

BEFORE TELANGANA REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY

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

Complaint No. 489 of 2025

Dated: 28th 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

Pindikura Ravindra
VILLA 22, Neelima greens,
Near Pragati Enclave,
Miyapur, Hyderabad, Telangana - 500049

...Complainant

AND

Vianna Homes Pvt. Ltd, represented by its Managing Partner, Shri. Anji Reddy
Annapureddy
Plot No. 3 & 53, Radhika Reddy Arcade,
Jayabheri Pine Valley, Gachibowli,
Hyderabad- 500032.

...Respondent

The present matter filed by the Complainant mentioned herein-above came up for hearing on 11.09.2025 before this Authority in the presence of the Complainant, and the Respondent's Counsel AD Legal firm. 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 that the Complainants, after meeting the company directors, namely Mr. Anji Reddy and Mr. Lenin Reddy, had purchased a unit in the *Poojitha Tech Park Project* which had received HMDA and RERA approvals. It was further submitted that the said directors had committed to completing the entire project by February 2024, including the grace period.

4. It was submitted that the company directors had insisted on making the total payment upfront for construction activities rather than on a slab-wise basis and had executed the

10. It was further submitted by the Respondent that, in furtherance of its commercial portfolio, it launched a commercial project titled “Poojitha Tech Park”, situated in Survey Nos. 89/A1 and 89/A2, Kokapet Village, Narsingi Municipality, Ranga Reddy District. In this regard, an application dated 14.02.2020 was submitted before the Hyderabad Metropolitan Development Authority (HMDA) seeking approval for construction of an IT Office Building comprising 2 Cellars + Stilt + 11 Upper Floors over an extent of 9,069.22 sq. mts. It was submitted that HMDA, vide communication dated 10.09.2020, confirmed that the proposal was under process under Section 19 of the HMDA Act, 2008.

11. It was further submitted that, after detailed scrutiny, the HMDA accorded technical approval and issued a Commencement Certificate on 27.01.2021, permitting construction as per the sanctioned plan.

12. It was submitted that the Respondent subsequently applied for RERA registration under the provisions of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016. After due verification, this Hon’ble Authority granted RERA Registration Certificate No. P02400002546 for the project “Poojitha Tech Park” on 15.02.2021.

13. It was submitted that on 03.05.2021, the Board of Directors of the Respondent Company passed a resolution authorizing Mr. Syamala Lenin Kumar Reddy, Manager (Sales), to execute Sale Deeds, sign Agreements, issue Receipts, and undertake registration formalities on behalf of the Company, including for the sale of Unit No. 15 on the 8th Floor admeasuring 1000 sq. ft. in favour of Sri. Pindikura Ravindra.

14. It was submitted that the Complainant became aware of the project only three months after RERA registration and voluntarily approached the Respondent expressing interest in investing in the said commercial project, based solely on the Respondent’s market reputation and the statutory approvals available in the public domain.

15. It was further submitted that a registered Sale Deed dated 05.05.2021 (Document No. 7162/2021) was executed between the parties, whereby the Complainant purchased Unit No. 15 on the 8th Floor, having a total saleable area of 1000 sq. ft. in the said project.

16. It was submitted that the sale transaction was completed in good faith, and the total sale consideration of ₹40,00,000 was received in slab-wise instalments and not as an upfront payment as alleged. The same is reflected in the Sale Deed and corresponding receipts.

utilized solely for the development of Poojitha Tech Park, and that no other pre-launch projects exist.

23. It was submitted that the Complainant is not entitled to any relief, as no cause of action arises. The project is duly registered under RERA, and all monitoring powers rest with this Hon'ble Authority under Sections 34(a) and (b) of the Act. Hence, any request for separate investigation is unnecessary. The Respondent contended that the Complainant's reliance on the Agreement of Sale is untenable, as the registered Sale Deed is the binding document.

24. It was further submitted that the claim for compensation at ₹100 per sq. ft. per month is arbitrary, excessive, and not supported by Section 18(1)(b) of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016. The Respondent stated that, without prejudice, it is willing to provide compensation strictly as per the Act and the Telangana RERA Rules, if so directed by the Hon'ble Authority. It was also submitted that the claim for compensation is triable only by the Adjudicating Officer under Section 71, and hence the present complaint is not maintainable before this Authority in its current form.

25. It was categorically submitted that the allegations of fund diversion and misappropriation are false, baseless, and malicious. All investments and payments have been duly accounted for and exclusively utilized for the project. The Respondent maintains transparent, verifiable financial records and is ready to produce them if required by the Hon'ble Authority. The request to appoint a specific individual for weekly updates was stated to be impractical and beyond the scope of the RERA framework. However, the Respondent assured that it continues to provide periodic project updates via official channels, including emails and photographic progress reports.

D. Rejoinder Filed by the Complainant

26. It was submitted by the Complainants that the Respondent had propagated and marketed the project titled "Poojitha Tech Park", in which the Complainants purchased a commercial unit admeasuring 1000 sq. ft., through a Registered Sale Deed dated 05.05.2021, bearing Document No. 7162 of 2021. It was submitted that the permissions and approvals obtained by the Respondent for the said project are borne out by record.

27. It was further submitted by the Complainants that the Respondent had duly obtained all necessary approvals and RERA registration prior to the sale, and that the Complainants had purchased the unit only after verifying all such records. However, despite obtaining all

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

- I. Whether the Complainant is entitled to the relief sought? If so, to what extent?

F. Observations of the Authority

33. Upon a careful examination of the pleadings, documents, and submissions placed on record by both the parties, this Authority observes that the principal grievance of the Complainant revolves around the alleged inordinate delay in completion and delivery of the commercial unit purchased by her in the project titled “Poojitha Tech Park.” It is the case of the Complainant that, despite assurances allegedly extended at the time of purchase and notwithstanding the fact that the Respondent had obtained the requisite statutory approvals and registration under the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016, the project has not been completed within the expected timeframe.

34. The Respondent, however, has refuted the said allegations and has primarily relied upon the registered Sale Deed to contend that no specific timeline for delivery of possession was contractually agreed upon between the parties.

35. With regard to the first relief sought by the Complainant, namely, a direction to investigate the reasons for the alleged delay in construction and to fix a revised timeline for completion of the project, this Authority notes that the project “Poojitha Tech Park” is duly registered with this Authority and that the RERA Registration No. P02400002546 is valid up to 27.01.2027, which is the declared and approved date of completion of the project. The said registration continues to remain in force and has not yet expired.

36. In the aforesaid circumstances, this Authority is of the considered view that, as on date, there exists no delay within the meaning of Section 18 of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016. The statutory period available to the Respondent for completion of the project has not lapsed, and the promoter is legally entitled to complete the project within the approved timeline as declared at the time of registration.

37. Consequently, this Authority finds no justification at this stage to direct any inspection, enquiry, or investigation into the alleged delay or to fix any revised timeline for completion. Accordingly, the first relief sought by the Complainant is declined. However, this shall be without prejudice to the Respondent’s continuing statutory obligation to complete the project

43. With regard to the third relief sought by the Complainant alleging fraud and diversion of funds, this Authority has carefully examined the pleadings and submissions placed on record.

44. The Complainant has alleged that the Respondent diverted the amounts collected from her and other allottees towards other pre-launch projects, thereby committing fraud. The Respondent has categorically denied the said allegations and has asserted that all amounts collected have been duly accounted for and utilised exclusively for the development of the project “Poojitha Tech Park.”

45. This Authority notes that the Complainant has failed to place on record any documentary material or prima facie evidence in support of the serious allegations of fraud or diversion of funds. No advertisements, marketing materials, booking documents, allotment letters, agreements of sale, or financial statements have been produced to enable this Authority to even prima facie examine the allegation of pre-launch activity or siphoning of funds. In the absence of any such material, this Authority finds no basis to call for information from the Respondent or to initiate any investigation on this aspect.

46. In view of the above, this Authority holds that the allegation of fraud raised by the Complainant cannot be examined or adjudicated in the present proceedings. The Complainant is at liberty to approach the appropriate competent authority or forum, in accordance with law, for redressal of such allegations.

47. Accordingly, the Complaint is dismissed. 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