

**BEFORE THE HARYANA REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY,  
GURUGRAM**

**Date of decision: 17.08.2022**

NAME OF THE BUILDER		M/S IREO GRACE REALTECH PVT. LTD.	
PROJECT NAME		THE CORRIDORS	
S. No.	Case No.	Case title	Appearance
1	CR/1600/2019	Akshay Kumar Madan and Veena Madan V/S M/s Ireo Grace Realtech Pvt. Ltd.	Shri Manish Yadav Shri M.K Dang
2	CR/2085/2021	Vijay Kumar Choudhary V/S M/s Ireo Grace Realtech Pvt. Ltd.	Shri Sahil Chandra Shri M.K Dang
3	CR/2292/2021	Arvind Mathur V/S M/s Ireo Grace Realtech Pvt. Ltd.	Shri Devvrat proxy counsel Shri M.K Dang
4	CR/2707/2021	G.V Chanana V/S M/s Ireo Grace Realtech Pvt. Ltd.	Shri S. Nanda Shri M.K Dang
5	CR/3150/2021	Sumit Jain V/S M/s Ireo Grace Realtech Pvt. Ltd.	Shri Sukhbir Yadav Shri M.K Dang
6	CR/4527/2019	Lt. Col Sushil Rana V/S M/s Ireo Grace Realtech Pvt. Ltd.	Shri Harshit Batra Shri M.K Dang
7	CR/5162/2021	Anuj Agarwal V/S M/s Ireo Grace Realtech Pvt. Ltd.	Shri Sukhbir Yadav Shri M.K Dang

**CORAM:**

Dr. K.K. Khandelwal  
Shri Vijay Kumar Goyal

**Chairman**  
**Member**

**ORDER**

1. This order shall dispose of all the seven complaints titled above filed before this authority under section 31 of the Real Estate (Regulation and

- Development) Act, 2016 (hereinafter referred as "the Act") read with rule 28 of the Haryana Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Rules, 2017 (hereinafter referred as "the rules") for violation of section 11(4)(a) of the Act wherein it is inter alia prescribed that the promoter shall be responsible for all its obligations, responsibilities and functions to the allottees as per the agreement for sale executed inter se between parties.
- The core issues emanating from them are similar in nature and the complainant(s) in the above referred matters are allottees of the project, namely, The Corridors situated at Sector-67 A, Gurugram being developed by the same respondent/promoter i.e., M/s Ireo Grace Realtech Private Limited. The terms and conditions of the buyer's agreements fulcrum of the issue involved in all these cases pertains to failure on the part of the promoter to deliver timely possession of the units in question, seeking possession of the unit along with delayed possession charges.
  - The details of the complaints, reply status, unit no., date of agreement, possession clause, due date of possession, total sale consideration, total paid amount, and relief sought are given in the table below:

<b>Project Name and Location</b>	<b>"The Corridors" at sector 67A, Gurgaon, Haryana.</b>
<b>Project area</b>	37.5125 acres
<b>DTCP License No.</b>	05 of 2013 dated 21.02.2013 valid upto 20.02.2021
<b>Name of Licensee</b>	M/s Precision Realtors Pvt. Ltd. and 5 others
<b>Rera Registered</b>	Registered Registered in 3 phases <b>Vide 378 of 2017 dated 07.12.2017(Phase 1)</b> Vide 377 of 2017 dated 07.12.2017 (Phase 2) Vide 379 of 2017 dated 07.12.2017 (Phase 3)
<b>Validity Status</b>	30.06.2020 (for phase 1 and 2) 31.12.2023 (for phase 3)

<b>Details of phases</b>	Phase I: Tower A6 to A 10, B1 to B4 and C3 to C7 Phase II: Tower A1to A5, B5-B8, C8-C11, C1 and convenient shopping Phase III: Tower D1 to D5
<b>Details of Occupation Certificate</b>	31.05.2019 for phase 1 27.01.2022 for phase 2 Not obtained for phase 3
<b>Possession Clause: - 13. Possession and Holding Charges</b> Subject to force majeure, as defined herein and further subject to the Allottee having complied with all its obligations under the terms and conditions of this Agreement and not having default under any provisions of this Agreement but not limited to the timely payment of all dues and charges including the total sale consideration, registration chares, stamp duty and other charges and also subject to the allottee having complied with all the formalities or documentation as prescribed by the company, the company proposes to offer the possession of the said apartment to the allottee within a period of 42 months from the date of approval of building plans and/or fulfillment of the preconditions imposed thereunder(Commitment Period). The Allottee further agrees and understands that the company shall additionally be entitled to a period of 180 days (Grace Period), after the expiry of the said commitment period to allow for unforeseen delays beyond the reasonable control of the Company.	
<b>Date of approval of building plans:</b> 23.07.2013	
<b>Date of environment clearance:</b> 12.12.2013	
<b>Date of fire scheme approval:</b> 27.11.2014	
<b>Due date of possession:</b> 23.01.2017 (Calculated from the date of approval of building plans) Note: Grace Period is not allowed.	

Sr. No	Complaint No., Case Title, and Date of filing of complaint	Reply status	Unit No.	Unit admeasuring	Date of apartment buyer agreement	Total Sale Consideration / Total Amount paid by the complainant	Relief Sought
1.	CR/1600/2019 Akshay Kumar Madan V/S M/s Ireo Grace	17.05.2019	Old Unit No.: 702, 7th floor, tower C8  New Unit No.: 603, 6 <sup>th</sup>	1483.93 sq. ft.  1476 sq. ft.	11.04.2014	TSC: - Rs. 1,63,33,23 6/-  AP: - Rs. 1,34,70,98 1/-	Handover the possession of unit along with DPC.

	Realtech Pvt. Ltd.  <b>DOF:</b> 09.04.2019		floor, tower C6				
2.	CR/2085/2021 Vijay Kumar Chaudhary V/S M/s Ireo Grace Realtech Pvt. Ltd.  <b>DOF:</b> 13.04.2021	27.09.2021	502, 5th floor, tower B4  [annexure-P-2 on page no. 49 of the complaint]	1932.15 sq. ft.	04.05.2015	TSC: - Rs.2,72,18,094/-  AP: - Rs. 2,31,51,449/-	Handover the possession of unit along with DPC.  To withdraw demand notice dated 14.06.2019 or declare the same invalid.  Cost of litigation.
3.	CR/2292/2021 Arvind Mathur V/S M/s Ireo Grace Realtech Pvt. Ltd.  <b>DOF:</b> 03.06.2021	27.09.2021	602, 6th floor, tower A-7  (annexure-2 on page no. 33 of the complaint)	1920.22 sq. ft.	30.01.2015	TSC: - Rs. 2,62,34,753/-  AP: - Rs. 2,12,29,460/-	DPC.
4.	CR/2707/2021 G.V Chanana V/S M/s Ireo Grace Realtech Pvt. Ltd.  <b>D.O.F:</b> 16.07.2021	01.10.2021	402, 4th floor, tower C5  (annexure-C-2 on page no. 33 of the complaint)	1296.07 sq. ft.	24.09.2014	TSC: - Rs. 1,70,99,905/-  AP: - Rs. 1,49,08,271/-	Handover the possession of unit along with DPC.  To cancel offer of possession as it was invalid.  Not to levy holding charges.

							To not levy delayed interest on the outstanding amount to be paid for the possession on account of default of the respondent.
5.	CR/3150/2021 Sumit Jain V/S M/s Ireo Grace Realtech Pvt. Ltd.  <b>D.O.F:</b> 26.08.2021	08.10.2021	804, 8th floor, tower C7  (annexure-P-4 on page no. 50 of the complaint)	1295.78 sq. ft.	14.07.2014	TSC: - Rs. 1,54,31,904/- AP: - Rs. 1,14,03,084/-	Handover the possession of unit along with DPC.  To get the area calculation of the flat.
6.	CR/4527/2019 Lt. Col Sushil Rana V/S M/s Ireo Grace Realtech Pvt. Ltd.  <b>D.O.F:</b> 19.09.2019	16.07.2021	401, 4th floor, tower A6  (annexure-C-3 on page no. 42 of the complaint)	1932.15 sq. ft.	09.05.2014	TSC: Rs. 2,26,77,006 AP: - Rs. 2,14,17,319/-	Handover the possession of unit along with DPC.
7.	CR/5162/2021 Anuj Agarwal V/S M/s Ireo Grace Realtech Pvt. Ltd.  <b>D.O.F:</b> 04.01.2022	21.03.2022	903, 9th floor, tower A8  (annexure-P-4 on page no. 75 of the complaint)	1902.48 sq. ft.	28.04.2014	TSC: Rs. 1,90,42,526/- AP: Rs. 1,87,42,496/-	Handover the possession of unit along with DPC.  To get the area calculation of the flat.

								To refrain from charging holding charges.  To give GST input credit on GST levied.
<b>Note: In the table referred above certain abbreviations have been used. They are elaborated as follows:</b> <b>Abbreviation Full form</b> TSC Total Sale consideration AP Amount paid by the allottee(s)								

4. The aforesaid complaints were filed by the complainants against the promoter on account of violation of the builder buyer's agreement executed between the parties in respect of said units for not handing over the possession by the due date, seeking possession of the unit along with delayed possession charges.
5. It has been decided to treat the said complaints as an application for non-compliance of statutory obligations on the part of the promoter /respondent in terms of section 34(f) of the Act which mandates the authority to ensure compliance of the obligations cast upon the promoters, the allottee(s) and the real estate agents under the Act, the rules and the regulations made thereunder.
6. The facts of all the complaints filed by the complainant(s)/allottee(s) are similar. Out of the above-mentioned case, the particulars of lead case **CR/2707/2021 G.V Chanana V/S M/s Ireo Grace Realtech Pvt. Ltd.** are being taken into consideration for determining the rights of the allottee(s) qua handover the possession of the unit along with interest.

**A. Project and unit related details**

7. The particulars of the project, the details of sale consideration, the amount paid by the complainant(s), date of proposed handing over the possession, delay period, if any, have been detailed in the following tabular form:

***CR/2707/2021 G.V Chanana V/S M/s Ireo Grace Realtech Pvt. Ltd.***

S. N.	Particulars	Details
1.	Name of the project	"The Corridors" at sector 67A, Gurgaon, Haryana
2.	Nature of the project	Group Housing Colony
3.	Project area	37.5125 acres
4.	DTCP license no. and validity status	05 of 2013 dated 21.02.2013 valid upto 20.02.2021
5.	Name of licensee	M/s Precision Realtors Pvt. Ltd. and 5 others
6.	RERA Registered/ not registered	<b>Registered</b> Registered in 3 phases <b>Vide 378 of 2017 dated 07.12.2017(Phase 1)</b> Vide 377 of 2017 dated 07.12.2017 (Phase 2) Vide 379 of 2017 dated 07.12.2017 (Phase 3)
	Validity Status	30.06.2020 (for phase 1 and 2) 31.12.2023 (for phase 3)
8.	Unit no.	402, 4th floor, tower C5

		(annexure- C-2 on page no. 33 of the complaint)
9.	Unit area admeasuring	1296.07 sq. ft. (annexure- C-2 on page no. 33 of the complaint)
10.	Date of approval of building plans	23.07.2013 (annexure- R-8 on page no. 59 of the reply)
11.	Date of allotment	13.08.2013 (annexure- R-2 on page no. 50 of the reply)
12.	Date of builder buyer agreement	24.09.2014 (annexure- C-2 on page no. 30 of the complaint)
13.	Due date of possession	23.01.2017 {calculated from the date of approval of building plans} <b>Note:</b> Grace Period is not allowed.
14.	Possession clause	<b>13. Possession and Holding Charges</b> Subject to force majeure, as defined herein and further subject to the Allottee having complied with all its obligations under the terms and conditions of this Agreement and not having default under any provisions of this Agreement but not limited to the timely payment of all dues and charges including the total sale consideration,



		registration chares, stamp duty and other charges and also subject to the allottee having complied with all the formalities or documentation as prescribed by the company, the company proposes to offer <b>the possession of the said apartment to the allottee within a period of 42 months from the date of approval of building plans and/or fulfillment of the preconditions imposed thereunder(Commitment Period).</b> The Allottee further agrees and understands that the company shall additionally be entitled to a period of 180 days (Grace Period), after the expiry of the said commitment period to allow for unforeseen delays beyond the reasonable control of the Company.
15.	Total sale consideration	Rs. 1,70,99,905/- (vide annexure-C-4 on page 91 of the complaint)
16.	Amount paid by the complainant	Rs. 1,49,08,271/- (vide annexure-C-4 on page 91 of the complaint)
17.	Occupation certificate	31.05.2019 (annexure R-14 on page 134 of the reply)
18.	Offer of possession	17.06.2019

	(vide annexure-R-15 on page 137 of the reply)
--	---

**B. Facts of the complaint**

The complainant has made the following submissions in the complaint: -

19. That based on the representations the complainant made an application in July 2013 for booking an apartment in the project. The respondent kept on demanding payment as per the payment plan and he kept on paying. After a delay of more than 1.5 years the apartment buyer's agreement dated 24.09.2014 was executed between the parties.
20. That as per clause 13.3 of the flat buyers agreement the unit was to be hand over within 42 months from the date of approval of building plans or preconditions imposed thereunder. The possession of the unit was supposed to be delivered by January 2017 i.e., 42 months from the date of approval of the building plan i.e., 23.07.2013. However, the respondent illegally changed the interpretation of the possession and informed the complainant that the possession would become due from the date of grant of fire NOC and not from the building plan approval. And since the fire NOC was granted on 27.11.2014 so the possession would fall due on 27.05.2018 i.e., 42 months from date of receipt of approval. Thus, by illegally changing the interpretation of the possession clause, the respondent extended the possession duration by 1 year 10 months.
21. That the respondent failed to offer possession of the unit within the schedule date as per the agreement. After a delay of more than 1 year 1 month, the respondent sent an offer of possession dated 17.06.2019 to the complainant. With the said offer of possession, the respondent demanded

a total sum of Rs. 21,91,634/- from the complainant. The complainant was also instructed to make the final outstanding payment by 17.07.2019 and in case of delay the complainant was liable to pay a holding charge of Rs. 7.5/ per sq. ft. per month of the super area besides delayed payment interest.

22. That at the offer of possession, the respondent offered a rebate amount of Rs. 65,836/- for the delay. The delay compensation of Rs. 65,836/- is inadequate, unfair and unjustified in view of long inordinate and unexplained delay and in a situation where the complainant had already paid around Rs. 1.49 crores till June 2017 i.e., two years prior to the date of offer of possession. After receiving the offer of possession, the complainant contacted the respondent and requested to compensate him as per the provisions of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016 i.e., pay interest at the same rate at which he charged from the complainant on the delayed payment or at least as per the prescribed rate of interest, but the respondent refused.
23. That after receiving the offer of possession, the complainant visited the project site to see if the unit was actually ready and habitable. The complainant found that the apartment was not complete and not in habitable condition. No internal work was done only superstructure was ready and the complete final finishing work such as plasters, flooring, kitchen was yet to be done to make the apartment ready and habitable.
24. The clauses of the agreement are unfair. The arbitrariness and unfairness of the agreement can be found out from the clauses 7.4, 13.3 and 13.4 of the agreement among other clauses. As per clause 7.4 of the agreement, in case of delay in payment, the respondent was liable to charge interest

@20% p.a. whereas as per clause 13.4, in case of delay in offering possession, the complainant was only entitled a pay compensation @ Rs. 7.50/- per sq. ft. per month of super area. Under clause 13.3, the respondent illegally extended the possession date by more than 1 year 10 months. However, due to payment of huge amount prior to execution of agreement and forfeiture of the entire payment made till that date in case of cancellation of allotment, the original allottee had no other option but to sign on the dotted line.

25. That till date the complainant has paid a total sum of Rs. 1,57,63,995/- out of the total amount payable of Rs 1,70,99,905/- .
26. That the respondent, vide its email dated 29.01.2021 has asked complainant to remit additional amounts under various heads without giving details of arriving at those amounts. He via email dated 25.02.2021 sought clarification regarding the demand raised by it. The respondent via email sent reply dated 01.03.2021. The complainant through email dated 05.04.2021 informed the respondent that he would pay the last installment as demanded without prejudice and requested the respondent to work out the delay compensation due to him and again requested for joint registration of the property in the name of the complainant and his wife.
27. That the complainant sent a reminder dated 31.05,2021 to the respondent informing about payment of Rs. 8,55,724/- made to the respondent towards the last installment through NEFT, the complainant again requested the respondent to work out the delay compensation and requested for the joint registration of the property in the name of complainant and his wife.

28. That respondent has failed to abide by the promises and to deliver the possession of the unit within the promised time and the possession offered by the respondent was illegal and incomplete and was sent with intention of extracting money from complainant and then sent a demand letter levying charges which are illegal. Under such circumstances, the complainant is left with no other option but to file the present complaint seeking immediate peaceful possession with adequate delay compensation.

**C. Relief sought by the complainant: -**

29. The complainant has sought following relief(s):

- I. Pay the compensation for delay in the form of interest @20% p.a. on the amount paid by the complainant from the promised date of delivery till date of filing of complaint.
- II. To deliver the peaceful possession of the subject unit after completing it in all aspects with promised amenities and as per specification in terms of the buyer's agreement and in habitable condition.
- III. To cancel the offer of possession letter dated 17.06.2019 and demand letter dated 29.01.2021 being incomplete, invalid and illegal.
- IV. Not to levy holding charges and any other charges which are not part of buyer's agreement.
- V. To not levy delay payment interest on the outstanding amount to be paid for the possession on account of default on the part of the respondent.

30. On the date of hearing, the authority explained to the respondent/ promoter about the contraventions as alleged to have been committed in relation to section 11(4) (a) of the act to plead guilty or not to plead guilty.

**D. Reply by the respondent: -**

The respondent has contested the complaint on the following grounds.

31. That the complaint is neither maintainable nor tenable and is liable to be out-rightly dismissed. The apartment buyer's agreement was executed between the parties prior to the enactment of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016 and the provisions laid down in the said Act cannot be applied retrospectively.
32. That there is no cause of action to file the present complaint.
33. That the complainant has no locus standi to file the present complaint.
34. That the complainant is estopped from filing the present complaint by his own acts, omissions, admissions, acquiescence's and laches.
35. That this Hon'ble Authority does not have the jurisdiction to try and decide the present complaint.
36. That the complaint is not maintainable for the reason that the agreement contains an arbitration clause which refers to the dispute resolution mechanism to be adopted by the parties in the event of any dispute i.e., clause 35 of the buyer's agreement.
37. That the complainant has not approached this authority with clean hands and has intentionally suppressed and concealed the material facts. The present complaint has been filed maliciously with an ulterior motive and it is nothing but a sheer abuse of the process of law. The true and correct facts are as follows:

- That the complainant, after checking the veracity of the project namely, 'The Corridors', Sector 67-A, Gurgaon had applied for allotment of an apartment by filling the booking application form and agreed to be bound by the terms and conditions of the same.
- That based on the said application, the respondent vide its letter dated 13.08.2013 allotted to the complainant apartment no. CD-C5-04-402 having tentative super area of 1296.07 sq.ft for a sale consideration of Rs. 1,50,78,923.36. However, the agreement was executed on 24.09.2014 only after reminders dated 28.05.2014 and 17.07.2014 were sent by the respondent to the complainant.
- That vide payment request dated 29.06.2015, the respondent had raised the fifth installment demand of net payable amount of Rs. 17,76,323.83. However, the complainant failed to remit the complete amount and the remaining due amount was adjusted in the next payment installment dated 22.07.2015 as arrears.
- That as per clause 13.3 of the agreement, the possession has to be handed over within 42 months from the date of approval of building plans and preconditions imposed thereunder. The time was to be computed from the date of receipt of all requisite approvals. Even otherwise construction can't be raised in the absence of the necessary approvals. It has been specified in sub-clause (iv) of clause 17 of the approval of building plan dated 23.07.2013 of the said project that the clearance issued by the Ministry of Environment and Forest, Government of India has to be obtained before starting the construction of the project. That the environment clearance for construction of the said project was

granted on 12.12.2013. Furthermore, in clause 39 of part A of the environment clearance dated 12.12.2013 it was stated that fire safety plan was to be duly approved by the fire department before the start of any construction work at site. That as per clause 35 of the environment clearance certificate dated 12.12.2013, the project was to obtain permission of mines & geology department for excavation of soil before the start of construction. The requisite permission from the department of mines & geology department has been obtained on 04.03.2014.

- That last of the statutory approvals which forms a part of the pre-conditions was the fire scheme approval which was obtained on 27.11.2014 and that the time period for offering the possession, according to the agreed terms of the buyer's agreement would have lapsed only on 27.11.2019. The occupation certificate was granted by the concerned authorities on 31.05.2019 and the possession has been already offered on 17.06.2019.

38. That the implementation of the said project was hampered due to non-payment of instalments by allottees on time and also due to the events and conditions which were beyond the control of the respondent, and which have affected the materially affected the construction and progress of the project. Some of the force majeure events/conditions which were beyond the control of the respondent and affected the implementation of the project and are as under :

39. Inability to undertake the construction for approx. 7-8 months due to Central Government's Notification with regard to Demonetization: The respondent had awarded the construction of the project to one of the



leading construction companies of India. The said contractor/ company could not implement the entire project for approx. 7-8 months w.e.f from 9-10 November 2016 the day when the Central Government issued notification with regard to demonetization. During this period, the contractor could not make payment to the labour in cash and as majority of casual labour force engaged in construction activities in India do not have bank accounts and were paid in cash on a daily basis. During Demonetization the cash withdrawal limit for companies was capped at Rs. 24,000 per week initially whereas cash payments to labour on a site of the magnitude of the project in question are Rs. 3-4 lakhs per day and the work at site got almost halted for 7-8 months as bulk of the labour being unpaid went to their hometowns, which resulted into shortage of labour. Hence the implementation of the project in question got delayed due on account of issues faced by contractor due to the said notification of central government.

40. There are also studies of Reserve Bank of India and independent studies undertaken by scholars of different institutes/universities and also newspaper reports of Reuters of the relevant period of 2016-17 on the said issue of impact of demonetization on real estate industry and construction labour.
41. Thus, in view of the above studies and reports, the said event of demonetization was beyond the control of the respondent, hence the time period for offer of possession should deemed to be extended for 6 months on account of the above.
42. Orders Passed by National Green Tribunal: In last four successive years i.e. 2015-2016-2017-2018, Hon'ble National Green Tribunal has been

passing orders to protect the environment of the country and especially the NCR region. The Hon'ble NGT had passed orders governing the entry and exit of vehicles in NCR region. Also the Hon'ble NGT has passed orders with regard to phasing out the 10 year old diesel vehicles from NCR. The pollution levels of NCR region have been quite high for couple of years at the time of change in weather in November every year. The Contractor of the respondent could not undertake construction for 3-4 months in compliance of the orders of Hon'ble National Green Tribunal. Due to following, there was a delay of 3-4 months as labour went back to their hometowns, which resulted in shortage of labour in April -May 2015, November- December 2016 and November- December 2017. The district administration issued the requisite directions in this regard.

43. In view of the above, construction work remained very badly affected for 6-12 months due to the above stated major events and conditions which were beyond the control of respondent and the said period is also required to be added for calculating the delivery date of possession.
44. Non-Payment of Instalments by Allottees: Several other allottees were in default of the agreed payment plan, and the payment of construction linked instalments was delayed or not made resulting in badly impacting and delaying the implementation of the entire project.
45. Inclement Weather Conditions viz. Gurugram: Due to heavy rainfall in Gurugram in the year 2016 and unfavourable weather conditions, all the construction activities were badly affected as the whole town was waterlogged and gridlocked as a result of which the implementation of the project in question was delayed for many weeks. Even various institutions

were ordered to be shut down/closed for many days during that year due to adverse/severe weather conditions.

46. Copies of all the relevant documents have been filed and placed on the record. Their authenticity is not in dispute. Hence, the complaint can be decided on the basis of these undisputed documents and submission made by the parties.

#### **E. Jurisdiction of the authority**

47. The plea of the respondent regarding rejection of complaint on ground of jurisdiction stands rejected. The authority observes that it has territorial as well as subject matter jurisdiction to adjudicate the present complaint for the reasons given below.

##### **E.I Territorial jurisdiction**

48. As per notification no. *1/92/2017-1TCP dated 14.12.2017* issued by Town and Country Planning Department, the jurisdiction of Real Estate Regulatory Authority, Gurugram shall be entire Gurugram District for all purpose with offices situated in Gurugram. In the present case, the project in question is situated within the planning area of Gurugram District. Therefore, this authority has complete territorial jurisdiction to deal with the present complaint.

##### **E.II Subject matter jurisdiction**

49. Section 11(4)(a) of the Act, 2016 provides that the promoter shall be responsible to the allottee as per agreement for sale. Section 11(4)(a) is reproduced as hereunder:

##### **Section 11**

\*\*\*\*

*(4) The promoter shall-*

*(a) be responsible for all obligations, responsibilities and functions under the provisions of this Act or the rules and regulations made thereunder or to the allottees as per the agreement for sale, or to the association of allottees, as the case may be, till the conveyance of all the apartments, plots or buildings, as the case may be, to the allottees, or the common areas to the association of allottees or the competent authority, as the case may be;*

**Section 34-Functions of the Authority:**

*34(f) of the Act provides to ensure compliance of the obligations cast upon the promoters, the allottees and the real estate agents under this Act and the rules and regulations made thereunder.*

50. So, in view of the provisions of the Act quoted above, the authority has complete jurisdiction to decide the complaint regarding non-compliance of obligations by the promoter leaving aside compensation which is to be decided by the adjudicating officer if pursued by the complainant at a later stage.

**F. Findings on the objections raised by the respondent**

**F.1 Objection regarding jurisdiction of the complaint w.r.t the apartment buyer's agreement executed prior to coming into force of the Act.**

51. The respondent submitted that the complaint is neither maintainable nor tenable and is liable to be outrightly dismissed as the buyers agreement was executed between the complainant and the respondent prior to the enactment of the Act and the provision of the said Act cannot be applied retrospectively.

52. The authority is of the view that the provisions of the Act are quasi retroactive to some extent in operation and will be applicable to the agreements for sale entered into even prior to coming into operation of the Act where the transaction are still in the process of completion. The Act nowhere provides, nor can be so construed, that all previous agreements would be re-written after coming into force of the Act.

Therefore, the provisions of the Act, rules and agreement have to be read and interpreted harmoniously. However, if the Act has provided for dealing with certain specific provisions/situation in a specific/particular manner, then that situation would be dealt with in accordance with the Act and the rules after the date of coming into force of the Act and the rules. The numerous provisions of the Act save the provisions of the agreements made between the buyers and sellers. The said contention has been upheld in the landmark judgment of *Neelkamal Realtors Suburban Pvt. Ltd. Vs. UOI and others. (W.P 2737 of 2017) decided on 06.12.2017* which provides as under:

- "119. Under the provisions of Section 18, the delay in handing over the possession would be counted from the date mentioned in the agreement for sale entered into by the promoter and the allottee prior to its registration under RERA. Under the provisions of RERA, the promoter is given a facility to revise the date of completion of project and declare the same under Section 4. The RERA does not contemplate rewriting of contract between the flat purchaser and the promoter...
122. We have already discussed that above stated provisions of the RERA are not retrospective in nature. They may to some extent be having a retroactive or quasi retroactive effect but then on that ground the validity of the provisions of RERA cannot be challenged. The Parliament is competent enough to legislate law having retrospective or retroactive effect. A law can be even framed to affect subsisting / existing contractual rights between the parties in the larger public interest. We do not have any doubt in our mind that the RERA has been framed in the larger public interest after a thorough study and discussion made at the highest level by the Standing Committee and Select Committee, which submitted its detailed reports."

53. Further, in appeal no. 173 of 2019 titled as *Magic Eye Developer Pvt. Ltd. Vs. Ishwer Singh Dahiya*, in order dated 17.12.2019 the Haryana Real Estate Appellate Tribunal has observed-

- "34. Thus, keeping in view our aforesaid discussion, we are of the considered opinion that the provisions of the Act are quasi retroactive to some extent in operation and will be applicable to the agreements for sale entered into even prior to coming into operation of the Act where the transaction are still in the process of completion. Hence in case of delay in the

*offer/delivery of possession as per the terms and conditions of the agreement for sale the allottee shall be entitled to the interest/delayed possession charges on the reasonable rate of interest as provided in Rule 15 of the rules and one sided, unfair and unreasonable rate of compensation mentioned in the agreement for sale is liable to be ignored."*

54. The agreements are sacrosanct save and except for the provisions which have been abrogated by the Act itself. Further, it is noted that the builder-buyer agreements have been executed in the manner that there is no scope left to the allottee to negotiate any of the clauses contained therein. Therefore, the authority is of the view that the charges payable under various heads shall be payable as per the agreed terms and conditions of the agreement subject to the condition that the same are in accordance with the plans/permissions approved by the respective departments/competent authorities and are not in contravention of any other Act, rules and regulations made thereunder and are not unreasonable or exorbitant in nature. Hence, in the light of above-mentioned reasons, the contention of the respondent w.r.t. jurisdiction stands rejected.

**F.II Objection regarding complainant is in breach of agreement for non-invocation of arbitration**

55. The respondent submitted that the complaint is not maintainable for the reason that the agreement contains an arbitration clause which refers to the dispute resolution mechanism to be adopted by the parties in the event of any dispute and the same is reproduced below for the ready reference:

***"35. Dispute Resolution by Arbitration***

*"All or any disputes arising out or touching upon in relation to the terms of this Agreement or its termination including the interpretation and validity of the terms thereof and the respective rights and obligations of the parties shall be settled amicably by mutual discussions failing which the same shall be*

*settled through reference to a sole Arbitrator to be appointed by a resolution of the Board of Directors of the Company, whose decision shall be final and binding upon the parties. The allottee hereby confirms that it shall have no objection to the appointment of such sole Arbitrator even if the person so appointed, is an employee or Advocate of the Company or is otherwise connected to the Company and the Allottee hereby accepts and agrees that this alone shall not constitute a ground for challenge to the independence or impartiality of the said sole Arbitrator to conduct the arbitration. The arbitration proceedings shall be governed by the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 or any statutory amendments/modifications thereto and shall be held at the Company's offices or at a location designated by the said sole Arbitrator in Gurgaon. The language of the arbitration proceedings and the Award shall be in English. The company and the allottee will share the fees of the Arbitrator in equal proportion".*

56. The authority is of the opinion that the jurisdiction of the authority cannot be fettered by the existence of an arbitration clause in the buyer's agreement as it may be noted that section 79 of the Act bars the jurisdiction of civil courts about any matter which falls within the purview of this authority, or the Real Estate Appellate Tribunal. Thus, the intention to render such disputes as non-arbitrable seems to be clear. Also, section 88 of the Act says that the provisions of this Act shall be in addition to and not in derogation of the provisions of any other law for the time being in force. Further, the authority puts reliance on catena of judgments of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, particularly in **National Seeds Corporation Limited v. M. Madhusudhan Reddy & Anr. (2012) 2 SCC 506**, wherein it has been held that the remedies provided under the Consumer Protection Act are in addition to and not in derogation of the other laws in force, consequently the authority would not be bound to refer parties to

arbitration even if the agreement between the parties had an arbitration clause.

57. Further, in *Aftab Singh and ors. v. Emaar MGF Land Ltd and ors., Consumer case no. 701 of 2015 decided on 13.07.2017*, the National Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission, New Delhi (NCDRC) has held that the arbitration clause in agreements between the complainant and builder could not circumscribe the jurisdiction of a consumer. The relevant paras are reproduced below:

*"49. Support to the above view is also lent by Section 79 of the recently enacted Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016 (for short "the Real Estate Act"). Section 79 of the said Act reads as follows:-*

*"79. Bar of jurisdiction - No civil court shall have jurisdiction to entertain any suit or proceeding in respect of any matter which the Authority or the adjudicating officer or the Appellate Tribunal is empowered by or under this Act to determine and no injunction shall be granted by any court or other authority in respect of any action taken or to be taken in pursuance of any power conferred by or under this Act."*

*It can thus, be seen that the said provision expressly ousts the jurisdiction of the Civil Court in respect of any matter which the Real Estate Regulatory Authority, established under Sub-section (1) of Section 20 or the Adjudicating Officer, appointed under Sub-section (1) of Section 71 or the Real Estate Appellant Tribunal established under Section 43 of the Real Estate Act, is empowered to determine. Hence, in view of the binding dictum of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in A. Ayyaswamy (supra), the matters/disputes, which the Authorities under the Real Estate Act are empowered to decide, are non-arbitrable, notwithstanding an Arbitration Agreement between the parties to such matters, which, to a large extent, are similar to the disputes falling for resolution under the Consumer Act.*

*...  
56. Consequently, we unhesitatingly reject the arguments on behalf of the Builder and hold that an Arbitration Clause in the afore-stated kind of Agreements between the Complainants and the Builder cannot circumscribe the jurisdiction of a Consumer Fora, notwithstanding the amendments made to Section 8 of the Arbitration Act."*

58. While considering the issue of maintainability of a complaint before a consumer forum/commission in the fact of an existing arbitration clause in the builder buyer agreement, the Hon'ble Supreme Court in case titled



as M/s Emaar MGF Land Ltd. V. Aftab Singh in revision petition no. 2629-30/2018 in civil appeal no. 23512-23513 of 2017 decided on 10.12.2018 has upheld the aforesaid judgement of NCDRC and as provided in Article 141 of the Constitution of India, the law declared by the Supreme Court shall be binding on all courts within the territory of India and accordingly, the authority is bound by the aforesaid view. The relevant para of the judgement passed by the Supreme Court is reproduced below:

*"25. This Court in the series of judgments as noticed above considered the provisions of Consumer Protection Act, 1986 as well as Arbitration Act, 1996 and laid down that complaint under Consumer Protection Act being a special remedy, despite there being an arbitration agreement the proceedings before Consumer Forum have to go on and no error committed by Consumer Forum on rejecting the application. There is reason for not interjecting proceedings under Consumer Protection Act on the strength an arbitration agreement by Act, 1996. The remedy under Consumer Protection Act is a remedy provided to a consumer when there is a defect in any goods or services. The complaint means any allegation in writing made by a complainant has also been explained in Section 2(c) of the Act. The remedy under the Consumer Protection Act is confined to complaint by consumer as defined under the Act for defect or deficiencies caused by a service provider, the cheap and a quick remedy has been provided to the consumer which is the object and purpose of the Act as noticed above."*

59. Therefore, in view of the above judgements and considering the provisions of the Act, the authority is of the view that complainant is well within right to seek a special remedy available in a beneficial Act such as the Consumer Protection Act and RERA Act, 2016 instead of going in for an arbitration. Hence, we have no hesitation in holding that this authority has the requisite jurisdiction to entertain the complaint and that the dispute does not require to be referred to arbitration necessarily. In the light of the above-mentioned reasons, the authority is of the view that the objection of the respondent stands rejected.

**G. Findings on the relief sought by the complainant**

**G.I To deliver the peaceful possession of the subject unit after completing it in all aspects with promised amenities and as per specification in terms of the buyer's agreement and in habitable condition.**

60. The respondent promoter was granted OC for the subject unit from the competent authority on 31.05.2019 and had offered possession to the complainant allottee vide notice of possession letter dated 17.06.2019. The promoter is directed to handover possession of the unit complete in all respect as per BBA on making due payment by the allottee after adjusting the delayed possession charges. If there is any delayed payment by the allottee the interest at the prescribed rate shall be chargeable by the promoter.

**G.II To cancel the offer of possession letter dated 17.06.2019 and demand letter dated 29.01.2021 being incomplete, invalid and illegal.**

61. The respondent promoter was granted OC on 31.05.2021 for the subject unit from the competent authority and had offered possession to the complainant allottee within two months of obtaining OC vide notice of possession letter dated 17.06.2019 which was lawful.

**G.III. Not to levy holding charges and any other charges which are not part of buyer's agreement.**

62. The respondent shall not charge anything from the complainant which is not part of the buyer's agreement. Further, holding charges shall also not be charged by the promoter at any point of time even after being part of the agreement as per law settled by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in civil appeal no. 3864-3889/2020 dated 14.12.2020.

**G.IV. To not levy delay payment interest on the outstanding amount to be paid for the possession on account of default on the part of the respondent.**

63. The complainant is directed to pay outstanding dues, if any, after adjustment of interest for the delayed period. The rate of interest chargeable from the allottee by the promoter, in case of default shall be charged at the prescribed rate i.e., 10% by the respondent/promoter which is the same rate of interest which the promoter shall be liable to pay the allottee, in case of default i.e., the delayed possession charges as per section 2(za) of the Act.

**G.V. Pay the compensation for delay in the form of interest @20% p.a. on the amount paid by the complainant from the promised date of delivery till date of filing of complaint.**

64. In the present complaint, the complainant intends to continue with the project and is seeking delay possession charges at prescribed rate of interest on amount already paid by her as provided under the proviso to section 18(1) of the Act which reads as under:-

***"Section 18: - Return of amount and compensation***

*18(1). If the promoter fails to complete or is unable to give possession of an apartment, plot, or building, —*

*.....*  
*Provided that where an allottee does not intend to withdraw from the project, he shall be paid, by the promoter, interest for every month of delay, till the handing over of the possession, at such rate as may be prescribed."*

65. Clause 13.3 of the apartment buyer's agreement (in short, the agreement) dated 24.09.2014, provides for handing over possession and the same is reproduced below:

*"13.3 Subject to Force Majeure, as defined herein and further subject to the Allottees having complied with all its obligations under the terms and conditions of this Agreement and not having defaulted under any provision(s) of this Agreement including but not limited to the timely payment of all dues and charges including the total Sale Consideration, registration charges, stamp duty and other charges and also subject to the Allottees having complied with all formalities or documentation as prescribed by the Company, the company proposes to offer the possession of the said apartment to the allottees within a period of 42 months from the date of approval of the Building plans and/or fulfilment of the preconditions imposed thereunder ("**Commitment Period**"). The Allottees further agrees and understands that the company shall additionally be entitled to a period of 180 days ("**Grace Period**"), after the expiry of the said Commitment Period to allow for unforeseen delays beyond reasonable control of the company."*

66. The apartment buyer's agreement is a pivotal legal document which should ensure that the rights and liabilities of both builders/promoters and buyers/allottee are protected candidly. The apartment buyer's agreement lays down the terms that govern the sale of different kinds of properties like residentials, commercials etc. between the buyer and builder. It is in the interest of both the parties to have a well-drafted apartment buyer's agreement which would thereby protect the rights of both the builder and buyer in the unfortunate event of a dispute that may arise. It should be drafted in the simple and unambiguous language which may be understood by a common man with an ordinary educational background. It should contain a provision with regard to stipulated time of delivery of possession of the apartment, plot or building, as the case may be and the right of the buyer/allottee in case of delay in possession of the unit. In pre-RERA period it was a general practice among the promoters/developers to invariably draft the terms of the apartment buyer's agreement in a manner that benefited only the promoters/developers. It had arbitrary, unilateral, and unclear clauses

that either blatantly favoured the promoters/developers or gave them the benefit of doubt because of the total absence of clarity over the matter.

67. The authority has gone through the possession clause of the agreement. At the outset, it is relevant to comment on the pre-set possession clause of the agreement wherein the possession has been subjected to all kinds of terms and conditions of this agreement and the complainant not being in default under any provisions of this agreements and in compliance with all provisions, formalities and documentation as prescribed by the promoter. The drafting of this clause and incorporation of such conditions are not only vague and uncertain but so heavily loaded in favour of the promoter and against the allottee that even a single default by the allottee in fulfilling formalities and documentations etc. as prescribed by the promoter may make the possession clause irrelevant for the purpose of allottee and the commitment date for handing over possession loses its meaning. The incorporation of such clause in the apartment buyer's agreement by the promoter is just to evade the liability towards timely delivery of subject unit and to deprive the allottee of his right accruing after delay in possession. This is just to comment as to how the builder has misused his dominant position and drafted such mischievous clause in the agreement and the allottee is left with no option but to sign on the dotted lines.

68. The respondent promoter has proposed to handover the possession of the subject apartment within a period of 42 months from the date of approval of building plans and/or fulfilment of the preconditions imposed thereunder plus 180 days grace period for unforeseen delays beyond the reasonable control of the company i.e., the respondent/promoter.

69. The counsel for the respondent promoter argued that the due date of possession should be calculated from the date of fire scheme approval which was obtained on 27.11.2014, as it is the last of the statutory approvals which forms a part of the preconditions. The authority is of the view that the respondent has not kept the reasonable balance between his own rights and the rights of the complainant/allottees. The respondent has acted in a pre-determined and preordained manner.
70. On a bare reading of the clause 13.3 of the agreement, it becomes apparently clear that the possession in the present case is linked to the "fulfillment of the preconditions" which is so vague and ambiguous in itself. Nowhere in the agreement it has been defined that fulfillment of which conditions forms a part of the pre-conditions, to which the due date of possession is subjected to in the said possession clause. If the said possession clause is read in entirety the time period of handing over possession is only a tentative period for completion of the construction of the flat in question and the promoter is aiming to extend this time period indefinitely on one eventuality or the other. Moreover, the said clause is an inclusive clause wherein the "fulfilment of the preconditions" has been mentioned for the timely delivery of the subject apartment. It seems to be just a way to evade the liability towards the timely delivery of the subject apartment. According to the established principles of law and the principles of natural justice when a certain glaring illegality or irregularity comes to the notice of the adjudicator, the adjudicator can take cognizance of the same and adjudicate upon it. The inclusion of such vague and ambiguous types of clauses in the agreement which are totally arbitrary, one sided and totally against the interests of the allottees must be ignored

and discarded in their totality. In the light of the above-mentioned reasons, the authority is of the view that the date of sanction of building plans ought to be taken as the date for determining the due date of possession of the unit in question to the complainant.

71. By virtue of apartment buyer's agreement executed between the parties on 24.09.2014, the possession of the booked unit was to be delivered within 42 months from the date of approval of building plan (23.07.2013) which comes out to be 23.01.2017 along with grace period of 180 days which is not allowed in the present case.
72. Here, the authority is diverging from its earlier view i.e., earlier the authority was calculating/assessing the due date of possession from date approval of firefighting scheme (as it the last of the statutory approval which forms a part of the pre-conditions) i.e., 27.11.2014 and the same was also considered/observed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Civil Appeal no. 5785 of 2019 titled as '**IREO Grace Realtech Pvt. Ltd. v/s Abhishek Khanna and Ors.**'
73. On 23.07.2013, the building plans of the project were sanctioned by the Directorate of Town and Country Planning, Haryana. Clause 3 of the sanctioned plan stipulated that an NOC/ clearance from the fire authority shall be submitted within 90 days from the of issuance of the sanctioned building plans. Also, under section 15(2) and (3) of the Haryana Fire Service Act, 2009, it is the duty of the authority to grant a provisional NOC within a period of 60 days from the date submission of the application. The delay/failure of the authority to grant a provisional NOC cannot be attributed to the developers. But here the sanction building plans stipulated that the NOC for fire safety (provisional) was required to be

obtained within a period of 90 days from the date of approval of the building plans, which expired on 23.10.2013. It is pertinent to mention here that the developers applied for the provisional fire approval on 24.10.2013 (as contented by the respondents herein the matter of Civil Appeal no. 5785 of 2019 titled as '**IREO Grace Realtech Pvt. Ltd. v/s Abhishek Khanna and Ors.**') after the expiry of the mandatory 90 days period got over. The application filed was deficient and casual and did not provide the requisite. The respondents submitted the corrected sets of drawings as per the NBC-2005 fire scheme only on 13.10.2014 (as contented by the respondents herein the matter of Civil Appeal no. 5785 of 2019 titled as '**IREO Grace Realtech Pvt. Ltd. v/s Abhishek Khanna and Ors.**'), which reflected the laxity of the developers in obtaining the fire NOC. The approval of the fire safety scheme took more than 16 months from the date of the building plan approval i.e., from 23.07.2013 to 27.11.2014. The builders failed to give any explanation for the inordinate delay in obtaining the fire NOC.

74. In view of the above the authority changed its stand and diverged from its previous view of calculating the due date of possession from the date of fire NOC as the complainant/allottees should not bear the burden of mistakes/ laxity or the irresponsible behavior of the developer/respondent and seeing the fact that the developer/respondent did not even apply for the fire NOC within the mentioned time frame of 90 days. It is a well settled law that no one can take benefit out of his own wrong. In light of the above-mentioned facts the respondents/ promoters should not be allowed to take benefit out of his own mistake just because of a clause mentioned i.e., fulfilment of the preconditions even when it did



not even apply for the same in the mentioned time frame. In view of the above-mentioned reasoning the authority has started to calculate the due date of possession from the date of approval of building plans.

75. **Admissibility of grace period:** The respondent promoter had proposed to hand over the possession of the apartment within 42 months from the date of sanction of building plan and/or fulfilment of the preconditions imposed thereunder which comes out to be 23.01.2017. The respondent promoter has sought further extension for a period of 180 days after the expiry of 42 months for unforeseen delays in respect of the said project. The respondent raised the contention that the construction of the project was delayed due to *force majeure* conditions including demonetization and the order dated 07.04.2015 passed by the Hon'ble NGT including others.
- (i) **Demonetization:** It was observed that due date of possession as per the agreement was 23.01.2017 wherein the event of demonetization occurred in November 2016. By this time, major construction of the respondents' project must have been completed as per timeline mentioned in the agreement executed between the parties. Therefore, it is apparent that demonetization could not have hampered the construction activities of the respondents' project that could lead to the delay of more than 2 years. Thus, the contentions raised by the respondents in this regard are rejected.
- (ii) **Order dated 07.04.2015 passed by the Hon'ble NGT:** The order dated 07.04.2015 relied upon by the respondent promoters states that

*"In these circumstances we hereby direct state of U.P., Noida and Greater NOIDA Authority, HUDA, State of Haryana and NCT, Delhi to immediately direct stoppage of construction activities of all the buildings shown in the report as well as at other sites wherever, construction is being carried on in violation to the direction of NGT as well as the MoEF guideline of 2010."*

A bare perusal of the above makes it apparent that the above-said order was for the construction activities which were in violation of the NGT direction and MoEF guideline of 2010, thereby, making it evident that if the construction of the respondents' project was stopped, then it was due to the fault of the respondent itself and cannot be allowed to take advantage of its own wrongs/faults/deficiencies. Also, the allottee should not be allowed to suffer due to the fault of the respondent/promoter. It may be stated that asking for extension of time in completing the construction is not a statutory right nor has it been provided in the rules. This is a concept which has been evolved by the promoter themselves and now it has become a very common practice to enter such a clause in the agreement executed between the promoter and the allottee. It needs to be emphasized that for availing further period for completing the construction the promoter must make out or establish some compelling circumstances which were in fact beyond his control while carrying out the construction due to which the completion of the construction of the project or tower or a block could not be completed within the stipulated time. Now, turning to the facts of the present case the respondent promoters has not assigned such compelling reasons as to why and how he shall be entitled for further extension of time 180 days in delivering the possession of the unit. Accordingly, this grace period of 180 days cannot be allowed to the promoter at this stage.

- 76. Admissibility of delay possession charges at prescribed rate of interest:** The complainant is seeking delay possession charges at the rate of 18% p.a. however, proviso to section 18 provides that where an allottee does not intend to withdraw from the project, he shall be paid, by the promoter, interest for every month of delay, till the handing over of

possession, at such rate as may be prescribed and it has been prescribed under rule 15 of the rules. Rule 15 has been reproduced as under:

**Rule 15. Prescribed rate of interest- [Proviso to section 12, section 18 and sub-section (4) and subsection (7) of section 19]**

(1) For the purpose of proviso to section 12; section 18; and sub-sections (4) and (7) of section 19, the "interest at the rate prescribed" shall be the State Bank of India highest marginal cost of lending rate +2%.

Provided that in case the State Bank of India marginal cost of lending rate (MCLR) is not in use, it shall be replaced by such benchmark lending rates which the State Bank of India may fix from time to time for lending to the general public.

77. The legislature in its wisdom in the subordinate legislation under the provision of rule 15 of the rules, has determined the prescribed rate of interest. The rate of interest so determined by the legislature, is reasonable and if the said rule is followed to award the interest, it will ensure uniform practice in all the cases. The Haryana Real Estate Appellate Tribunal in **Emaar MGF Land Ltd. vs. Simmi Sikka** observed as under: -

"64. Taking the case from another angle, the allottee was only entitled to the delayed possession charges/interest only at the rate of Rs.15/- per sq. ft. per month as per clause 18 of the Buyer's Agreement for the period of such delay; whereas, the promoter was entitled to interest @ 24% per annum compounded at the time of every succeeding instalment for the delayed payments. The functions of the Authority/Tribunal are to safeguard the interest of the aggrieved person, may be the allottee or the promoter. The rights of the parties are to be balanced and must be equitable. The promoter cannot be allowed to take undue advantage of his dominate position and to exploit the needs of the home buyers. This Tribunal is duty bound to take into consideration the legislative intent i.e., to protect the interest of the consumers/allottees in the real estate sector. The clauses of the Buyer's Agreement entered into between the parties are one-sided, unfair and unreasonable with respect to the grant of interest for delayed possession. There are various other clauses in the Buyer's Agreement which give sweeping powers to the promoter to cancel the allotment and forfeit the amount paid. Thus, the terms and conditions of the Buyer's Agreement dated 09.05.2014 are ex-facie one-sided, unfair and unreasonable, and the same shall constitute the unfair trade practice on the part of the promoter. These types of discriminatory terms and conditions of the Buyer's Agreement will not be final and binding."

78. Consequently, as per website of the State Bank of India i.e., <https://sbi.co.in>, the marginal cost of lending rate (in short, MCLR) as on date 17.08.2022 is 8%. Accordingly, the prescribed rate of interest will be marginal cost of lending rate +2% i.e., 10% per annum.

79. The definition of term 'interest' as defined under section 2(z a) of the Act provides that the rate of interest chargeable from the allottee by the promoter, in case of default, shall be equal to the rate of interest which the promoter shall be liable to pay the allottee, in case of default. The relevant section is reproduced below:

*"(za) "interest" means the rates of interest payable by the promoter or the allottee, as the case may be.*

*Explanation. —For the purpose of this clause—*

- (i) the rate of interest chargeable from the allottee by the promoter, in case of default, shall be equal to the rate of interest which the promoter shall be liable to pay the allottee, in case of default;*
- (ii) the interest payable by the promoter to the allottee shall be from the date the promoter received the amount or any part thereof till the date the amount or part thereof and interest thereon is refunded, and the interest payable by the allottee to the promoter shall be from the date the allottee defaults in payment to the promoter till the date it is paid;"*

80. Therefore, interest on the delay payments from the complainant shall be charged at the prescribed rate i.e., 10% by the respondent/promoter which is the same as is being granted to the complainant in case of delay possession charges.

81. On consideration of the circumstances, the evidence and other record and submissions made by the parties, the authority is satisfied that the respondent is in contravention of the provisions of the Act. By virtue of apartment buyer's agreement executed between the parties on 24.09.2014, the possession of the booked unit was to be delivered within 42 months from the date of approval of building plan (23.07.2013) which comes out to be 23.01.2017. The grace period of 180 days is not allowed

in the present complaint for the reasons mentioned above. Accordingly, non-compliance of the mandate contained in section 11(4) (a) read with proviso to section 18(1) of the Act on the part of the respondent is established. As such the complainant is entitled to delayed possession charges at the prescribed rate of interest i.e., 10% p.a. for every month of delay on the amount paid to the respondent from due date of possession i.e., 23.01.2017 till offer of possession of the booked unit i.e., 17.06.2019 plus two months which comes out to be 17.08.2019 as per the proviso to section 18(1)(a) of the Act read with rules 15 of the rules.

#### **H. Directions of the authority**

82. Hence, the authority hereby passes this order and issues the following directions under section 37 of the Act to ensure compliance of obligations cast upon the promoter as per the function entrusted to the authority under section 34(f):

- i. The respondent is directed to pay interest at the prescribed rate of 10% p.a. for every month of delay from the due date of possession i.e., 23.01.2017 till offer of possession of the booked unit, plus two months as per the proviso to section 18(1)(a) of the Act read with rules 15 of the rules.
- ii. The respondent is directed to pay arrears of interest accrued within 90 days from the date of order.
- iii. The complainant is also directed to pay the outstanding dues, if any.
- iv. The rate of interest chargeable from the allottees by the promoter, in case of default shall be charged at the prescribed rate i.e., 10% by the respondent/promoter which is the same rate of interest

which the promoter shall be liable to pay the allottees, in case of default i.e., the delayed possession charges as per section 2 (za) of the Act.

- v. The respondent shall not charge anything from the complainants which is not part of the builder buyer agreement.

83. This decision shall mutatis mutandis apply to cases mentioned in para 3 of this order.

84. The complaints stand disposed of. True certified copies of this order be placed on the case file of each matter. There shall be separate decrees in individual cases.


85. Files be consigned to registry.

  
(Vijay Kumar Goyal)

Member

Haryana Real Estate Regulatory Authority, Gurugram

Dated: 17.08.2022

  
(Dr. K.K. Khandelwal)

Chairman

**HARERA**  
**GURUGRAM**