

BEFORE THE MAHARASHTRA

REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY, MUMBAI

Hearing held through Hybrid Mode

REGULATORY CASE NO. 448 OF 2025

TATA HOUSING DEVELOPMENT COMPANY ... APPLICANT (PROMOTER)
LIMITED

AVEZA PHASE 1 ...PROJECT NAME

MAHARERA PROJECT REGISTRATION NO. P51900007527

ORDER

September 07, 2026

(Date of hearing -24.04.2026, matter reserved for order)

Coram: Ravindra Deshpande, Member-II, MahaRERA

Advocate Parth Chande is present for the applicant promoter.

Mr. Prakash Hartalkar is present for the objector, allottee.

1. The applicant promoter herein has registered the project namely "Aveza Phase 1" under section 5 of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016 ("Act") of Real Estate Regulatory Authority ("RERA") bearing MAHARERA Registration No. P51900007527 (hereinafter referred to as the "project"). As per the project webpage, the proposed date of completion (PCD) of the project is 30.12.2023 and the revised date of completion (RCD) of the project is 29.12.2024. The project has lapsed. The applicant promoter had earlier filed an extension application bearing No. EXT51800024990 dated 08.11.2024, seeking extension of the project registration up to 31.10.2031 without the consent of the allottees, on the grounds more specifically set out therein. The said application was listed and heard before the Authority on 16.05.2025, wherein the following roznama was recorded. The said application was thereafter closed in terms of Order No. 65/2026 dated 23.02.2026.

"Advocate Parth Chande appeared for the applicant.

1.Heard the learned Advocate for the applicant. It is submitted that the project has not yet received the Environment Clearance Certificate as per the revised plans.

2. *The learned Advocate further submits that the promoter has already settled approximately 100 allottees by providing them with refund and compensation. However, one allottee is not agreeable to any of the settlement terms offered by the promoter and insists on continuing in the project without opting for an exit.*
3. *The proper legal course of action would be to proceed with the deregistration of the project and subsequently apply for fresh registration once all statutory clearances and permissions are in place.*
4. *The learned Advocate for the promoter assures that he will consult his client and explore the option of settling the matter, including the route of deregistration.*
5. *The matter is adjourned. The next date of the hearing shall be fixed upon filing of an application by the promoter seeking further hearing."*

2. Vide application dated 15.10.2025, the applicant promoter sought deregistration of the project. Upon receipt of the application, the Authority issued a notice dated 17.10.2025 inviting objections from the stakeholders within 30 days. No objections were received in response to the said notice within the stipulated period. However, during the hearing dated 06.03.2026, upon the applicant promoter informing the Authority that Mr. Uddhavsingh Rajput was the sole remaining allottee in the project, the Authority found necessary to hear the unsettled allottee and directed to issue notice in the present proceedings. Thereafter, Mr. Prakash Hartalkar on behalf of the allottee remained present on 27.03.2026 and 24.04.2026 before the Authority, filed his objections opposing the application for deregistration, and the matter was heard after affording both parties an opportunity of being heard. The regulatory case was finally heard on 24.04.2026, whereupon the following roznama was recorded:

"Today, Advocate, Mr. Parth Chande, present for the Promoter, and Mr. Prakash Hartalkar, present for the objector Allottee.

The objector uploaded objection which was received on 27.03.2026 and revised objection was received on 20.04.2026. Adv. Parth Chande appearing for Applicant Promoter submitted that he has uploaded reply to the objection and sent the same through email on 15.04.2026. It is further submitted that the Promoter is not willing to give reply to the revised objection which was received by this Authority on 20.04.2026. It is submitted that revised objection submitted by objector/Allottee may not be recorded. At the same time, it was submitted that he may be permitted to upload written arguments regarding revised objection.

It is submitted that De-registration is asked due to Environmental Clearance (EC). Initial EC was granted on 19.09.2009 and it was valid upto March 2023. The project

was registered with MahaRERA on 17.08.2017. The Promoter entered into Agreement for Sale with objector was entered on 02.11.2017. Similarly, other agreements also were executed were cancelled. By September 2021, the Promoter had realised that there will be issues with the revalidation of EC and on 29.09.2021, the Promoter had communicated the objector via email regarding the cancellation of booking of objector. In January 2022, the Promoter offered refund to the Complainant and on 29.03.2022, formal cancellation letter was issued.

In November 2024, the Promoter had applied for RERA extension, and the objector did not consent for the same and subsequently, Hon'ble Chairperson, MahaRERA recorded in the Roznama dated 16.05.2025 that viable option would be de-registration. The Ministry of

Environment and Forest (MOEF) issued an Office Memorandum. Based on the same, the Promoter was required to apply for revalidation of EC. This Office Memorandum was stayed by Hon'ble Supreme Court on 02.03.2024 and subsequently it was struck down on 16.05.2025. Review Application is pending. Promoter does not have EC as on today. Therefore, De-registration Application is filed. The Promoter is relying upon two MahaRERA cases, in which, it is held that allottees consent is not mandatory provided interest of allottees are protected by way of depositing the refund amount in a Fixed Deposit and the Promoter is willing to deposit refund amount alongwith interest as per MahaRERA Rules. Hence, De-registration Application may be allowed. Promoter is going to upload a detailed Written Arguments.

Adv. for objector submitted that Appeal is pending before Appellate Tribunal and the same has not been stated. Allottee wants to continue with his booking. EC clearance stays has been recalled by Hon'ble Supreme Court on 18.11.2025. As of now, there is no roadblock for proceeding with construction. The Promoter is forcefully making the objector withdraw from the project. The Promoter internally settled with Richa Realtors and they have recovered 90 Crore Rupees for the liabilities of delay. Adv. Chande submitted that he has mentioned with regards to pending Appeal before the Appellate Tribunal and that no judgment is placed on record recalling Supreme Court Order dated 16.05.2025.

The objector requested that the present proceedings be stayed till the Appeal pending before the Appellate Tribunal is finally decided.

The parties are directed to file their written arguments till 12.05.2026 and thereafter matter is reserved for order."

3. The applicant promoter has made the following submissions for seeking deregistration of the project:

- a. The applicant promoter submitted that the objections filed by the objector is misconceived, devoid of merit and intended only to delay the adjudication

of the application for deregistration. It was contended that the applicant promoter has acted bona fide throughout and has made full disclosure of all material facts before the Authority.

- b. It was submitted that the project "*AVEZA PHASE 1*" was registered with MahaRERA on 17.08.2017. The objector executed an agreement for sale dated 22.11.2017 for Flat No. A-1802 for a total consideration of Rs. 2,19,50,404/-, out of which they paid Rs. 97,67,931/-. The applicant promoter submitted that due to supervening regulatory changes, environmental clearance issues, judicial pronouncements and uncertainty in obtaining statutory approvals, continuation of the project became impracticable. Accordingly, an application for extension of the project registration was filed on 08.11.2024, followed by a letter dated 11.03.2025 seeking permission to proceed without the consent of allottees. It was further submitted that in the Roznama dated 16.05.2025, the Authority observed that the appropriate legal course would be to proceed with deregistration of the project and thereafter seek fresh registration upon obtaining the requisite statutory approvals. Pursuant thereto, the applicant promoter filed the present application for deregistration on 15.10.2025.
- c. The applicant promoter further submitted that all other allottees, except the present objector, had accepted refunds and exited the project. It was contended that the objector is the sole remaining allottee. The booking of the objector was cancelled by email dated 29.09.2021, reiterated by letter dated 29.03.2022, and refund cheques were issued on 25.01.2022. Thereafter, by email dated 26.09.2025, the applicant promoter again offered refund of Rs. 1,52,97,621/-, comprising the principal amount together with interest payable under the Act and the MahaRERA Rules. It was submitted that despite repeated efforts for amicable settlement, the objector through its advocate vide letter dated 11.12.2023 refused to accept the refund and simultaneously opposed both the extension and deregistration proceedings.
- d. The applicant promoter denied the allegation that it had suppressed material facts or falsely represented that there were no allottees. It was submitted that the Declaration-cum-Undertaking accompanying the deregistration application specifically disclosed that there was one remaining allottee and that the pending appeal before the Maharashtra Real Estate Appellate Tribunal arising from the order dated 07.01.2025 had also been disclosed. According to the applicant promoter, the appeal proceedings and the present deregistration proceedings operate in distinct fields and, therefore, the pendency of the appeal does not bar consideration of the present application.

- e. It was further submitted that deregistration would not prejudice the rights of the objector as the applicant promoter has consistently undertaken to refund the entire amount paid by them together with applicable interest and has expressed its willingness to secure the said amount by depositing it in a fixed deposit or by such other mechanism as may be directed by the Authority.
 - f. The applicant promoter further contended that the allegations regarding its intention to evade statutory obligations are baseless. It submitted that the inability to continue the project arose due to circumstances beyond its control, including regulatory changes, environmental clearance issues and judicial developments, and not due to any deliberate inaction or lack of intent. It was also submitted that newspaper reports relied upon by the objector are inadmissible in evidence and cannot form the basis of adjudication.
 - g. In support of the application, the applicant promoter relied upon the orders passed by Authority recognising its power to grant deregistration where the interests of allottees are adequately protected to contend that where completion of a project becomes impossible due to circumstances beyond the promoter's control, the promoter is entitled to refund the amounts received together with interest. It was therefore prayed that the objections be rejected and the application for deregistration of the project be allowed.
4. The objector, Mr. Uddhavsingh Rajput has made the following submissions with respect to the deregistration of the project:
- a. The objector submitted that the application for deregistration is liable to be rejected as the applicant promoter has suppressed material facts. It was contended that although the applicant promoter declared that no proceedings were pending except one complaint, Appeal No. AT06/00171/2025 arising from the order dated 07.01.2025 in Complaint No. CC006000000251361 is pending before the Maharashtra Real Estate Appellate Tribunal. According to the objector, permitting deregistration during the pendency of the appeal would prejudice the appellate proceedings and render the relief sought therein ineffective.
 - b. The objector submitted that he has paid an aggregate amount of Rs. 1,12,44,881/- towards the purchase of Flat No. A-1802 under the agreement for sale dated 22.11.2017, wherein possession was agreed to be handed over by December 2022. It was contended that the promoter has failed to honour its contractual and statutory obligations despite substantial payments having been made.

- c. The objector further contended that the applicant promoter cannot rely upon environmental clearance issues or legal impossibility to justify deregistration. It was submitted that the subsequent judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court dated 18.11.2025 in the review proceedings relating to the Vanashakti matter recalled the earlier restrictions on post facto environmental clearances, thereby removing the legal impediment relied upon by the applicant promoter. According to the objector, any delay in obtaining statutory approvals is attributable to the applicant promoter's own inaction and cannot constitute a valid ground for avoiding its obligations.
- d. It was further submitted that the applicant promoter had recovered substantial compensation from its development partner in relation to the project delays and, therefore, cannot simultaneously plead hardship or unforeseen circumstances to deny the objector the benefits available under the Act.
- e. The objector contended that under the proviso to Section 18(1) of the Act, an allottee who does not intend to withdraw from the project is entitled to interest for every month of delay until possession is handed over. It was submitted that the decision whether to continue in or withdraw from the project rests solely with the allottee and that the applicant promoter cannot unilaterally cancel the allotment or compel acceptance of a refund. According to the objector, the agreement for sale can be terminated only by a registered deed of cancellation or by an order of a competent court.
- f. The objector further submitted that the project is physically capable of completion. It was pointed out that the applicant promoter's own documents disclose substantial construction progress, with Wing B being approximately 39.54% complete and Wings A and C approximately 30% complete. It was argued that deregistration is being sought not because completion is impossible but to avoid existing contractual liabilities and facilitate a fresh launch of the project at higher market prices.
- g. The objector also alleged that the applicant promoter has taken inconsistent positions during different proceedings. It was submitted that while seeking extension of the project registration, the applicant promoter had expressed its intention to complete the project, whereas it subsequently sought deregistration by claiming that continuation of the project was no longer feasible. According to the objector, such contradictory stands undermine the credibility of the application.
- h. The objector further contended that reliance placed by the applicant promoter on the settlement of other allottees is irrelevant, as the statutory rights of the remaining allottee cannot be defeated merely because a majority of allottees have accepted refunds. It was also alleged that attempts were

made by representatives of the applicant promoter to compel the objector to withdraw from the project by threatening transfer of the deposited amount to a suspense or escrow account.

- i. Lastly, the objector submitted that he continues to be interested in obtaining possession of the subject flat and claimed delayed possession interest on the amount of Rs. 1,12,44,881/- from January 2023 till delivery of possession, together with continuing monthly interest in accordance with the provisions of the Act. In the alternative, the objector expressed willingness to consider the applicant promoter's earlier proposal of allotment of an alternate flat in the Tata Serein project at no additional cost.

5. Before moving ahead, the following observations are noteworthy:

- a. The applicant promoter has sought deregistration primarily on the ground that the project cannot presently be proceeded with on account of the requisite statutory approvals, particularly the Environmental Clearance ("EC"). It is the case of the applicant promoter that the project was originally conceived in 2010 and has thereafter undergone changes in FSI, rehabilitation requirements, arrangements with the joint venture partner and applicable planning regulations, necessitating corresponding changes in the development proposal. The applicant promoter has further submitted that the EC originally granted on 19.09.2009 was valid upto March 2023 and that the project has thereafter not been able to proceed in the absence of a valid EC.
- b. The Authority has also taken note of the subsequent developments in the proceedings before the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Vanashakti v. Union of India*. The judgment dated 16.05.2025 was subsequently recalled by the Hon'ble Supreme Court vide judgment dated 18.11.2025 in the review proceedings. Thereafter, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has further considered the validity and operation of the regulatory framework concerning environmental clearance. The Authority, however, is not required in the present proceedings to adjudicate upon the entitlement of the applicant promoter to obtain EC or to examine the environmental approval process, which falls within the jurisdiction of the competent statutory authorities. It is sufficient to note that, as on date, the applicant promoter does not have a valid EC for the project and the requisite statutory approval for undertaking further construction has not been demonstrated on record.
- c. It is observed that the project namely "Aveza Phase 2", bearing MahaRERA Registration No. P51900007740 and CTS Nos. 1320 A PT/1320/A/21/1 to 4 and 1320/A/22 to 33, has been deregistered vide Order dated 04.03.2026, for

the reasons recorded therein. It is further observed that the project namely “Aveza Phase 1”, bearing MahaRERA Registration No. P51900007527, pertains to the same CTS Nos. 1320 A PT/1320/A/21/1 to 4 and 1320/A/22 to 33. Thus, although “Aveza Phase 1” and “Aveza Phase 2” are separately registered projects bearing distinct MahaRERA Registration Nos., both projects form part of the same larger layout and relate to the same land. The deregistration of “Aveza Phase 2” is therefore relevant while considering the present proceedings pertaining to “Aveza Phase 1”.

- d. It is observed that, as on 31.03.2025, the physical progress of the project was approximately 27% for Wing A, 39% for Wing B, and 34% for Wing C.
- e. It is observed that three complaints have been registered in respect of the project. The status of the said complaints is as follows:

SR. NO.	COMPLAINANT NO.	COMPLAINANT NAME	ORDER DATE	APPEAL	APPEAL STATUS
1.	CC006000000057247	Ratul Lahiri	20.05.2019	NA	
2.	CC006000000057308	Shikha Singh	28.08.2019	AT0060000000052631/20	Appeal withdrawn vide order dated 22.02.2021
3.	CC006000000251361	Uddhavsingh Rajput	07.01.2025	AT06/00171/2025 AND AT06/00392/2026 is filed on 05.03.2026	Order dated 14.11.2025 in Misc. Application No. 1098 of 2025 (Recalling and setting aside) in Appeal No. AT06/00-171/2025

- f. It is further observed that the complaint proceedings in respect of the project are not uniformly pending. The first complaint, filed by Ratul Lahiri, was disposed of vide Order dated 20.05.2019. The second complaint, filed by Shikha Singh, was disposed of vide Order dated 28.08.2019, and the appeal arising therefrom was subsequently withdrawn vide order dated 22.02.2021. The third complaint, filed by Mr. Uddhavsingh Rajput, who is stated to be the sole remaining allottee in the project, was disposed of vide Order dated 07.01.2025; however, proceedings arising therefrom are presently pending before the Appellate Tribunal, as reflected above.
- g. Further, it is observed from the disclosure of sold and unsold inventory as on 31.03.2025 that only one unit, i.e. Unit No. A-1802, is reflected as sold in the

project. The said unit is the unit allotted to the Objector, Mr. Uddhavsingh Rajput. Further, the applicant promoter along with the deregistration application has filed "Declaration-cum-undertaking" dated 11.10.2025 stating that the project has only one allottee and that the rights of all other allottees have been fully settled.

6. In view of the observations, submissions made by the applicant promoter and the allottee, the issue that needs consideration is *whether the application filed by the applicant promoter for deregistration of the project bearing MahaRERA Registration No. P51900007527 is maintainable?*
7. Before the Authority decides on the order on deregistration, the section that provides for grant of registration needs to be examined. Section 5 of the said Act is hereinbelow reproduced for ease of reference:

"Section 5 – grant of registration:

(1) On receipt of the application under sub-section (1) of section 4, the Authority shall within a period of thirty days. (a) grant registration subject to the provisions of this Act and the rules and regulations made thereunder, and provide a registration number, including a Login Id and password to the applicant for accessing the website of the Authority and to create his web page and to fill therein the details of the proposed project; or (b) reject the application for reasons to be recorded in writing, if such application does not conform to the provisions of this Act or the rules or regulations made thereunder: Provided that no application shall be rejected unless the applicant has been given an opportunity of being heard in the matter.

(2) If the Authority fails to grant the registration or reject the application, as the case may be, as provided under sub-section (1), the project shall be deemed to have been registered, and the Authority shall within a period of seven days of the expiry of the said period of thirty days specified under sub-section (1), provide a registration number and a Login Id and password to the promoter for accessing the website of the Authority and to create his web page and to fill therein the details of the proposed project.

(3) The registration granted under this section shall be valid for a period declared by the promoter under sub-clause (C) of clause (1) of sub-section (2) of section 4 for completion of the project or phase thereof, as the case may be."

8. On perusal of section 5 it is clear that a project registration is granted pursuant to the promoter seeking a grant of registration. A grant for registration when sought under section 5 is an acknowledgment of the intent of the promoter to start and complete a project wherein premises as described under the said Act would be handed over to the allottees. Thus, the critical ingredient of section 5 is the intent of the promoter to complete as a project in the manner envisaged under the said registration. A registration number has been provided so as to ensure that from the point the project starts namely on receipt of commencement certificate to the point when the project concludes namely on receipt of occupation/completion certification, the project remains compliant. This is the intent of RERA, and this intent is clearly brought about in the preamble of the said Act which is reproduced hereinbelow:

“An Act to establish the Real Estate Regulatory Authority for regulation and promotion of the real estate sector and to ensure sale of plot, apartment or building, as the case may be, or sale of real estate project, in an efficient and transparent manner and to protect the interest of consumers in the real estate sector and to establish an adjudicating mechanism for speedy dispute redressal and also to establish the Appellate Tribunal to hear appeals from the decisions, directions or orders of the Real Estate Regulatory Authority and the adjudicating officer and for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto.”

9. On perusal of the preamble, it is evident that the intent is to ensure the sale of plot, apartment, etc. in an efficient and transparent manner and to protect the interest of the consumers. The intent thus mandates the Authority to ensure that the project remains compliant and the home buyers/allottees receive their premises. Hence the legislation is to ensure delivery of the premises to the home buyers/allottees. This is a beneficial legislation where a tangible asset needs to move from the promoter/developer to the home buyer/allottee in a manner as laid out under the Act. The legislation is not for providing project registration numbers which do not lead to home buyers/allottees receiving tangible assets as envisaged under the said project registration. The Authority needs to make it clear here that a project registration number once given to a project, the project must then proceed and take a course as defined in the said Act and finally

tangible premises get delivered to the home buyers/allottees. The grant of a project registration number is not a hypothetical exercise for complying with certain statistical purpose.

10. It can thus be concluded that in the event the Authority finds that a project registration number which has been granted to a project is not likely to be completed the Authority is bound to take cognizance of the same and take such actions as may be necessary to bring the project to a conclusion. As the Authority is mandated to exercise oversight once a project registration number is given till the date it is successfully completed, it is also for the Authority to take a call when it becomes apparent that the project is not likely to move further.
11. In the present case, the material on record demonstrates that the applicant promoter has not been able to proceed with the project for a considerable period and that the project presently does not have a valid EC. The project was registered on 17.08.2017, whereas the EC relied upon by the applicant promoter was valid only upto March 2023. The applicant promoter has placed on record the circumstances which, according to it, have prevented the revalidation/obtaining of the requisite EC, including changes in the development proposal and the intervening regulatory and judicial developments. The Authority is not required, in this deregistration proceedings, to adjudicate upon the correctness or otherwise of the environmental approval process or to substitute itself for the competent environmental authority. What is relevant for the present proceedings is that, as on date, the applicant promoter has not demonstrated that the requisite EC has been obtained or that there exists a presently ascertainable and immediate basis on which the project can resume construction and proceed towards completion under the existing registration. The physical progress of the project, though substantial to some extent, cannot by itself dispense with the requirement of the requisite statutory approvals.

12. The Authority has taken note of the “Declaration-cum-undertaking” dated 11.10.2025 filed by the applicant promoter along with the deregistration application, wherein it has been stated that the project has only one allottee and that the rights of all other allottees have been fully settled. Accordingly, Mr. Uddhavsingh Rajput is the sole remaining allottee whose rights are presently unsettled. The material placed on record further indicates that the other allottees have exited the project upon settlement/refund. Thus, the present case is not one where a large body of allottees is awaiting delivery of their respective premises under a project which is otherwise capable of immediate progression. At the same time, the Authority is conscious that the rights of the sole remaining allottee cannot be defeated merely by permitting deregistration.
13. The Authority is therefore required to balance the regulatory purpose of continuation of the project registration with the protection of the rights and interests of the sole remaining allottee. The Authority further takes note that the project namely “Aveza Phase 2”, bearing MahaRERA Registration No. P51900007740 and relating to the same land forming part of the larger layout, has already been deregistered vide Order dated 04.03.2026. Although the two projects are separately registered, the fact that both form part of the same larger layout and relate to the same underlying land is a relevant circumstance while considering whether continuation of the present registration would serve a meaningful regulatory purpose. The Authority is, however, not proceeding merely on the basis of the deregistration of “Aveza Phase 2”. The present application is being considered independently on the basis of the project’s present status, the absence of a valid EC, the uncertainty regarding the timeline for obtaining the requisite statutory approvals, the extent of construction already undertaken, the status of the sold inventory and, most importantly, the manner in which the rights of the sole remaining allottee are proposed to be protected.
14. In these circumstances, the Authority is satisfied that the applicant promoter has demonstrated that the project, in its presently registered form, cannot presently

be proceeded with within any reasonably ascertainable timeframe. Continuation of the existing registration, in circumstances where the requisite statutory approval has not been obtained and there is no demonstrated immediate prospect of resumption and completion of the project, would not by itself advance the object of the Act. The Authority is also of the view that deregistration cannot, however, operate to extinguish or prejudice any accrued rights of the sole remaining allottee. Accordingly, deregistration can be considered only upon ensuring that the financial and other rights of the said allottee arising from the existing allotment are duly protected in accordance with law. The applicant promoter has expressly undertaken to refund the amount received from the allottee together with applicable interest and has expressed its willingness to secure such amount in the manner directed by the Authority.

15. The Authority has also considered the objection of the allottee that the appeal arising out of the Order dated 07.01.2025 is pending before the Appellate Tribunal and that deregistration during the pendency of the said appeal would prejudice the appellate proceedings. The Authority notes that the pendency of the said appeal has been disclosed by the applicant promoter and has been taken into consideration while considering the present application. The present proceedings are confined to the question of continuation of the project registration under the Act and do not constitute an adjudication upon the correctness of the Order dated 07.01.2025 or upon the merits of the pending appellate proceedings. The deregistration of the project shall not be construed as extinguishing, prejudicing or otherwise affecting any right or claim of the allottee available to him in law. Any right or relief arising from the Order dated 07.01.2025 or the pending appeal shall remain subject to the final orders that may be passed by the Appellate Tribunal in accordance with law.

16. The Authority is satisfied that, in the present circumstances, continuation of the project registration does not serve the regulatory purpose of the Act, particularly when the project presently lacks the requisite statutory approval for further

construction and there is no reasonably ascertainable timeframe for its resumption and completion. In view thereof, and subject to the applicant promoter first complying with the directions as set out hereinbelow, the Authority is satisfied that continuation of the existing MahaRERA project registration bearing no. P51900007527 does not serve any meaningful regulatory purpose and that the **application for deregistration is maintainable and deserves to be allowed**. The Authority answers the issue at **paragraph no. 6** in the **affirmative**.

O R D E R

17. In view of the foregoing, **the application for deregistration of the project bearing MahaRERA Registration No. P51900007527 is allowed**, subject to the applicant promoter complying with the following conditions and directions:

- a. The applicant promoter shall, in the first instance, refund to the sole remaining allottee, Mr. Uddhavsingh Rajput, the amount actually received from him towards the subject unit, together with interest thereon calculated at the rate prescribed under Rule 18 of the Maharashtra Real Estate (Regulation and Development) (Registration of Real Estate projects, Registration of Real Estate Agents, Rate of Interest and Disclosures on Website) Rules, 2017, from the respective dates of payment till the date of actual refund.
- b. The applicant promoter shall file an Affidavit of Indemnity/Indemnity Bond before the Director of Compliance, MahaRERA, undertaking that, notwithstanding the deregistration of the project, it shall remain liable, at its own cost, to discharge and make good any monetary or other liability that may arise towards the present allottee or any other allottee who has previously settled his/her claims in respect of the project, pursuant to any final order or direction passed by any Court of law, the Maharashtra Real Estate Appellate Tribunal or any other competent forum in any proceedings relating to the project, the allotment, the amounts paid by the allottees or the settlement/refund thereof. Such undertaking shall not affect or prejudice any right or remedy otherwise available to the concerned allottees in accordance with law.
- c. The applicant promoter shall comply with the aforesaid directions within 30 days from the date of this Order and shall submit the Affidavit of

Indemnity/Indemnity Bond and proof of refund along with all supporting documents to the Director of Compliance, MahaRERA.

- d. Upon receipt of the aforesaid documents, the Director of Compliance, MahaRERA shall verify the same and, upon being satisfied that the conditions and directions contained in this Order have been duly complied with, shall process the deregistration of the project.
- e. Subject to satisfactory compliance with the aforesaid conditions and directions, the project bearing MahaRERA Registration No. P51900007527 shall stand deregistered upon expiry of 30 days from the date of this Order.
- f. The applicant promoter shall not, pursuant to or by relying upon the present deregistration, advertise, market, book, sell, offer for sale or invite any person to purchase, in any manner whatsoever, any apartment/unit forming part of the Project under the aforesaid MahaRERA Registration No. P51900007527.
- g. Any future development, redevelopment or fresh launch in respect of the project shall be subject to obtaining all requisite statutory approvals, including environmental clearance, wherever applicable, and compliance with the provisions of the Act, the Rules and Regulations made thereunder and all other applicable laws.
- h. In the event of non-compliance with any of the conditions or directions contained in this Order, the benefit of deregistration granted herein shall not take effect, without prejudice to any further action that may be taken by the Authority in accordance with law.

**RAVINDRA
PADMAKARA
O DESHPANDE**
Digitally signed by
RAVINDRA PADMAKARAO
DESHPANDE
Date: 2026.09.07 14:26:48
+05'30'
**Kavindra Deshpande
Member-II, MahaRERA**

Date : 07.09.2026