations under the RE(R&D) Act. The Respondent is hereby directed to complete the subject unit in all respects, strictly in accordance with the sanctioned plans and approvals, ensure that the unit is in a fully habitable and liveable condition and handover lawful and complete possession to the Complainant within 30 days from the date of the order.

VII. Directions of the Authority

54. In light of the discussions and findings made hereinabove, this Authority, vide its powers under Sections 37 and 38, issues the following directions to the Respondent:

- a. The Respondent is hereby directed to complete the subject unit in all respects, strictly in accordance with the sanctioned plans and approvals, ensure that the unit is in a fully habitable and liveable condition and handover lawful and complete possession to the Complainant within 30 days from the date of the order.
- b. The delay charges imposed by the Respondent upon the Complainant is hereby waived off in its entirety, as already discussed and determined by this Authority. The Respondent is directed to give full effect to this waiver and ensure that no such charges are levied or recovered from the Complainant in respect of the Scheduled property.
- c. Insofar as compensation is concerned, the Complainant is at liberty to pursue appropriate proceedings before the Learned Adjudicating Officer under “Form N”.
- d. The Complaint is accordingly allowed, in terms of the above directions.
- e. Failure to comply with above said directions by the Respondent shall attract penalty in accordance with Section 63 of the RE(R&D) Act, 2016.

55. As a result, the Complaint is disposed of accordingly. 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

Sd/-
Dr. N. Satyanarayana, IAS (Retd.),
Hon’ble Chairperson,
TG RERA