

**REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY, BIHAR**

**Before the Bench of Hon'ble Inquiry Commissioner, Mr. Sanjaya Kumar Singh, RERA, Bihar.**

**RERA/SM/667/2025**

Authorised Representative of RERA .... Complainant

Vs.

M/s Shubh Aprajita Constructions Private Limited ....Respondent

Project: **SHUBH APRAJITA APARTMENT**

Present: For Complainant: Mr. Abhinay Priyadarshi,

Legal Representative

For Respondents: None

**10.09.2025**

**ORDER**

1. Hearing taken up. Learned legal representative Mr. Abhinay Priyadarshi appears on behalf of the complainant-Authority. Respondents are absent.
2. Learned counsel for the complainant-Authority submits that in compliance of the previous order of this Court dated 04.08.2025, he is hereby submitting reply after due verification. He further submits that after verification of the documents, he found that there has been no evidence found on record to prove that the impugned project has been developed by the concerned respondents in violation of the provisions of Section 3 of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016. He also submits that on verification it has been found that the respondents have developed only three projects, namely, *Saptgiri Geeta* Apartment which was completed before 2016; *Shubh Pavitra* Apartment which was completed before 2009; and *Keshri Kunj* Apartment which was completed in 2011, as stated by the respondent and after verification it has been found that no other apartment has been constructed by the respondents. Even a photograph of an apartment bearing "*Aprajita Apartment*" which is on record, has been verified and after verification it has been found that the said apartment does not belong to the respondent-promoter and also does not create any prima facie evidence as regards any advertisement being made in contravention of the provisions of the RERA Act. He, therefore, recommends for the present *suo motu* proceeding to be dropped.

3. Perused the record of the case and written submissions made by the complainant-Authority. On perusal of the same, it is observed that nothing has been brought on record which could prove that the respondent has contravened the provisions of Section 3 of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016 and therefore, this *suomotu* proceeding is hereby dropped.

Sd/-

**(Sanjaya Kumar Singh)**  
**Inquiry Commissioner**