

A Case Study on Paranormal History of Property

ATHISH M

St. Joseph College of Law

*Abstract- This paper examines the legal implications of stigmatized property, particularly properties alleged to be haunted or associated with paranormal history. Using a doctrinal and comparative approach, the study analyses whether psychological stigma should be considered a material fact requiring disclosure in real estate transactions. The research draws upon major judicial decisions including *Stambovsky v. Ackley*, *Reed v. King*, and *Johnson v. Davis*, while evaluating the position in India, Hong Kong, and New York. The paper argues that although paranormal claims cannot be scientifically verified, their impact on market value, buyer autonomy, and contractual consent is sufficiently significant to justify disclosure obligations in appropriate circumstances.*

Keywords: *Stigmatized Property, Haunted Houses, Psychological Stigma, Property Law, Disclosure, Misrepresentation, Transfer of Property Act 1882, Comparative Property Law.*

I. INTRODUCTION

In the context of real estate law, paranormal activity is legally classified as a psychological stigma or a non-physical defect. This term refers to alleged phenomena that defy conventional scientific explanation, including reports of spectral apparitions, poltergeist disruptions, curses, or residual metaphysical taints associated with historical events.

It does not refer to the verification of actual ghosts but rather to the reputation of a property being haunted, which can diminish its market value. In legal terms, if a house is widely rumoured to be haunted by spirits or any or has been the site of a tragedy, it is considered as "stigmatized property". This stigma is independent of any physical or structural defects and typically arises from reputations involving supposed haunting, suicides, homicides, notorious crimes,¹

Property transactions are traditionally governed by principles concerning title, possession, encumbrances and physical defects. However, modern property markets increasingly recognise that non-physical factors may influence market value and buyer

decision-making. To properly evaluate these market dynamics, a foundational distinction must be drawn between two core concepts such as paranormal activity and stigmatized property.²

The intersection of these concepts presents difficult legal questions of enduring importance. Should a seller disclose that a house is believed to be haunted? Can psychological discomfort amount to a material defect? If a buyer would not have purchased the property had they known its reputation, does the law afford a remedy? These questions challenge orthodox property law doctrines and require courts and legislators to balance fairness, contractual freedom and market efficiency. American jurisprudence has confronted these issues directly in landmark decisions such as *Reed v. King* and *Johnson v. Davis*, while Indian law, as expressed in the Property Act, 1882³, provides a potentially applicable but as yet untested statutory framework.

II. BACKGROUND AND ORIGIN

The doctrine of stigmatized property emerged prominently in American jurisprudence during the late twentieth century. Historically, the common law doctrine of "caveat emptor" placed responsibility upon buyers to investigate property conditions and imposed no general obligation upon sellers to volunteer information about a property's history or reputation⁴. Courts were accordingly reluctant to impose wide disclosure obligations upon sellers.

The first major change was seen in the case law *Stambovsky v. Ackley*, in which a New York appellate court permitted rescission of a contract for a house the seller had publicly and repeatedly represented as haunted⁵. The court held that the seller was estopped from denying the haunting she had herself publicised and that equity required rescission⁶.

Subsequent decisions continued the evolution. In *Reed v. King*, the California Court of Appeal held that the

seller's failure to disclose that a woman and her four children had been murdered in the property ten years earlier could, if it produced a significant and quantifiable effect on market value, constitute nondisclosure of a material fact warranting rescission and damages⁷. These decisions contributed to the identification of a distinct legal category: property rendered undesirable not by physical defect but by the events associated with it or the reputation that those events have generated.⁸

The common law rule from which these decisions diverged was the strict application of caveat emptor in the sale of land. A seller below that baseline had no positive obligation to disclose patent defects .be discoverable by reasonable inspection and courts in some jurisdictions have held that there is no duty to even latent defects where no fiduciary or confidential relationship exists. The modern trend, best illustrated in *Johnson v. Davis*, has been to replace this baseline with a rule requiring disclosure of all fact materially affecting value and known to the seller but not readily observable by or known to the buyer.⁹

III. ECONOMIC IMPLICATIONS, COURT RULINGS AND APPLICATION IN INDIAN CIVIL LAW

3.1 Economic implication: Paranormal activity affecting the value of the property

The financial assessment of the value of the real estate property depends heavily on community or social view points, historical context like violent crimes, and investor psychology, moving far beyond mere structural or geological evaluation. Even though claims of paranormal activity cannot be verified through objective and empirical testing, the widespread community belief that a site is cursed or haunted regularly shifts real-world real estate metrics.¹⁰ From a judicial perspective, true financial value is governed by external market actions rather than scientific proof; if a meaningful segment of prospective purchasers refuses to consider a home due to its negative history, the asset experiences a demonstrable and measurable drop in pricing.

East Asian metropolitan markets like Hong Kong highlight the depth of this economic reality. Studies directed by Professor Utpal Bhattacharya at the Hong

Kong University of Science and Technology and Daisy Huang of Nanjing Audit University demonstrate using a database using more than 1 million residential transaction, combining sources from websites, the author found more than 880 haunted houses from 2000 to 2015, they find that haunted apartments or houses decline in price by an average of 20%. The authors observe as “ripple effect” in the local market. Neighboring properties fall by 5% those in the same block drop by 3%; and those in the same estate by 1%. So, discerning Hong Kong house hunters must consider ghosts and ghouls. However, the process through which a property becomes. Suicides (which account for nearly 75% of haunting in the territory) lower the value of affected property. Depending on the method used, properties are discounted by 16% to 28%; fatal accidents reduce prices by 20%. Murders, meanwhile, have the most chilling effect on values, dropping prices by 36%. Shrewd buyers ignore the gruesome history of their prospective purchase may cause its value to go bump in the night.¹¹ These financial losses remain clear, objective, and legally relevant, despite coming entirely from collective psychological factors. In the case of *Stambovsky v. Ackley*, the appellate court accepted the premise that the property's public reputation as a haunted venue had deeply damaged its transactional value and limited its reach of future buyers, choosing to bypass any debate regarding whether ghosts exist or not. This perspective appropriately frames the legal question around market mechanics rather than spiritual philosophy. When a measurable number group of the purchasing public avoids buying due to its historical reputation, that factor triggers negative financial outcomes that courts are fully equipped to arbitrate.¹² Ultimately, a property's reputed paranormal history influences overall market value by altering buyer psychology, shaping cultural perspective, lowering total demand in the market and finally leading to reduction in the price.¹³ While the exact extent of this financial damage shifts depending on the local community, regional traditions, and individual risk tolerance, the existence of quantifiable financial harm remains firmly supported by both judicial precedent and real estate market studies¹⁴

3.2 Judicial rulings for assessing materiality and disclosure obligations:

Materiality concerns whether a fact would influence a reasonable purchaser's decision. Traditionally, courts focused on physical defects such as flooding, structural damage and title irregularities. Over the time court had expanded its scope to psychological factors too, like multiple murders occurring in a house could constitute material information despite leaving no physical defect. The decision recognised that non-physical facts may affect value and desirability. Historically, the judiciary restricted its focus to visible, physical problems such as foundation cracks, plumbing issues, zoning encumbrances, or clouding on titles. Over time, modern jurisprudence has systematically expanded this scope to include non-physical, psychological issues.¹⁵

In the case of *Stambovsky v. Ackley*, widely known as “Ghostbusters ruling” is a famous New York property law case. The plaintiff (Stambovsky) bought a house from defendant (Ackley). The defendant knew the house was haunted but did not disclose it to the defendant as he had publicly and repeatedly represented as haunted.¹⁶ The seller had written articles in describing poltergeists she claimed to have encountered and the property had been included in a neighbourhood haunted-house walking tour in November 1989, two months later the contract of sale was executed. The, Jeffrey Stambovsky (plaintiff), was a New York City resident with no knowledge of Nyack folklore.

Issue was whether the buyer can withdraw from the contract for the sale of a house because the seller failed to disclose the information that the property was possessed by ghost or spirits? Will the doctrine of caveat emptor yield to equity when there is no possibility that the buyer could discover the material special information only known to the seller. The appellate division held that a seller who actively promotes a house as haunted must disclose the paranormal reputation to a buyer. The seller created a severe “Paranormal stigma” that impaired the home’s value and was unlikely discoverable to out-of-town buyer, the court granted the buyer the right to withdraw or rescind the contract.¹⁷

In the case of *King v. Reed*, petitioner purchased a house from defendant for \$76,000. Ten years ago, a

woman and her four children were brutally murdered inside the property. Defendant and his real estate agents knew about the murders and were aware that this violent history had substantially dropped the market value of the home to roughly \$65,000. Despite this, defendant intentionally concealed the history, never disclosed it to petitioner, and even said neighbours to keep it a secret. After moving in, petitioner found out about the murders from a neighbour. She sued the defendant to rescind the contract (cancel the sale) and recover damages. The trial court initially dismissed her complaint, agreeing with King that the murders were not a “material fact” that required disclosure under the law. The main issue was did a seller of real estate have a legal duty to disclose a non-physical or psychological “defect” such as the home being the site of a multiple murder that materially affects the property’s value and desirability?¹⁸

The appellate court ruled out the trial court's decision, ruling in favour of petitioner. The court determined that concealment of such murders could constitute a material defect if it severely impacted the home's market value or the buyer's peace of mind. Court of Appeal laid down three distinct prongs to assess whether a psychological taint rises to a material level: (1) the overall severity of the psychological harm caused by the seller's silence; (2) the baseline fairness of forcing a buyer to discover the history independently versus requiring the seller to disclose it; and (3) the long-term impact on contractual stability if courts routinely allow rescission for non-physical issues. The court set the rule that a fact is material if it affects the value or desirability of the property and is known only to the seller. Because the murders had a tangible, measurable impact on the market value, the omission was considered actionable fraud.

Similarly in *Johnson v. Davis*, The buyers (the Davis) agreed to buy a house from the sellers (the Johnsons) for \$310,000 and down payment deposits totalling \$31,000. Before the deal closed, the buyers noticed water leakage and stains on the ceiling, but the sellers falsely claimed the roof was in good working condition. After heavy rain, the buyers discovered severe leaks, with water gushing in around windows and the ceiling. The buyers sued to rescind (cancel) the contract and get their deposit back. The Supreme

Court ruled that a seller who knows of hidden facts materially affecting the property's value has an affirmative legal duty to disclose them to the buyer. Because the sellers lied about the condition of the roof after knowing it was flawed, their actions constituted fraudulent misrepresentation. The court allowed the buyer to rescind from the contract and recover the deposit money¹⁹. Although the underlying dispute in Johnson involved a leaky roof rather than an eerie history, its core legal reasoning confirms that materiality is defined by a defect's ultimate effect on market value and purchaser consent, rather than its physical presence.

Courts require plaintiffs to prove clear, objective financial losses rather than relying on unique personal discomfort. This protective standard keeps real estate markets free from unpredictable or frivolous lawsuits while ensuring that genuine market damage is fairly addressed²⁰.

3.3 The Indian context and application:

A liability of the seller in India has been established in Section 55(1)(a) of the Property Act, 1882.²¹ Section 55(1)(a) of the Transfer of Property Act 1882 requires a seller of real property to affirmatively disclose to an incoming buyer "any material defect in the property or in the seller's title thereto of which the seller is, and the buyer is not, aware, and which the buyer could not with ordinary care discover". The section explicitly adds that failing to provide this information constitutes an act of fraud.²² Historically, courts of India have interpreted "material defect" through physical factors or in legal context. A material defect is understood as that something that affects the enjoyment of the property or significantly reduces the value.

In the case of Haryana Financial Corporation v. Rajesh Gupta the court held that non-disclosure of an independent passage to the property is considered as material defect.²³ Similarly in Lallubhai Rupchand v. Mohanlal, the Bombay court held that a defect is material if it is so substantial that the buyer "would be getting something different from what he contracted to buy"²⁴. The court reasoned that if the defect interferes with ordinary use of the property and is not appeared on the face, the seller cannot hide it and has obligation to disclose it.²⁵

Furthermore, in the Contract Act 1872²⁶, section (17)²⁷ defines fraud to include the active concealment of a material fact by an individual who possesses direct knowledge of it. Section (18)²⁸ covers misrepresentation, which includes making positive statements about a matter that are factually incorrect. If a property owner explicitly assures a buyer that a home has no troubling history, or if a real estate agent states that no tragic events have occurred on the property when that statement is knowingly. Also, the statutory provisions governing fraud and misrepresentation apply directly—regardless of whether the hidden history is criminal or paranormal in nature.

IV. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

4.1 United States

The United States presents a dual framework where common law developments have prompted precise statutory intervention. Under classical American common law, caveat emptor dominated real property transfers. However, courts carved out exceptions where sellers actively weaponized historical taints or where the non-physical defect severely impacted market value.

In New York, the foundational authority remains *Stambovsky v. Ackley*. The Appellate Division held that when a seller has deliberately created a widespread public reputation that a property is haunted, they are equitably estopped from enforcing a contract of sale against an out of town buyer who has no reason to know of the local folklore. The court ruled that under equity, the property was legally "haunted" as a matter of law due to the seller's promotional activities, which directly impaired its market value. In California, courts focused on criminal and tragic taints via *Reed v. King*, establishing that a history of severe violence or multiple homicides constitutes an adverse material fact if it directly lowers market valuation. The California Legislature enacted California Civil Code section 1710.²⁹ This statute provides a bright-line rule: a seller must disclose any death occurring on the property within the preceding three years. However, it shields sellers and agents from liability for failing to disclose deaths that occurred more than three years prior, unless a buyer asks a direct question.

4.2 Hong Kong

Hong Kong's legal approach provides a unique perspective of how deep-seated cultural, specifically traditional beliefs regarding Feng Shui, spiritual unrest, and hongza (calamity houses)—can shape formal legal duties. The foundational judicial precedent was set in *Centaline Property Agency Ltd v. Tsang Wai Kwong*.³⁰ In this case, the Hong Kong District Court ruled that real estate brokers are under a professional duty of care to conduct reasonable investigations and provide honest disclosures regarding "tragic incidents" (such as suicides or homicides) occurring within a property if a buyer inquires. This judicial standard is reinforced by the Real Estate Agents Ordinance, which empowers the Estate Agents Authority to sanction brokers who omit material information regarding tragic histories.³¹ Because of this structural framework, the Hong Kong real estate market utilizes highly systematized, accessible databases that track stigmatized units. This systematic tracking has direct financial consequences: local banking institutions routinely reference these databases to lower or entirely refuse standard mortgage financing on hongza unit.

4.3 India

Unlike in California or Hong Kong, India's approach to psychological defects remains uncodified and relies on broader civil statutes. The primary statutory text is Section 55(1)(a) of the Transfer of Property Act 1882, which mandates the disclosure of latent material defects.³² While Indian courts have traditionally applied this section to physical structural flaws or title defects, the statutory language does not explicitly exclude psychological encumbrances. If an Indian court were presented with a scenario similar to *Stambovsky*—where a seller systematically publicised a property's haunting to the public, causing a measurable drop in its market value—the buyer could argue that the seller's silence constitutes an omission under Section 55(1)(a), rendering the contract voidable due to fraud.

V. SUGGESTIONS

They are some suggestions listed below.

5.1 Introduction of statutory guidelines: Parliament should enact specific Act statutory provisions requiring disclosure of a property's known stigmatized

history where that history has a demonstrable and quantifiable effect on market value. The statute should focus upon economic consequences rather than the truth of paranormal claims.

5.2 Mandate Disclosure Where the Seller Has Promoted the Stigma: in *Stambovsky v. Ackley*, disclosure should be required where a seller has actively publicized, promoted or contributed to the properties paranormal or stigmatized reputation, whether through media, tours, public statements or other means.

5.6 Develop Professional Standards for Real Estate Agents: Regulatory bodies governing real estate agents should, by analogy with Hong Kong's approach, require agents to disclose known tragic incidents upon inquiry and to exercise reasonable diligence in investigating the history of properties they list, to the extent that such history is likely to affect value.³³

5.7 Promote judicial ruling: Until legislative reform is enacted, judicial consistency should be promoted through the publication and creation of guidelines by the Law Commission of India addressing the application of existing disclosure principles to stigmatized properties.³⁴

VI. CONCLUSION

Stigmatized property law occupies a unique blend of psychology, economics and property law. Although paranormal claims remain incapable of scientific verification, their influence upon market behavior is well-documented in both judicial decisions. Comparative jurisprudence across New York, California, Florida and Hong Kong demonstrates increasing recognition that non-physical factors may materially affect property transactions and that buyers are entitled to information relevant to their informed consent. The central issue is not whether supernatural activity exists but whether information concerning a property's reputation influences its market value and the consent of contracting parties. Indian law currently lacks regulation of stigmatized property, yet the existing principles of disclosure, fraud and misrepresentation enshrined in the Transfer of Property Act 1882 and the Indian Contract Act 1872

provide a foundational basis for future judicial and legislative development. A carefully balanced disclosure framework, grounded in objective market consequences rather than supernatural belief, would enhance transparency, protect consumers and promote confidence in real estate markets.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources:

Cases

- [1] Centaline Property Agency Ltd v Tsang Wai Kwong [2004] DCCJ 7750/2001 (Hong Kong District Court). Johnson v Davis 480 So 2d 625 (Fla 1985).
- [2] Reed v King 145 Cal App 3d 261, 193 Cal Rptr 130 (Cal Ct App 1983).
- [3] Stambovsky v Ackley 169 AD 2d 254, 572 NYS 2d 672 (NY App Div 1991).
- [4] Haryana Financial Corporation v Rajesh Gupta (2010) 1 SCC 655 [20]
- [5] Allubhai Rupchand v Mohanlal Sakarchand (1934) 36 Bom LR 665

Legislation

- [6] California Civil Code § 1710.2 (United States).
- [7] Indian Contract Act 1872 (India).
- [8] Real Estate Agents Ordinance (Cap 511) (Hong Kong).
- [9] Transfer of Property Act 1882 (India).
- [10] Indian Contract Act 1872 ,s 17
- [11] Indian Contract Act 1872 ,s 18

Secondary Sources

Books and Journal Articles

- [12] Albano AE, 'Caveat Emptor: Real Property Law's "Get Out of Jail Free" Card v. The Property Condition Disclosure Act' (2020) 35(4) Touro Law Review 1185 <<https://digitalcommons.tourolaw.edu/lawreview/vol35/iss4/10/>> accessed 24 June 2026.
- [13] Binder D, 'The Duty to Disclose Geologic Hazards and Non-Physical Taints in Real Estate Transactions' (1998) 1(1) Chapman Law Review

13<<https://digitalcommons.chapman.edu/chapman-law-review/vol1/iss1/2/>> accessed 24 June 2026.

- [14] Bouwman JA, 'Murdering the Market: How Stigmatized Property Disclosure Requirements Unreasonably Diminish Economic Value' (2021) 66(1) South Dakota Law Review 120<<https://red.library.usd.edu/sdlrev/>> accessed 24 June 2026.
- [15] Brown RB and Thurlow TH, 'Buyers Beware: Statutes Shield Real Estate Brokers from Non-Disclosure of Psychologically Tainted Properties' (1996) 49(4) Oklahoma Law Review 625<<https://digitalcommons.law.ou.edu/olr/vol49/iss4/3/>> accessed 24 June 2026.
- [16] Chapman D, Jani S and Shiers D, 'Stigmatized Properties and Housing Values: An Exploratory Study' (2019) 34(3) Journal of Housing and the Built Environment 683<https://www.researchgate.net/publication/332302471_Stigmatized_properties_and_housing_values_an_exploratory_study> accessed 24 June 2026.
- [17] Greenberg M and Hollander J, 'Neighborhood Stigma, Real Estate Value, and Urban Redevelopment' (2006)15(2) Journal of Housing Research 81<<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10527001.2005.10678988>> accessed 24 June 2026.
- [18] Hajnal I, 'Evaluation of Stigmatized Properties' (2017) 9(1) Organization, Technology and Management in Construction 1615 <<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10527001.2005.10678988>> accessed 24 June 2026.
- [19] Larsen JE and Coleman JW, 'The Effect of House Stigmatization on Market Value and Time on Market' (2001) 22(3) Journal of Real Estate Research 351. >accessed 24 June 2026.
- [20] Peck I, 'Haunting Conditions: Stambovsky, Psychological Stigma, and Disclosure in Real Estate Transactions' (2014) 39(1) Vermont Law Review 209 <<https://lawreview.vermontlaw.edu/>> accessed 24 June 2026.

- [21] Roddewig RJ, 'Stigma, Environmental Risk and Property Value: From Foundations to Current Trends' (1996) 64(4) *The Appraisal Journal* 375.
- [22] Webb E, 'Houses with a History — Disclosure Obligations and "Psychologically Stigmatized Property"' (2006) 33(1) *The University of Western Australia Law Review* 67 <<https://www.law.uwa.edu.au/law-review/volumes>> accessed 24 June 2026.
- stigmatised-property-and-what-do-agents-need-to-consider> accessed 24 June 2026.
- [29] Jain S Purvi, "Haunted House" Clause: Is "Paranormal Stigma" a Material Defect Under the Transfer of Property Act?' (Jus Corpus, 16 March 2016) <<https://share.google/ptYCbo1S78n53Qi9U>> accessed 24 June 2026.

FOOTNOTES

Research Papers and Institutional Reports

- [23] Bhattacharya U, Deng Y and Zhu G, 'Haunted Houses and Property Values: Evidence from Hong Kong' (2019) Hong Kong University of Science and Technology Research Paper <https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2557608> accessed 24 June 2026
- [24] National Association of REALTORS®, Code of Ethics and Arbitration Manual: Real Estate Broker Disclosure Directives (NAR 2023) <<https://www.nar.realtor/about-nar/governing-documents/code-of-ethics/2023-code-of-ethics-standards-of-practice>> accessed 24 June 2026
- [25] National Law Commission of India, 157th Report on Section 52 of the Transfer of Property Act (1998) <<https://lawcommissionofindia.nic.in/>> accessed 24 June 2026.
- [26] 'Something Strange in the Neighborhood: The Ghostbusters Ruling' (HeinOnline Blog, 31 October 2019) <<https://home.heinonline.org/blog/2019/10/something-strange-in-the-neighborhood-the-ghostbusters-ruling/>> accessed 24 June 2026.
- [1] Hajnal I, 'Evaluation of Stigmatized Properties' (2017) 9(1) *Organization, Technology and Management in Construction* 1615 <<https://doi.org/10.1515/otmcj-2016-0025>> accessed 24 June 2026
- [2] Regan Seidler, 'The Law of Haunted Houses: A Comment on Stigmatized Properties following Wang v Shao' (SSRN, 2021) <https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=4337> accessed 24 June 2026.
- [3] Transfer of Property Act 1882 (India).
- [4] Albano AE, 'Caveat Emptor: Real Property Law's "Get Out of Jail Free" Card v. The Property Condition Disclosure Act' (2020) 35(4) *Touro Law Review* 1185.> Accessed on 24 June 2026
- [5] *Stambovsky v Ackley* 169 AD 2d 254, 572 NYS 2d 672 (NY App Div 1991).
- [6] Peck I, 'Haunting Conditions: Stambovsky, Psychological Stigma, and Disclosure in Real Estate Transactions' (2014) 39(1) *Vermont Law Review* 209.> Accessed on 24 June 2026
- [7] *Reed v King* 145 Cal App 3d 261, 193 Cal Raptor 130 (Cal Ct App 1983).
- [8] Binder D, 'The Duty to Disclose Geologic Hazards and Non-Physical Taints in Real Estate Transactions' (1998) 1(1) *Chapman Law Review* 13. .> Accessed on 24 June 2026
- [9] *Johnson v Davis* 480 So 2d 625 (FLA 1985)
- [10] Larsen JE and Coleman JW, 'The Effect of House Stigmatization on Market Value and Time on Market' (2001) 22(3) *Journal of Real Estate Research* 351. .> Accessed on 24 June 2026

Online resources

- [27] Fafoglia L, 'The Spooky Side to a Seller's Market' (SLU Law Journal Online, 2020) <<https://scholarship.law.slu.edu/lawjournalonline/48/>> accessed 24 June 2026
- [28] Real Estate Institute of Queensland, 'Stigmatized Properties: What is a Stigmatized Property and What Do Agents Need to Consider?' (REIQ, 2022) <<https://www.reiq.com/articles/property-sales/stigmatised-properties-what-is-a->

- [11] Bhattacharya U, Deng Y and Zhu G, 'Haunted Houses and Property Values: Evidence from Hong Kong' (2019) Hong Kong University of Science and Technology Research Paper<https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2557608> accessed 24 June 2026
- [12] Chapman D, Jani S and Shiers D, 'Stigmatized Properties and Housing Values: An Exploratory Study' (2019) 34(3) Journal of Housing and the Built Environment 683<https://www.researchgate.net/publication/332302471_Stigmatized_properties_and_housing_values_an_exploratory_study> accessed 24 June 2026
- [13] Hajnal I, 'Evaluation of Stigmatized Properties' (2017) 9(1) Organization, Technology and Management in Construction 1615 <<https://doi.org/10.1515/otmcj-2016-0025>> accessed 24 June 2026
- [14] Roddewig RJ, 'Stigma, Environmental Risk and Property Value: From Foundations to Current Trends' (1996) 64(4) The Appraisal Journal 375
- [15] Bouwman JA, 'Murdering the Market: How Stigmatized Property Disclosure Requirements Unreasonably Diminish Economic Value' (2021) 66(1) South Dakota Law Review 120 <<https://red.library.usd.edu/sdlrev/>> accessed 24 June 2026
- [16] Stambosvky(n5)
- [17] 'Something Strange in the Neighborhood: The Ghostbusters Ruling' (HeinOnline Blog, 31 October 2019) <https://home.heinonline.org/blog/2019/10/something-strange-in-the-neighborhood-the-ghostbusters-ruling/> accessed 24 June 2026.
- [18] Reed (n7)
- [19] John (n9)
- [20] Brown RB and Thurlow TH, 'Buyers Beware: Statutes Shield Real Estate Brokers from Non-Disclosure of Psychologically Tainted Properties' (1996) 49(4) *Oklahoma Law Review* 625 <<https://digitalcommons.law.ou.edu/olr/vol49/iss4/3/>> accessed 24 June 202
- [21] The Transfer of Property Act 1882, s 55(1)(a)
- [22] Ibid
- [23] Haryana Financial Corporation v Rajesh Gupta (2010) 1 SCC 655 [20]
- [24] allubhai Rupchand v Mohanlal Sakarchand (1934) 36 Bom LR 665
- [25] Jain S PurviThe "Haunted House" Clause: Is "Paranormal Stigma" a Material Defect Under the Transfer of Property Act?' (Jus Corpus, 16 March 2016) <<https://share.google/ptYCbo1S78n53Qi9U>> accessed 24 June 2026.
- [26] Indian Contract Act 1872
- [27] Indian Contract Act 1872 ,s 17
- [28] Indian Contract Act 1872 ,s 18
- [29] California Civil Code § 1710.2 (United States)
- [30] Centaline Property Agency Ltd v Tsang Wai Kwong [2004] DCCJ 7750/2001 (Hong Kong District Court)
- [31] Real Estate Agents Ordinance (Cap 511) (Hong Kong).
- [32] Transfer of Property Act 1882 (India)
- [33] See Real Estate Institute of Queensland, 'Stigmatized Properties: What is a Stigmatized Property and What Do Agents Need to Consider?' (REIQ, 2022).
- [34] National Law Commission of India, 157th Report on Section 52 of the Transfer of Property Act (1998) accessed 24 June 2026.