



REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY, BIHAR
Before the Single Bench of Senior Land Revenue Officer, RERA, Bihar.

RERA/SM/749/2025

Authorised Representative of RERA	Complainant
	Vs	
M/s Shree Punya City Pvt Ltd	Respondent

Project: Dream Village

Present: For Complainant: Ojaswi Ishani
For Respondents: Mr. Raju Kumar, Adv

28.07.2025

ORDER

1. Hearing taken up. Learned legal representative Ojaswi Ishani appears on behalf of the RERA. Learned counsel Mr. Raju Kumar appears on behalf of the respondents.
2. A Suo Motu proceeding has been initiated against the promoter in respect of the project "Dream Village" on the basis of field inspection made by RERA Team in collaboration with District Administrations, Saran which is not registered with the Real Estate Regulatory Authority, Bihar as required under the provisions of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016. It is submitted by the Learned Counsel for Authority that a show cause notice dated 12.07.2025 has already been served upon the promoter. It has been further brought to the Authority's attention that the promoter is engaged in the development, advertisement, marketing, offering for sale, and selling of plots in the said project without registration, thereby acting in contravention of Section 3 of the Act.

3. In reply to the above show cause issued to the respondents, the measure thrust of the respondents was to take the plea that company has no direct or indirect involvement in the promotion, development, advertisement or sale of the said project, namely “Dream Village” and have no project of such name in the land situated in Rajapur Mauja, Sonapur of Saran district. That the name and reputation of the respondent have been wrongly associated with the aforesaid project by a third party.
4. In the matter at hand, the technical report accompanied by a geo-tagged photograph relating to the purported development project was duly placed on record. According to that report, the subject site is located in Sonpur Anchal, Mauza Rajapur, and comprises a plotted development of approximately 58,183.86 sqm. The project had been publicly advertised via a banner erected at the project site, bearing the project name “Dream Village.” Subsequent online investigation by the examining team revealed an associated advertisement displaying the same promoter name. Notably, however, no such advertisement is accessible at present.
5. Further, the Jamabandi records procured from the relevant administrative office identify the land in question as being registered under the name “Dream Village,” corresponding to Plot Nos. 1734 and 1757, under Khata Nos. 1402 and 1489, and measuring approximately 65 decimals. These records show the registered owner to be one Baleshwar Singh S/o Ranjit Singh. Consequently, based on the discrepancies in ownership and absence of any contemporaneous advertising link, no evidentiary nexus can be established between the respondent and the record-owner of the land.

6. Heard the parties.
7. The Authority has perused the materials placed on record and taken note of the submissions made by the parties.
8. Following a careful review of the material placed on record, it is manifest that no prima facie link or legal connection (nexus) has been demonstrated between the subject development project and the promoter's corporate entity, given that the advertisement from which the promoter's name had originally been drawn is no longer accessible or available for verification. Further the legal title to the land parcel in question is vested in a person distinct from the director of the promoter company, as evidenced by official land records.
9. Accordingly, it must be concluded that the evidence fails to establish any credible association or relationship between the promoter and the registered landowner. Absent corroborative documentary proof, such as contemporaneous promotional material linking the company to the property, no inferential chain exists to attribute beneficial or proprietary interest in the land to the promoter
10. Upon going through the records and considering the facts and circumstances, the case against the promoter for violation of Section 3 has not been established against them.

With these observations and directions, the matter is disposed of.

Sd/-
(Amarendra Shahi)
Senior Land Revenue Officer
RERA, Bihar