

**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/965/2022	Rohit Jaggi and Sonu Saberwal V/S M/s Ireo Grace Realtech Pvt. Ltd.	Shri Sukhbir Yadav Shri M.K Dang
2	CR/1326/2022	Sandeep Batra and Priyanka Batra V/S M/s Ireo Grace Realtech Pvt. Ltd.	Shri Sukhbir Yadav proxy for Ms. Ankur Berry Shri M.K Dang
3	CR/1372/2021	Surbhi Jain V/S M/s Ireo Grace Realtech Pvt. Ltd.	Shri Rishabh Jain Shri M.K Dang
4	CR/2885/2021	Nirbhay Shankar Bhatnagar V/S M/s Ireo Grace Realtech Pvt. Ltd.	None Shri M.K Dang
5	CR/3782/2021	Rakesh Pandit V/S M/s Ireo Grace Realtech Pvt. Ltd.	Shri Mohd. Faris Shri M.K Dang

CORAM:

 Dr. K.K. Khandelwal
Shri Vijay Kumar Goyal


**Chairman
Member**
ORDER

1. This order shall dispose of all the five 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:

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

Details of Occupation Certificate

31.05.2019 for phase 1
 27.01.2022 for phase 2
 Not obtained for phase 3

Possession Clause: - 13. Possession and Holding Charges

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.

Date of approval of building plans: 23.07.2013

Date of environment clearance: 12.12.2013

Date of fire scheme approval: 27.11.2014

Due date of possession: 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/965/2022 Rohit Jaggi and Sonu Saberwal V/S M/s Ireo Grace Realtech Pvt. Ltd. DOF: 16.03.2022	04.07.2022	1002, 10th floor, tower C9 (annexure-P-4 on page no. 77 of the complaint)	1483.57 sq. ft.	25.04.2014	TSC: - Rs.1,63,82,206/- AP: - Rs.1,54,02,076/-	Direct the respondent to handover physical possession of the unit along with delayed possession charges. Restrain the respondent from



							charging enhanced development charges. Direct the respondent to provide area calculation. Refrain from charging holding charges. Direct the respondent to give GST input tax credit on GST levied.
2.	CR/1326/2022 Sandeep Batra and Priyanka Batra V/S M/s Ireo Grace Realtech Pvt. Ltd. DOF: 04.04.2022	04.07.2022	1401, 14th floor, tower A2 (annexure-C-2 on page no. 64 of the complaint)	1876.38 sq. ft.	04.03.2014	TSC: - Rs.2,06,61,092/- AP: - Rs. 1,98,68,920/-	Direct the respondent to handover physical possession along with DPC. Direct the respondent to provide copy of executed BBA.
3.	CR/1372/2021 Surbhi Jain V/S M/s Ireo Grace Realtech Pvt. Ltd. DOF: 24.03.2021	20.12.2021	104, 1st Floor, Tower - A3 (annexure-5 on page no. 43 of complaint)	1726.69 sq. ft.	12.05.2014	TSC: - Rs.1,73,06,088/- AP: - Rs. 1,59,98,773/-	Direct the respondent to handover physical possession along with DPC. Cost of litigation.
4.	CR/2885/2021 Nirbhay Shankar Bhatnagar V/S M/s Ireo Grace	27.09.2021	103, first floor, tower B5 (annexure-C-4 on page no. 58 of the complaint)	1321.15 sq. ft.	23.02.2016	TSC: - Rs.1,30,35,970/- AP: - Rs. 1,21,34,060/-	Direct the respondent to handover physical possession along with DPC.

	Realtech Pvt. Ltd. D.O.F: 06.08.2021						
5.	CR/3782/2 021 Rakesh Pandit V/S M/s Ireo Grace Realtech Pvt. Ltd. D.O.F: 15.09.2021	17.11.2021	Old Unit: 102, 1st Floor, Tower - C-4 New Unit: 201,2nd floor, Tower B-5	Old Unit area: 1312.50 sq. ft. New Unit area: 1593.06 sq. ft.	05.05.2014 Unit shifting date: 08.12.2015	TSC: - Rs. 1,56,67,49 1/- AP: - Rs. 1,54,40,86 2	Direct the respondent to handover physical possession along with DPC.
Note: In the table referred above certain abbreviations have been used. They are elaborated as follows: Abbreviation Full form 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 the physical 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/965/2022 Rohit Jaggi and Sonu Saberwal V/S M/s Ireo Grace*

Realtech Pvt. Ltd. are being taken into consideration for determining the rights of the allottee(s) qua delay possession charges.

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/965/2022 Rohit Jaggi and Sonu Saberwal 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	Registered Registered in 3 phases Vide 378 of 2017 dated 07.12.2017(Phase 1) 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.	1002, 10th floor, tower C9 (annexure- P-4 on page no. 77 of the complaint)
9.	Unit area admeasuring	1483.57 sq. ft. (annexure- P-4 on page no. 77 of the complaint)
10.	Date of approval of building plans	23.07.2013 (annexure R-23 on page no. 67 of reply)
11.	Date of allotment	07.08.2013 (annexure- P-3 on page no. 65 of the complaint)
12.	Date of environment clearance	12.12.2013 (annexure R-9 on page no. 66 of reply)
13.	Date of apartment buyer agreement	25.04.2014 (annexure- P-4 on page no. 74 of the complaint)
14.	Date of fire scheme approval	27.11.2014 (annexure R-11 on page no. 73 of reply)
15.	Due date of possession	23.01.2017

		(calculated from the date of approval of building plans) Note: Grace Period is not allowed.
16.	Possession clause	<p>13. Possession and Holding Charges</p> <p>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</p>

		the reasonable control of the Company.
17.	Total sale consideration	Rs. 1,63,82,206/- (as per payment plan on page no. 68 of complaint) Rs. 1,62,95,418/- (revised total sale consideration vide letter dated 26.04.2016 annexed on page no. 64 of complaint)
18.	Amount paid by the complainants	Rs. 1,54,02,076/- (vide statement of account on page no. 189 of reply)
19.	Occupation certificate	27.01.2022 [annexure R-21 on page no. 186 of reply]
20.	Offer of possession	16.02.2022 [annexure R-22 on page no. 188 of reply]

B. Facts of the complaint

The complainants have made the following submissions in the complaint:-

21. That complainants relying upon the representations booked an apartment in the project of the respondent namely, 'Corridors' situated at sector 67 A, Gurugram and signed an application form on 05.03.2013 and paid Rs. 12,00,000/- as booking amount. out of the total sale consideration

- of Rs. 1,63,82,206/-. The respondent revised the PLC from Rs. 17,74,350/- to Rs. 16,87,561/-, therefore the revised total cost of the flat was Rs. 1,62,95,418/-.
22. That on 07.08.2013 respondent issued an allotment letter in favour of them and allotted a unit no. CD-C9-10-1002, for a size admeasuring 1483.57 sq. ft.
23. That thereafter on 25.04.2014 a preprinted, one sided, builder buyer agreement was executed interse the parties. As per clause 13.3 of the agreement the possession of the said apartment was to be handed over within 42 months from the date of approval of building plans or fulfillment of preconditions imposed thereunder. As per the agreement the company was additionally entitled to a period of 180 days, after the expiry of the said commitment period to allow for unforeseen delays beyond the reasonable control of the company.
24. That the respondent kept demanding the instalments and the complainants have paid the instalments. As per the statement of account dated 07.02.2022 the respondent has demanded Rs. 1,54,02,076/- and the same has been paid by the complainants.
25. That as per the home loan account statement the complainants have paid Rs. 20,48,139/- as an interest for the period 01.04.2016 to 31.01.2022.
26. That on 16.02.2022, respondent sent a notice of possession through email informing that the occupation certificate of phase -II has been granted by the competent authority and asked for the payment of Rs. 22,00,212/-. That the respondent has increased the development charges from Rs. 4,86,477/- to Rs. 5,82,702/-. Therespondent has acknowledged the delay

in handing over of possession therefore, credited Rs. 4,32,032 as delay compensation and Rs. 17,250/- as GST rebates.

27. That the respondent issued a letter on 18.03.2014 and offered a timely payment discount of Rs. 200/- per sq. ft. which was further extended by email dated 17.04.2014.
28. That the main grievance of the complainants in the present complaint is that despite they having paid more than 95% of the actual cost of the flat and ready and willing to pay the remaining amount the respondent failed to deliver possession of the flat along with the proposed amenities.
29. That since 2017, the complainants are regularly contacting the respondent and made several phone calls to them and made efforts to get possession of the allotted flat but all in vain. Despite several phone calls and requests by the complainants, respondent did not give possession of the flat.

C. Relief sought by the complainants: -

30. The complainants have sought following relief(s):
 - I. Direct the respondent to handover the physical possession of the fully developed apartment with all amenities.
 - II. Direct the respondent to pay delayed possession interest on the amount paid by the allottee at the prescribed rate from the due date of possession to till the actual possession of the flat is handed over as per the proviso to section 18(1) of the Act.
 - III. To restrain the respondent from charges enhanced development charges.

- IV. Direct the respondent to provide the area calculation of the flat (super area, carpet area and common loading) before physical possession of the flat.
 - V. Direct the respondent to refrain from charging holding charges and unreasonable interest.
 - VI. Direct the respondent to give GST input tax credit on GST levied.
31. 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.

32. 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.
33. That there is no cause of action to file the present complaint.
34. That the complainants have no locus standi to file the present complaint.
35. That the complainants are estopped from filing the present complaint by their own acts, conduct, admissions, acquiescence and laches.
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 complainants have not approached this authority with clean hands and has intentionally suppressed and concealed the material facts.

The present complaint has been filed by it 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 complainants after checking the veracity of the project namely 'The Corridors', Sector 67A, Gurugram had applied for allotment of an apartment vide Booking Application Form dated 22.03.2013. The complainants agreed to be bound by the terms and conditions of the Booking Application Form.
- That based on the said application, the respondent vide its allotment offer letter dated 07.08.2013 allotted to the complainants apartment no. CD-C9-10-1002 in group housing project known as 'The Corridors' having tentative super area 1483.57 sq. ft. for a sale consideration of Rs. 1,63,82,206.66/-. The builder buyer's agreement was executed on 25.04.2014.
- That the respondent raised payment demands from time to time from the complainants in accordance with the agreed terms and conditions of the allotment and the subsequently executed builder buyer's agreement dated 25.04.2014 by the complainants. Furthermore, the respondent being a customer-oriented company agreed to waive of PLC of 13% on parking element of Rs. 450 i.e., Rs. 86,789/- reducing the same from to Rs. 17,74,350/- to Rs. 16,68,756/- subject to the complainants remitting the future payments on time as well as per the terms of the application form and builder buyer agreement and the same is clear from the copy of email dated 21.04.2014.

- That the complainants did not abide by the terms and conditions and deliberately violated the same time and again. That payment request dated 08.03.2016 regarding 5th installment in respect of the unit allotted to the complainants was sent to the complainants on 08.03.2016. However, the complainants instead of complying with the said payment request started making requests contrary to the agreed terms and conditions that the 5th payment installment be accepted in three equal installments as the complainants allegedly had other commitments to meet.
- 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. That 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.

- 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. It is submitted that the 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 expired only on 27.11.2019.

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 are 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 be 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. That many defaulting allottees have filed various false and frivolous complaints before the DTCP, Haryana, Chandigarh with an intention to delay the grant of occupation certificate by the DTCP, Haryana, Chandigarh. The DTCP, Haryana while disposing of those false and frivolous complaints vide its order dated 25.09.2020 had categorically stated that the respondents had applied for the grant of the occupation certificate and that DTCP, Haryana, Chandigarh was not able to issue the same on account of several complaints being filed.
47. That further outbreak of covid-19 pandemic and its various subsequent waves adversely affected the functioning of various Govt. as well as private offices and caused delay in grant of occupation certificate of phase-II of the subject project in which unit of the complainants are situated.
48. That the complainants are trying to mislead this hon'ble authority by making baseless, false and frivolous averments. The respondent has already completed the construction of the tower in which the unit allotted to the complainants is located.
49. 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

50. 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

51. 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

52. 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.

53. 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.

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.

54. 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 complainants and the respondent prior to the enactment of the Act and the provision of the said Act cannot be applied retrospectively.

55. 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."

56. 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."

57. 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 complainants are in breach of agreement for non-invocation of arbitration

58. 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".

59. 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.
60. 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 B of the Arbitration Act."

61. 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."

62. Therefore, in view of the above judgements and considering the provisions of the Act, the authority is of the view that complainants are 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 complainants

G.1 Direct the respondent to handover the physical possession of the fully developed apartment with all amenities.

63. The respondent promoter was granted OC for the subject unit from the competent authority on 27.01.2022 and had offered possession to the complainants allottee vide notice of possession letter dated 16.02.2022. 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 restrain the respondent from charging enhanced developmental charges.

64. The promoter is directed to provide details of the enhanced developmental charges from Rs. 4,86,477/- to Rs. 5,82,702/-. The justification shall be given to the allottee and then only demand be raised by the respondent.

G.III. Direct the respondent to provide area calculation of the flat (super area, carpet area and common loading) before physical possession of the flat.

65. The authority is of the view that as per section 19(1) of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act 2016, the allottee shall be entitled to obtain the information relating to sanctioned plans, layout plans along with the specifications, approved by the competent authority and such other information as provided in this Act or the rules and regulations made thereunder or the agreement for sale signed with the promoter.

66. In view of the same, the respondent/promoter is directed to provide the area calculation of the subject unit to the complainants allottees.

G.IV. Direct the respondent to refrain from charging holding charges and unreasonable interest.

67. The respondent shall not charge anything from the complainants 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. V. Direct the respondent to give GST input tax credit on GST levied.

68. In this context the attention of the authority was drawn to the fact that the legislature while framing the GST law specifically provided for anti-profiteering measures as a check and to maintain the balance in the inflation of cost on the product/services due to change in migration to a new tax regime i.e. GST, by incorporating section 171 in Central Goods and Services Tax Act, 2017/ Haryana Goods and Services Tax Act, 2017, the same is reproduced herein below:

"Section 171. (1) Any reduction in rate of tax on any supply of goods or services or the benefit of input tax credit shall be passed on to the recipient by way of commensurate reduction in prices."

69. The intention of the legislature was amply clear that the benefit of tax reduction or 'Input Tax Credit' is required to be passed onto the customers in view of section 171 of HGST/CGST Act, 2017. As per the above said provisions of the Act, it is mandatory for the respondent to pass on the benefits of 'Input Tax Credit' by way of commensurate reduction in price of the flat/unit. Accordingly, respondent should reduce the price of the unit/consideration to be realized from the buyer of the flats commensurate with the benefit of ITC received by him. The promoter shall submit the benefit given to the allottee as per section 171 of the HGST Act, 2017.

70. The builder has to pass the benefit of input tax credit to the buyer. In the event, the respondent-promoter has not passed the benefit of ITC to the buyers of the unit then it is in contravention to the provisions of section 171(1) of the HGST Act, 2017 and has thus committed an offence as per the provisions of section 171 (3A) of the above Act. The allottee shall be at liberty to approach the State Screening Committee Haryana for initiating proceedings under section 171 of the HGST Act against the respondent-

promoter. The concerned SGST Commissioner is advised to take necessary action to ensure that the benefit of ITC is passed on to the allottee in future.

G.II Direct the respondent to pay delayed possession interest on the amount paid by the allottee at the prescribed rate from the due date of possession to till the actual possession of the flat is handed over as per the proviso to section 18(1) of the Act.

71. In the present complaint, the complainants intends to continue with the project and 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."

72. Clause 13.3 of the apartment buyer's agreement (in short, the agreement) dated 25.04.2014, 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."

73. 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.

74. 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 complainants 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.

75. 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.
76. 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 complainants/allottees. The respondent has acted in a pre-determined and preordained manner.

77. 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 complainants.
78. By virtue of apartment buyer's agreement executed between the parties on 23.02.2016, 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.

79. 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.**'
80. 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.

81. 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 complainants/allottees should not bear the burden of mistakes/ laxity or the irresponsible behavior of the developers/respondents and seeing the fact that the developers/respondents 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 they 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.

82. **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 they 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 promoters at this stage.

83. Admissibility of delay possession charges at prescribed rate of interest: The complainants are 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.

84. 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."

85. 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.

86. The definition of term 'interest' as defined under section 2(za) 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;"*

87. Therefore, interest on the delay payments from the complainants 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.

88. 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 25.04.2014, 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 complainants are 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 by them to the respondent from due date of possession i.e., 23.01.2017 till offer of possession of the booked unit i.e., 16.02.2022 plus two months which comes out to be 16.04.2022 as per the proviso to section 18(1)(a) of the Act read with rules 15 of the rules.

H. Directions of the authority

89. 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 after obtaining occupation certificate 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 complainants are also directed to pay the outstanding dues, if any after adjustment of delay possession charges.
- 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.
90. This decision shall mutatis mutandis apply to cases mentioned in para 3 of this order.
91. 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.
92. Files be consigned to registry.

v.i-3
(Vijay Kumar Goyal)

Member

Haryana Real Estate Regulatory Authority, Gurugram


(Dr. K.K. Khandelwal)

Chairman

Dated: 17.08.2022

HARERA
GURUGRAM