

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

Complaint no. : 1720 of 2021
First date of hearing: 28.05.2021
Date of decision : 31.05.2022

Mr. Rohit Dahiya

R/o: - House No. E-302, Plot No: - 13, Mahajan Shree
Apartments, Sector- 23, Dwarka, New Delhi- 110077

Complainant

Versus

1. M/s Revital Reality Private Limited.
2. Shri Mohit Arora
3. Shri Nitish Kumar Arora
4. Ms. Pooja Jain (Directors)

All having Regd. Office at: 1114, 11th Floor, Hemkunt
Chamber, 89, Nehru Place, New Delhi- 110019

Respondents

CORAM:

Shri K.K. Khandelwal
Shri Vijay Kumar Goyal

**Chairman
Member**

APPEARANCE:

Sh. Kuldeep Bhardwaj (Advocate)
Sh. Bhriugu Dhami (Advocate)

Complainant
Respondents

ORDER

1. The present complaint dated 15.04.2021 has been filed by the complainant/allottee under section 31 of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016 (in short, the Act) read with rule 28 of the Haryana Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Rules, 2017 (in short, 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



obligations, responsibilities and functions under the provision of the Act or the Rules and regulations made there under or to the allottee as per the agreement for sale executed *inter se*.

A. Unit and project related details

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

S.N.	Particulars	Details	
1.	Name of the project	"Supertech Basera" sector-79&79B, Gurugram	
2.	Project area	12.11 area	
3.	Nature of project	Affordable Group Housing Project	
4.	RERA registered/not registered	Registered vide no. 108 of 2017 dated 24.08.2017	
5.	RERA registration valid upto	31.01.2020	
6.	RERA extension no.	14 of 2020 dated 22.06.2020	
7.	RERA extension valid upto	31.01.2021	
8.	DTPC License no.	163 of 2014 dated 12.09.2014	164 of 2014 dated 12.09.2014
	Validity status	11.09.2019	11.09.2019
	Name of licensee	Revital Reality Private Limited and others	
9.	Unit no.	1007, 10 th floor, tower/block- 9,	



		(Page 3 of the agreement)
10.	Unit measuring	473 sq. ft [carpet area] 73 sq. ft. [balcony area]
11.	Date of execution of flat buyer's agreement	13.01.2016 (Page 2 of the agreement)
12.	Possession clause	3.1 Possession Subject to force majeure circumstances, intervention of Statutory Authorities, receipt of occupation certificate and Allottee/Buyer having timely complied with all its obligations, formalities, or documentation, as prescribed by the Developer and not being in default under any part hereof and Flat Buyer's Agreement, including but not limited to the timely payment of installments of the other charges as per payment plan, Stamp Duty and registration charges, the Developers Proposes to offer possession of the said Flat to the Allottee/Buyer within a period of 4 (four) years from the date of approval of building plans or grant of environment clearance, (hereinafter referred to as the " Commencement Date ") , whichever is later.

		(Page 6 of the agreement)
13.	Due date of possession	22.01.2020 [Note: - the due date of possession can be calculated by the 4 years from approval of building plans (19.12.2014) or from the date of environment clearance (22.01.2016) whichever is later.]
14.	Date of approval of building plans	19.12.2014 [as per information obtained by the planning branch]
15.	Date of grant of environment clearance	22.01.2016 [as per information obtained by the planning branch]
16.	Total sale consideration	Rs.19,28,500/- (As per payment plan page 5 of the agreement)
17.	Total amount paid by the complainant	Rs.17,53,127 /- (As per averment of complainant page 5 of the complaint)
18.	Occupation certificate	Not obtained
19.	Delay in handing over possession till the date of order i.e., 31.05.2022	2 years 4 months and 9 days

B. Facts of the complaint

3. The complainant has made the following submissions: -

- I. That on 13.01.2016, a flay buyer agreement was executed inter-se parties with regard to allotted unit bearing no. 1007, tower 9 (473 sq. ft. & balcony area 73 sq. ft. on 10th floor together with two-wheeler open parking). As per clause 3 of the agreement, the respondent was obligated to deliver possession of the allotted unit within 48 months, from the date of approval of building plans (19.12.2014) or from the date of environment clearance (22.01.2016) which ever being later, which comes to be 22.01.2020.
- II. That the complainant opted for the “part self-payment and part by loan”, whereby a tripartite agreement was executed on 13.01.2016 between the complainant, promoter, and India bulls Housing Finance Limited.
- III. That as per opted payment plan a total sum of Rs.17,53,127/- was paid to the respondents out of which Rs.1,19,085/- was paid by the complainant through self-funds and Rs.15,84,042/- were paid through loan from India bulls housing finance limited. These payments were made starting from 28.12.2015 till 09.07.2018.
- IV. That the respondent has failed to follow the time schedule agreed upon by the parties, resulting in non- delivery of possession of the allotted flat till date, and further failed to

provide any satisfactory explanation for delaying the delivery of possession.

- V. That the property was still under constructions, builder has collected service tax on initial 2 demands covering 25% total project value. This action of builder contrasts with the Delhi High Court judgement. In the case of **Suresh Kumar Bansal Vs Union of India & Others** 2016-VIL-284-DEL-ST, Hon'ble High Court has held that in a scenario where the price of under construction flats includes the cost of land, no service tax shall be payable. After much of follow-up builder was convinced on this and has not charged service tax on next 3 demands. Moreover, the complainant requested for refund but the builder despite multiple follow ups did not paid any heed to request of the complainant. That the builder has wrongfully collected Rs.17356.63/-.

C. Relief sought by the complainant:

4. The complainant has sought following relief(s).
- i. To pay/refund of the complainant a sum of Rs.17,53,127/- with the interest at the prescribed under the Act of 2016 and the regulations farmed thereunder.
 - ii. To pay service tax of Rs.17,356/- with interest to the complainant as the builder had collected service tax on initial 2 damages covering 25% total project value even when the project was and is still under construction.

- iii. Direct the respondent to pay litigation cost of Rs.40,000/- to the complainant.
 - iv. Kind request to lodge Criminal case including FIR against the respondent for willful cheating and misappropriate breach of trust as per law prevailing.
5. On the date of hearing, the Authority explained to the respondent/promoter about the contravention 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 respondents

6. The respondents contested the complaint on the following grounds: -
- i. The complainant approached the respondent making enquiries about the project and after complete information being provided to him, sought to book an apartment in the said project and the complainant submitted an application for allotment of a unit.
 - ii. That vide letter of allotment letter dated 15.12.2015, that complainant was allotted a unit bearing no. 1007, tower- 9, in the said project. The payment plan for remaining sale consideration was also detailed in the said letter. The total sale consideration was mutually decided as Rs.19,95,998/-
 - iii. That consequentially, after fully understanding the various contractual stipulations and payment plans for the said apartment, the complainant executed the flat buyer agreement dated 13.01.2016. It is pertinent to mention that the parties are

bound by the agreement executed by them and its terms and conditions. The agreement is in consonance with the Affordable Group Housing Policy, 2013.

- iv. In terms of the said policy and the terms of the agreement, the possession was to be handed over within 4 years from the date of approval of building plans or grant of environmental clearance (EC). However, the same were subject to force majeure conditions which would hamper the development of the project. Further, in terms of clause 3.5 of the agreement, the timely possession was subject to timely payments of sale consideration and the other charges and completion of all required formalities clause 15 of the agreement details out the conditions which were agreed between the parties would constitute as "Force Majeure".
- v. That the EC for the said project was received on 22.01.2016. Thus, the possession strictly as per the agreement was to be handed over by 21.01.2020.
- vi. That in interregnum, the pandemic of covid-19 has gripped the entire nation since March 2020. The Government of India has itself categorized the said event as a 'Force Majeure' condition, which automatically extends the timeline of handing over possession of the apartment to the complainant. Thereafter, it would be apposite to note that the construction of the project is in full swing, and the delay if at all, has been due to the government-

imposed lockdowns which stalled any sort of construction activity. Till date, there are several embargos qua construction at full operational level.

- vii. That the period of lockdown owing to the covid-19 first and second wave may be waived for the calculation of the DPC, if applicable to be paid by the respondent as no construction despite numerous efforts could be continued during the lockdown period.
- viii. That the delay if at all, has been beyond the control of the respondent and as such extraneous circumstances would be categorized as 'Force Majeure', and would extend the timeline of handing over the possession of the unit, and completion the project.
- ix. The delay in construction was on account of reasons that cannot be attributed to the respondent. That the flat buyer agreement provides that in case of delays in delivery of unit for reasons not attributed to the developer/respondent, then it shall be entitled to proportionate extension of time for completion of said project. The relevant clauses which relate to the time for completion offering possession extension to the said project are "Clause 3" under the heading "possession" of the "agreement".
- x. The force majeure clause, it is clear that the occurrence of delay in case of delay beyond the control of the respondent, including but

not limited to the dispute with the construction agencies employed by it for completion of the project and not a delay on account of the respondent for completion of the project.

xi. That apart from the defaults on the part of the allottee, like the complainant herein, the delay in completion of project was on account of the following reasons/ circumstances that were above and beyond the control of the respondents: -

- Shortage of labour/ workforce in the real estate market as the available labour had to return to their respective states due to guaranteed employment by the Central/ State Government under NREGA and JNNURM Schemes;
- that such acute shortage of labour, water and other raw materials or the additional permits, licenses, sanctions by different departments were not in control of the respondent and were not at all foreseeable at the time of launching of the project and commencement of construction of the complex. The respondent cannot be held solely responsible for things that are not in control of the respondent.

xii. The respondent has further submitted that the intention of the force majeure clause is to save the performing party from the consequences of anything over which he has no control. It is no more res integra that force majeure is intended to include risks beyond the reasonable control of a party, incurred not as a

product or result of the *negligence or malfeasance* of a party, which have a materially adverse affect on the ability of such party to perform its obligations, as where non-performance is caused by the usual and natural consequences of external forces or where the intervening circumstances are specifically contemplated. Thus, in light of the aforementioned, it is submitted that the delay in construction, if any, is attributable to reasons beyond the control of the respondent and as such the respondent may be granted reasonable extension in terms of the allotment letter.

- xiii. It is public knowledge, and several courts and quasi-judicial forums have taken cognisance of the devastating impact of the demonetisation of the Indian economy, on the real estate sector. The real estate sector is highly dependent on cash flow, especially with respect to payments made to labourers and contractors. The advent of demonetisation led to systemic operational hindrances in the real estate sector and whereby the respondent could not effectively undertake construction of the project for a period of 4-6 months. Unfortunately, the real estate sector is still reeling from the aftereffects of demonetisation, which caused a delay in the completion of the project. The said delay would be well within the definition of 'Force Majeure', thereby extending the time period for completion of the project.

- xiv. That the complainant has not come with clean hands before this authority and has suppressed the true and material facts from this authority. It would be apposite to note that the complainant is a mere speculative investor who has no interest in taking possession of the apartment.
- xv. That the enactment of Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016 is to provide housing facilities with modern development infrastructure and amenities to the allottees and to protect the interest of allottees in the real estate market sector. The main intention of the respondent is just to complete the project within stipulated time submitted before this authority. According to the terms of the builder buyer agreement also it is mentioned that all the amount of delay possession will be completely paid/adjusted to the complainant at the time final settlement on slab of offer of possession. The project is ongoing project and construction is going on.
- xvi. That the respondent further submitted that the Central Government has also decided to help bonafide builders to complete the stalled projects which are not constructed due to scarcity of funds. The Central Government announced Rs.25,000 Crore to help the bonafide builders for completing the stalled/unconstructed projects and deliver the homes to the homebuyers. It is submitted that the respondent/ promoter,

being a bonafide builder, has also applied for realty stress funds for its Gurgaon based projects.

xvii. That compounding all these extraneous considerations, the ***Hon'ble Supreme Court vide order dated 04.11.2019***, imposed a blanket stay on all construction activity in the Delhi- NCR region. It would be apposite to note that the 'Basera' project of the respondent was under the ambit of the stay order, and accordingly, there was next to no construction activity for a considerable period. It is pertinent to note that similar stay orders have been passed during winter period in the preceding years as well, i.e., 2017-2018 and 2018-2019. Further, a complete ban on construction activity at site invariably results in a long-term halt in construction activities. As with a complete ban the concerned labor was let off and they travelled to their native villages or look for work in other states, the resumption of work at site became a slow process and a steady pace of construction as realized after long period of time.

xviii. The respondent has further submitted that graded response action plan targeting key sources of pollution has been implemented during the winters of 2017-18 and 2018-19, These short-term measures during smog episodes include shutting down power plant, industrial units, ban on construction, ban on brick kilns, action on waste burning and construction,

mechanized cleaning of road dust, etc. This also includes limited application of odd and even scheme.

- xix. That the pandemic of covid-19 has had devastating effect on the world-wide economy. However, unlike the agricultural and tertiary sector, the industrial sector has been severally hit by the pandemic. The real estate sector is primarily dependent on its labour force and consequentially the speed of construction. Due to government-imposed lockdowns, there has been a complete stoppage on all construction activities in the NCR Area till July 2020. In fact, the entire labour force employed by the respondent were forced to return to their hometowns, leaving a severe paucity of labour. Till date, there is shortage of labour, and as such, the respondent has not been able to employ the requisite labour necessary for completion of its projects. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the seminal case of ***Gajendra Sharma v. UOI & Ors, as well Credai MCHI & Anr. V. UOI & Ors*** has taken cognizance of the devastating conditions of the real estate sector and has directed the UOI to come up with a comprehensive sector specific policy for the real estate sector. According to notification no. 9/3-2020 HARERA/GGM (Admn) dated 26.05.2020, passed by this authority, registration certificate upto 6 months has been extended by invoking clause

of force majeure due to spread of corona virus pandemic in Nation, which beyond the control of respondent.

xx. This authority vide, its order dated 26.05.2020 had acknowledged the Covid-19 as a force majeure event and had granted extension of six months period to ongoing projects. Furthermore, it is of utmost importance to point out that vide notification dated 28.05.2020, the Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs has allowed an extension of 9 months vis-a-vis all licenses, approvals, end completion dates of housing projects under construction which were expiring post 25.03.2020 in light of the force majeure nature of the Covid pandemic that has severely disrupted the workings of the real estate industry. That the pandemic is clearly a 'force majeure' event, which automatically extends the timeline for handing over possession of the apartment.

7. 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 submissions made by the parties.

E. Jurisdiction of the authority

8. The authority has complete territorial and subject matter jurisdiction to adjudicate the present complaint for the reasons given below.

E.I Territorial jurisdiction



9. As per notification no. 1/92/2017-1TCP dated 14.12.2017 issued by Town and Country Planning Department, Haryana the jurisdiction of Haryana Real Estate Regulatory Authority, Gurugram shall be entire Gurugram district for all purposes. 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

10. 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.

11. 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 complainants at a later stage.

12. Further, the authority has no hitch in proceeding with the complaint and to grant a relief of refund in the present matter in view of the judgement passed by the Hon'ble Apex Court in ***Newtech Promoters and Developers Private Limited Vs State of U.P. and Ors. 2021-2022 (1) RCR (Civil), 357 reiterated in case of M/s Sana Realtors Private Limited & other Vs Union of India & others SLP (Civil) No. 13005 of 2020 decided on 12.05.2022*** wherein it has been laid down as under:

"86. From the scheme of the Act of which a detailed reference has been made and taking note of power of adjudication delineated with the regulatory authority and adjudicating officer, what finally culls out is that although the Act indicates the distinct expressions like 'refund', 'interest', 'penalty' and 'compensation', a conjoint reading of Sections 18 and 19 clearly manifests that when it comes to refund of the amount, and interest on the refund amount, or directing payment of interest for delayed delivery of possession, or penalty and interest thereon, it is the regulatory authority which has the power to examine and determine the outcome of a complaint. At the same time, when it comes to a question of seeking the relief of adjudging compensation and interest thereon under Sections 12, 14, 18 and 19, the adjudicating officer exclusively has the power to determine, keeping in view the collective reading of Section 71 read with Section 72 of the Act. if the adjudication under Sections 12, 14, 18 and 19 other than compensation as envisaged, if extended to the adjudicating officer as prayed that, in our view, may intend to expand the ambit and scope of the powers and functions of the adjudicating officer under Section 71 and that would be against the mandate of the Act 2016."

13. Hence, in view of the authoritative pronouncement of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case mentioned above, the authority has the jurisdiction to entertain a complaint seeking refund of the amount and interest on the refund amount.

F. Findings on the objections raised by the respondent



F. I Objection regarding the project being delayed because of force majeure circumstances and contending to invoke the force majeure clause.

14. From the bare reading of the possession clause of the flat buyer agreement, it becomes very clear that the possession of the apartment was to be delivered by **22.01.2020**. The respondent in its reply pleaded the force majeure clause on the ground of Covid- 19. The High Court of Delhi in case no. **O.M.P (I) (COMM.) No. 88/2020 & I.As. 3696-3697/2020 title as M/S HALLIBURTON OFFSHORE SERVICES INC VS VEDANTA LIMITED & ANR. 29.05.2020** it was held that the past non-performance of the Contractor cannot be condoned due to the COVID-19 lockdown in March 2020 in India. The Contractor was in breach since September 2019. Opportunities were given to the Contractor to cure the same repeatedly. Despite the same, the Contractor could not complete the Project. The outbreak of a pandemic cannot be used as an excuse for non-performance of a contract for which the deadlines were much before the outbreak itself. Thus, this means that the respondents/promoters have to complete the construction of the apartment/building by 22.01.2020. The respondents/promoters have not given any reasonable explanation as to why the construction of the project is being delayed and why the possession has not been offered to the complainant/allottee by the promised/committed time. That the lockdown due to pandemic in the country began on 25.03.2020. So the contention of the respondents/promoters to invoke the force majeure clause is to be rejected as it is a well settled law that

“No one can take benefit out of his own wrong”. Moreover, there is nothing on record to show that the project is near completion, or the developer applied for obtaining occupation certificate. Thus, in such a situation, the plea with regard to force majeure on ground of Covid- 19 is not sustainable.

F. II Objections regarding the complainant being investor.

15. The respondent has taken a stand that the complainant is investor and not consumer, therefore, he is not entitled to the protection of the Act and thereby not entitled to file the complaint under section 31 of the Act. The respondent also submitted that the preamble of the Act states that the Act is enacted to protect the interest of consumer of the real estate sector. The authority observes that the respondent is correct in stating that the Act is enacted to protect the interest of consumers of the real estate sector. It is settled principle of interpretation that preamble is an introduction of a statute and states main aims & objects of enacting a statute but at the same time preamble cannot be used to defeat the enacting provisions of the Act. Furthermore, it is pertinent to note that any aggrieved person can file a complaint against the promoter if he contravenes or violates any provisions of the Act or rules or regulations made thereunder. Upon careful perusal of all the terms and conditions of the apartment buyer's agreement, it is revealed that the complainant is buyer and has paid total price of **Rs.17,53,127/-** to the promoter towards purchase of an apartment in the project of the promoter. At this stage, it is important to stress upon

the definition of term allottee under the Act, the same is reproduced below for ready reference:

"2(d) "allottee" in relation to a real estate project means the person to whom a plot, apartment or building, as the case may be, has been allotted, sold (whether as freehold or leasehold) or otherwise transferred by the promoter, and includes the person who subsequently acquires the said allotment through sale, transfer or otherwise but does not include a person to whom such plot, apartment or building, as the case may be, is given on rent;"

16. In view of above-mentioned definition of "allottee" as well as all the terms and conditions of the buyer's agreement cum provisional allotment letter executed between promoter and complainant, it is crystal clear that he is an allottee(s) as the subject unit allotted to them by the promoter. The concept of investor is not defined or referred in the Act. As per the definition given under section 2 of the Act, there will be "promoter" and "allottee" and there cannot be a party having a status of "investor". The Maharashtra Real Estate Appellate Tribunal in its order dated 29.01.2019 in appeal no. 0006000000010557 titled as *M/s Srushti Sangam Developers Pvt. Ltd. Vs. Sarvapriya Leasing (P) Lts. And anr.* has also held that the concept of investor is not defined or referred in the Act. Thus, the contention of promoters that the allottee being an investor is not entitled to protection of this Act also stands rejected.

G. Findings on the relief sought by the complainant.

G. I To pay/refund of the complainant a sum of Rs.17,53,127/- with the interest at the prescribed under the Act of 2016 and the regulations framed thereunder.

G.II To pay service tax of Rs.17,356/- with interest to the complainant as the builder had collected service tax on initial 2 damages covering 25% total project value even when the project was and is still under construction.

17. In the present complaint, the complainant intends to withdraw from the project and is seeking return of the amount paid by them in respect of subject unit along with interest at the prescribed rate as provided under section 18(1) of the Act. Section. 18(1) of the Act is reproduced below for ready reference.

“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,-

- (a) in accordance with the terms of the agreement for sale or, as the case may be, duly completed by the date specified therein; or*
(b) due to discontinuance of his business as a developer on account of suspension or revocation of the registration under this Act or for any other reason,

he shall be liable on demand to the allottees, in case the allottee wishes to withdraw from the project, without prejudice to any other remedy available, to return the amount received by him in respect of that apartment, plot, building, as the case may be, with interest at such rate as may be prescribed in this behalf including compensation in the manner as provided under this Act:

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.” (Emphasis supplied)

18. As per clause 3.1 of the booking application form provides for handing over of possession and is reproduced below: -

3.1 Possession

Subject to force majeure circumstances, intervention of Statutory Authorities, receipt of occupation certificate and Allottee/Buyer having timely complied with all its obligations, formalities, or documentation, as prescribed by the Developer and not being in default under any part hereof and Flat Buyer's Agreement, including but not limited to the timely payment of installments of the other charges as per payment plan, Stamp Duty and registration charges,

the Developers Proposes to offer possession of the said Flat to the Allottee/Buyer within a period of 4 (four) years from the date of approval of building plans or grant of environment clearance, (hereinafter referred to as the "Commencement Date"), whichever is later.

19. At the outset, it is relevant to comment on the preset possession clause of the agreement wherein the possession has been subjected to all kinds of terms and conditions of this agreement and application, and the complainant not being in default under any provisions of this agreement and 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 allottees 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 buyer developer 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 its 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.
20. **Admissibility of refund along with prescribed rate of interest:** The complainant is seeking refund the amount paid by them at the

prescribed rate of interest. However, the allottees intend to withdraw from the project and are seeking refund of the amount paid by them in respect of the subject unit with interest at prescribed rate as provided 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.

21. 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.
22. 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 i.e., 31.05.2022 is 7.50%. Accordingly, the prescribed rate of interest will be marginal cost of lending rate +2% i.e., 9.50%.
23. On consideration of the circumstances, the documents, submissions and based on the findings of the authority regarding contraventions as per provisions of rule 28(1), the authority is satisfied that the respondent is in contravention of the provisions of the Act. By virtue of clause 3.1 of the agreement executed between the parties on



24.12.2015, the possession of the subject apartment was to be delivered within stipulated time within 4 years from the date of approval of building plan i.e. (19.12.2014) or grant of environment clearance i.e. (22.01.2016) whichever is later. Therefore, the due date of handing over possession is calculated by the receipt of environment clearance dated 22.01.2016 which comes out to be 22.01.2020. It is pertinent to mention over here that even after a passage of more than 2 years and 4 months neither the construction is complete nor offer of possession of the allotted unit has been made to the allottee by the builder. Further, the authority observes that there is no document on record from which it can be ascertained as to whether the respondent has applied for occupation certificate/part occupation certificate or what is the status of construction of the project. In view of the above-mentioned fact, the allottee intend to withdraw from the project and are well within their right to do the same in view of section 18(1) of the Act, 2016. Further, the authority has no hitch in proceeding further and to grant a relief in the present matter in view of the recent judgement *Newtech Promoters and Developers Private Limited Vs State of U.P. and Ors.*"

24. Accordingly, the non-compliance of the mandate contained in section 11(4)(a) read with section 18(1) of the Act on the part of the respondent is established. As such, the complainant is entitled to refund the entire amount paid by them at the prescribed rate of



interest i.e., @ 9.50% p.a. from the date of payment of each sum till its actual realization as per provisions of section 18(1) of the Act read with rule 15 of the rules, 2017.

G.III. To pay compensation/damages in accordance with section 18 of the Act, 2016 on account of respondent failure to perform the agreement in question.

G. IV. To pay compensation to the complainant to the tune of Rs.2,00,000/- for agony hardship and inconvenience caused by the respondent.

G.V. To grant cost of litigation including documentation, representation, and cost of complaint to the tune of Rs.50,000/-

25. The complainant in the aforesaid relief is seeking relief w.r.t compensation. Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, in case titled as *M/s Newtech Promoters and Developers Pvt. Ltd. V/s State of UP & Ors.* (Supra), has held that an allottee is entitled to claim compensation under sections 12, 14, 18 and section 19 which is to be decided by the adjudicating officer as per section 71 and the quantum of compensation shall be adjudged by the adjudicating officer having due regard to the factors mentioned in section 72. Therefore, the complainant is advised to approach the adjudicating officer for seeking compensation.

H. Directions of the authority

26. 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 respondents/promoters are directed to refund the amount i.e., Rs.17,53,127/-received by them from the complainant along with interest at the rate of 9.50% per annum from the date ^{of} ~~surrender/withdrawn of allotment~~ ^{each payment} till the actual date of refund of the deposited amount.

ii. A period of 90 days is given to the respondent to comply with the directions given in this order and failing which legal consequences would follow.

27. Complaint stands disposed of.

28. File be consigned to registry.

v.1 - 3
(Vijay Kumar Goyal)

Member

Haryana Real Estate Regulatory Authority, Gurugram

Dated: 31.05.2022


(Dr. K.K. Khandelwal)

Chairman

HARERA
GURUGRAM