REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY, BIHAR
IN THE COURT OF SRI ANIMESH PANDEY,
SECRETARY, RERA, BIHAR

RERA/STV/15/2026

Authorised Representative … Complainant
Vs.
M/s Maharaja Real Estate Pvt. Ltd. … Respondent

PROJECT: VASANT VIHAR

PROCEEDING

10.08.2026

This case is taken up for hearing. The learned Authorized Representative, Mr. Rishikesh Rajan is present. The learned counsel on behalf of the respondent, Mr. Bishwash Vijeta is also present.

Learned counsel for the respondent submits that the report of the Technical Team does not portray the correct fact about the Director of the respondent company and the total area of the land of the project.

In this connection, he further submits that in the Technical Report, Mohammed Ahmed and Shamina Ahmed are stated to be the promoters/directors of M/s Maharaj Real Estate Pvt. Ltd., whereas the Directors and Additional Director of the respondent M/s Maharaj Real Estate Pvt. Ltd. are Satya Prakash Nayak, Rakesh Kumar Singh and Rukmani Kumari.

Further, in the aforesaid report, the total area of the project is stated to be 26,179.72 sq. mtr., whereas the notice itself states that an area measuring only 21.83 decimal is recorded in the name of the respondent. He also submits that the respondent has not transferred any part of the land or executed any sale deed in favor of any prospective buyer(s).

The aforesaid parcel of land has been demarcated by erecting a boundary over it and the display board merely mentions the

name of the project and the company which is likely to start the aforesaid project in the near future. However, as of now, the respondent has neither issued any advertisement nor offered, marketed or invited the public for sale of any plot in the project in question.

He also submits that a complaint has already been submitted before the Sub-divisional Officer, Darbhanga and the concerned SHO, Darbhanga, for misleading photographs or any other promotional material(s) using the name of the project. Lastly, he submits that if these submissions do not find favor with the Court, then a lenient view may be taken while imposing a penalty against the respondent.

The learned authorized representative submits that the display board found on the site of the project, shows that it has been made by the respondent with an intention to communicate and attract the masses to the project, which is also a kind of advertisement of the project and that violates the provision of Section 3 of the Real Estate (Regulation & Development) Act, 2016. However, he requests for time to file rejoinder to the reply filed by the respondent. The request is allowed. He is directed to file a reply positively before the next date.

In light of the submission made by the respondent, the Technical Team is directed to revisit its report and submit a fresh report before the next date of hearing.

Put up the matter for order on 19.08.2026.

Sd/-
(Animesh Pandey)
Secretary,
RERA, Bihar.