

**IN THE KARNATAKA REAL ESTATE APPELATE TRIBUNAL, BENGALURU**

**DATED THIS THE 24<sup>th</sup> DAY OF MARCH, 2021**

**PRESENT**

**HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE B SREENIVASE GOWDA, CHAIRMAN**

**AND**

**HON'BLE SRI K P DINESH, JUDICIAL MEMBER**

**AND**

**HON'BLE SRI P S SOMASHEKAR, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER**

**APPEAL (K-REAT) NO. 291/2020**

**BETWEEN:**

1. Mr. Chikkamunireddy,  
S/o Late Venkatareddy,  
Aged about 63 years.
2. Mr Puroshotham,  
S/o Chikkamunireddy,  
Aged about 39 years.
3. Master Bhavishk P Reddy,  
S/o Puroshotham,  
Aged about 8 years (minor in Age)  
Represented by his father  
Father as natural guardian
4. Mrs Kalpana,  
D/o Chikkamunireddy,  
Aged about 35 years.
5. Mrs Aruna,  
D/o Chikkamunireddy,  
Aged about 33 years.
6. Mrs Lakshmamma,  
W/o Late Munishamireddy,  
Aged about 60 years.

7. Mr Venugopal,  
S/o Late Munishamireddy,  
Aged about 41 years.
8. Master Kumar V,  
S/o Venugopal,  
Aged about 9 years (minor in Age)  
Represented by his father as natural guardian  
Mr Venugopal
9. Miss Priyanka V  
D/o Mr Venugopal  
Aged about 12 years (minor in Age)  
Represented by her father as natural guardian  
Mr Venugopal
10. Mrs Kalavathi,  
D/o Late Muniswamyireddy,  
Aged about 36 years.
11. Mrs Papamma,  
W/o Late Munireddy,  
Aged about 63 years.
12. Mrs Kavitha,  
D/o Late Munireddy,  
Aged about 40 years
13. Mr Anilkumar,  
S/o Late Munireddy,  
Aged about 34 years
14. Miss Neha  
D/o Anilkumar  
Aged about 7years (minor in Age)  
Represented by her father as natural guardian  
Mr Anilkumar

All residing at  
Iggaluru Village,  
Chandapura All post,  
Attibele hobli, Anekal Taluk,  
Bengaluru urban District – 560 081

Nos 1 to 6 & 8 to 14 are  
Represented by their  
Power of Attorney Holder  
(i.e., 7<sup>th</sup> Appellant) namely

Mr. Venugopal  
Aged about 41 years,  
Son of Late Muniswamy Reddy,  
Residing at Iggaluru village,  
Attibele Hobli, Anekal Taluk,  
Bangalore Urban District – 560 081

**:APPELLANTS**

(By Sri G T Yathisha for M/s Raj & Raj Associates, Advocate)

**AND**

1. The Adjudicating officer,  
Karnataka Real Estate Regulatory Authority,  
2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, Silver Jubilee Block,  
CSI Compound,  
Bengaluru – 560 027
2. Mr Ravikumar Madhappan,  
Major in Age  
Residing at No. 72/1, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor,  
J J Nivas, 11<sup>th</sup> Cross, 1<sup>st</sup> Main,  
Pai Layput,  
Bangalore – 560 106
3. M/s Sweta and Gita Constructions  
India Private Limited  
A Company incorporated  
Under the provisions of the Companies  
Act of 1956

Having its registered office  
Site/Sy. No.132, Iggaluru village,  
Attibele Hobli, Anekal Taluk,  
Bangalore Urban District – 560 081

Represented by its Director  
& Authorized signatory

Mr. Anand Marthand Purohit  
Aged about 40 years

**:RESPONDENTS**

(R1- RERA, served-unrepresented)

(Sri M D Alavandar, Advocate for R2)

(Sri Anand Marthand Purohit, Director for R3)

This Appeal is filed under Section 44 of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016, before this Tribunal to set aside the order dated 02<sup>nd</sup> January, 2019 in CMP/181003/0001353 passed by the Adjudicating Officer, RERA Respondent No. 1.

This appeal coming on for hearing this day, the Chairman, delivered the following:

### **JUDGMENT**

The appellants, who are the owners of the land and who have entered into a Joint Development Agreement with the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent/promoter, have preferred this Appeal challenging the impugned order dated 02.01.2019 passed in Complaint No. CMP/181003/0001353 by learned Adjudicating Officer, wherein the learned A.O., allowed the Complaint filed by respondent Nos.1 and 2 and directed the promoter to return the amount of the allottees with interest and further directed the promoter to discharge the loan availed by the allottees for the purpose of acquiring an Apartment.

2. Today, a memo signed by appellant No.7 for himself and for and on behalf of other appellants as their GPA holder and the learned Counsel appearing for the appellants, is filed, praying permission/liberty of this

Tribunal to withdraw the Appeal, with liberty to approach an appropriate Forum for redressal of their grievances.

3. The memo is placed on record.

4. In view of the above, following

**ORDER**

- (1) Appeal is dismissed as withdrawn.
- (2) It is needless to say that it is always open for the appellants to approach appropriate Forum for redressal of their grievances, if they are entitled to do so under law.
- (3) In view of dismissal of the Appeal as withdrawn, pending IAs., if any, are rejected, as they do not survive for consideration.
- (4) The Office, while issuing a copy of the order, shall also issue the copy of memo for withdrawal filed by the appellants along with the order.
- (5) Registry is hereby directed to comply provisions of Section 44(4) of the RERA Act to return the records of RERA, if received.

**Sd/-  
HON'BLE CHAIRMAN**

**Sd/-  
HON'BLE JUDICIAL MEMBER**

**Sd/-  
HON'BLE ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER**