

**BEFORE THE HARYANA REAL ESTATE APPELLATE
TRIBUNAL**

Appeal No. 268 of 2020

Date of Decision: 06.01.2023

Emaar India Ltd. registered office at # 306-308 Square One, C-2 District Centre, Saket, New Delhi-110017. 2nd Address Corporate Office, Emaar Business Park, MG Road, Sikandarpur, Sector 28, Gurugram (Haryana) 122 002

Appellant

Versus

Dharampal Sheoran resident of House No. 1444, Sector-13, HUDA, Bhiwani, Haryana.

Respondent

CORAM:

Shri Inderjeet Mehta
Shri Anil Kumar Gupta

Member (Judicial)
Member (Technical)

Argued by: Ms. Rupali Shekhar Verma, Advocate,
Ld. counsel for the appellant.

Shri Harsh Jain, Advocate,
Ld. counsel for the respondent.

ORDER:

ANIL KUMAR GUPTA, MEMBER (TECHNICAL):

The present appeal has been preferred under Section 44(2) of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act 2016 (further called as, 'the Act') by the appellant-promoter against impugned order dated 04.02.2020 passed by the Haryana Real

Appeal No. 268 of 2020

Estate Regulatory Authority, Gurugram (for short, 'the Ld. Authority') whereby the Complaint No. 453 of 2019 filed by the respondent-allottee was disposed of with the following directions:

"i. The respondent is directed to pay the interest at the prescribed rate i.e. 10.20% per annum for every month of delay on the amount paid by the complainant from due date of possession i.e. 10.06.2012 till the offer of possession i.e. 23.11.2016. The arrears of interest accrued so far shall be paid to the complainant within 90 days from the date of this order.

ii. The complainant is directed to pay outstanding dues, if any, after adjustment of interest for the delayed period.

iii. The respondent shall not charge anything from the complainant which is not part of the buyer's agreement.

iv. Interest on the due payments from the complainants shall be charged at the prescribed rate @ 10.20% by the promoter which is the same as is being granted to the complainant in case of delayed possession charges. "

2. As per the averments in the complaint, unit no. EHF-350-I-FF-122, First Floor, Block/building no. Ivory, measuring 1750 sq. ft. in the project of the appellant "Emerald

Hills-Floors”, Sector 65, Gurugram, Haryana was booked by original allottees Mr. Aashish Sachdeva and Mrs. Seema Sachdeva (hereinafter “Original Allottees”). The provisional allotment letter was issued on 27.07.2009. The Buyer’s Agreement (further called as, ‘the Agreement’) was executed between the parties on 10.12.2009. As per clause 13(i) of the agreement the due date of offer of possession is after 27 months from the date of agreement plus grace period of six months which comes out to be 10.06.2012. The total sale consideration as per statement of account dated 18.02.2019 is Rs. 74,23,244/-. The total amount paid by the respondent-allottee is Rs.76,32,260/- as per the statement of account dated 18.02.2019. The intimation of possession was received by the respondent-allottee on 23.11.2016. The possession was handed over to the respondent-allottee on 14.07.2018. Therefore, on account of delay in handing over of the possession, the respondent-allottee filed a complaint before the Id. Authority seeking the following relief:-

“(i) Direct the respondent to pay an interest for delay in possession of the unit to the complainants for a period of delay from the date of agreed possession as per the buyers agreement till the actual physical possession of the unit.”

Appeal No. 268 of 2020

3. Per contra, ld. counsel for the appellant in its reply to the complaint pleaded that the complaints pertaining to the refund, compensation and interest are to be decided by the Adjudicating Officer under Section 71 of the Act read with rule 29 of the Rules and not by the Ld. Authority.

4. It was pleaded that Mr. Ashish Sachdeva and Mrs. Seema Sachdeva had approached the appellant-promoter sometime in the year 2009 for purchase of independent unit in its project. The original allottees, in pursuance of the aforesaid application form dated 23.06.2009, was allotted an independent unit bearing no. EHF-350-I-FF-122, located on first floor in the project vide allotment letter dated 27.07.2009. Thereafter, the respondent-allottee approached the original allottees for purchasing their rights and title in the unit in question. The original allottees acceded to the request of the respondent-allottee and agreed to transfer and convey their rights, entitlement and title in the unit in question to the respondent-allottee for a sale consideration of Rs. 70,00,000/-.

5. It was further pleaded that the respondent-allottee was stepping into the shoes of the original allottees and therefore all the rights and liabilities of the original allottees were transferred to the respondent-allottee. The original allottees were not entitled to any compensation or any interest for delay, if any, in offering possession of the unit in terms of

the buyer's agreement on account of default of terms and conditions thereof by them.

6. It was further pleaded that the right from beginning, the original allottees were irregular regarding the remittance of instalments on time. The appellant-promoter was constrained to issue several payment request letters, reminders etc. to the allottees requesting them to make payment of outstanding amounts payable by them under payment plan opted by them.

7. It was further pleaded that as per clause 13(b)(v), in the event of any default or delay in payment of instalments as per the schedule of payment incorporated in the buyer's agreement, the time for delivery of possession shall also stand extended.

8. It was further pleaded that clause 15 of the buyer's agreement provides that the compensation for any delay in delivery of possession shall only be given to such allottees who are not in default of their obligations envisaged under the agreement and who have not defaulted in payment of instalments as per the payment plan incorporated in the agreement.

9. It was further pleaded that the respondent-allottee declared in an affidavit and indemnity-cum-undertaking that the respondent-allottee having been substituted in the place of

the original allottees in respect of the provisional allotment letter of the unit in question was not entitled to any compensation for delay, if any, in delivery of possession of the unit or any rebate under a scheme or otherwise or any other discount, by whatever name called from the appellant.

10. It was pleaded that the occupation certificate was received on 09.06.2016, the possession of the unit was offered on 23.11.2016 and the unit has been handed over on 14.07.2018. The conveyance deed has been executed on 28.08.2018.

11. After controverting all the pleas raised by the respondent-allottee, the appellant-promoter sought for dismissal of the complaint.

12. The Ld. authority after considering the pleadings of the parties passed the impugned order, the relevant part of which has already been reproduced in the upper part of this appeal.

13. We have heard, Ms. Rupali Shekhar Verma, Advocate, Ld. counsel for the appellant-promoter and Sh. Harsh jain, Advocate, Ld. counsel for the respondent-allottee and have carefully examined the record.

14. Ld. counsel for the appellant contended that the pleas taken in the grounds of appeal regarding the jurisdiction

of the 'Authority' and some other technical grounds in the grounds of the appeal are not being pressed on account of the Judgment of Hon'ble Apex Court in the case **M/s New Tech Promoters and Developers Pvt. Ltd. v. State of UP & others 2021 SCC online SC 1044.**

15. It was further contended that the agreement was executed between the original allottees Mr. Ashish Sachdeva and Mrs. Seema Sachdeva on 10.12.2009. As per clause 13(i) of the said agreement the due date of delivery of possession is after 27 months from the date of execution of the agreement plus grace period of 6 months which comes out to 10.06.2012. The original allottees sold the unit to respondent-allottee vide an agreement to sell between them vide a separate agreement dated 22.08.2012. Thus, the respondent-allottee is the subsequent allottee who stepped into the shoes of the original allottees on 22.08.2012 when the respondent-allottee submitted an indemnity-cum-undertaking to appellant having substituted in the place of the original allottees i.e. after the due date of delivery of possession i.e. 10.06.2012. The respondent-allottee at the time of purchase of the unit was aware of the fact that the due date of delivery of possession has already elapsed and the project is running behind schedule. However, despite the knowledge of the said fact that the project

is delayed the respondent allottee still chose to buy the unit in the said project.

16. She contended that it has been held in the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in case "**Wing. Commander Arifur Rahman Khan and Ors. Vs DLF Southern Homes Pvt. Ltd. 2020 SCC ONLINE 667 (SC).**" that the delayed possession interest to the subsequent allottee shall be payable from the date when the subsequent allottee stepped into the shoes of the original allottees.

17. She contended that the respondent – allottee has entered into the shoes of the original allottees after the due date of possession, therefore the delayed possession interest on the payments made by him to the appellant should be from the dates of payments made by him to the appellant.

18. With these contentions, it was contended that the present appeal may be allowed and the impugned order dated 04.02.2020 is set aside.

19. Per contra, Ld. counsel for the respondent- allottee contended that this Tribunal has passed orders in various appeals deciding similar issues and, therefore, this appeal may be decided in accordance with orders passed in those appeals.

Appeal No. 268 of 2020

20. It was further contended that the impugned order dated 04.02.2020 passed by the Ld. Authority is perfectly in order, is as per the Act, Rules and Regulations and contended for dismissal of the appeal being without any merits.

21. We have duly considered the aforesaid contentions of both the parties.

22. The undisputed facts of the case are that unit was booked by original allottee Mr. Ashish Sachdeva and Mrs. Seema Sachdeva unit no. EHF-350-I-FF-122, First Floor, Block/Building No. Ivory, measuring 1750 sq. ft. super area in the project of the appellant "Emerald Hills-Floors", Sector 65, Gurugramm Haryana. The provisional allotment letter was issued on 27.07.2009. The Agreement was signed between the original allottees and the appellant on 10.12.2009. The total sale consideration as per statement of account dated 18.02.2019 is Rs. 74,23,244/-. The total amount paid by the respondent-allottee as per statement account of dated 18.02.2019 is Rs. 76,32,260/-. The said unit was to be delivered within 27 months plus a grace period of six months i.e. on or before 10.06.2012. The unit was purchased by the respondent-allottee from the original allottees on 22.08.2012 and submitted an indemnity-cum-undertaking dated 22.08.2012 to the appellant of having substituted in place of

original allottees. The occupation certificate was issued on 09.06.2016 and offer of possession to the respondent-allottee was issued on 23.11.2016. The actual physical possession has been handed over to the respondent-allottee on 14.07.2018. The conveyance deed has been executed on 28.08.2018.

23. It is the argument of the appellant that the respondent-allottee is a subsequent allottee, who has purchased the property from the original allottees in resale on 22.08.2012 and submitted an indemnity-cum-undertaking dated 22.08.2012 to the appellant of having substituted in place of original allottees, after the due date of possession i.e. 10.06.2012. This means that the respondent-allottee at the time of purchase of the unit was aware of the fact that the due date of delivery of possession has already elapsed and the project is running behind schedule. However, despite the knowledge of the said fact that the project is delayed, the respondent-allottee still chose to buy the unit in the said project. It is further argument that the interest can only be awarded from the day when the respondent- allottee stepped into the shoes of the original allottees as per the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in case "**Wing. Commander Arifur Rahman Khan and Ors. Vs DLF Southern Homes Pvt. Ltd.** **2020 SCC ONLINE 667 (SC)..**

24. It has been held in case of **Hon'ble Supreme Court (Full Bench) in Civil Appeal No. 7042 of 2019 tilted as M/s Laureate Buildwell Private Ltd. v. Charanjeet Singh** decided on 22.07.2021, that the decision in **HUDA Vs. Raje Ram 2008 (17) SCC 407**, which was applied in *Wg. Commander Arifur Rehman (supra)* cannot be considered as a good law. However, with respect to the interest payable to the subsequent allottee, the relevant part of the judgment in case of *M/s Laureate Buildwell Private Ltd. (Supra)* is reproduced as below:-

“31. In view of these considerations, this court is of the opinion that the per se bar to the relief of interest on refund, enunciated by the decision in *Raje Ram (supra)* which was applied in *Wg. Commander Arifur Rehman (supra)* cannot be considered good law. The nature and extent of relief, to which a subsequent purchaser can be entitled to, would be fact dependent. However, it cannot be said that a subsequent purchaser who steps into the shoes of an original allottee of a housing project in which the builder has not honoured its commitment to deliver the flat within a stipulated time, cannot expect any – even reasonable time, for the performance of the builder's obligation. Such a conclusion would be arbitrary, given that there may be a large number- possibly thousands of flat buyers, waiting for their promised flats or residences; they surely would be entitled to all reliefs under

the Act. In such case, a purchaser who no doubt enters the picture later surely belongs to the same class. Further, the purchaser agrees to buy the flat with a reasonable expectation that delivery of possession would be in accordance within the bounds of the delayed timeline that he has knowledge of, at the time of purchase of the flat. Therefore, in the event the purchaser claims refund, on an assessment that he too can (like the original allottee) no longer wait, and face intolerable burdens, the equities would have to be moulded. It would no doubt be fair to assume that the purchaser had knowledge of the delay. However, to attribute knowledge that such delay would continue indefinitely, based on an a priori assumption, would not be justified. The equities, in the opinion of this court, can properly be moulded by directing refund of the principal amounts, with interest @ 9% per annum from the date the builder acquired knowledge of the transfer, or acknowledged it.”

25. In the present case, the respondent-allottee had purchased the unit from the original allottees on 22.08.2012, when he submitted an indemnity-cum-undertaking dated 22.08.2012 to the appellant of having substituted in place of original allottees, after the due date of handing over of the possession i.e. 10.06.2012, therefore, from the ratio of the above said law laid down in M/s Laureate Buildwell Private Ltd

(Supra), it is held that since the respondent-allottee had stepped into shoes of the original allottees after the expiry of due date of handing over of the possession, therefore, respondent-allottee is entitled for delayed possession charges w.e.f the date of entering into the shoes of the original allottees i.e. 22.08.2012 vide nomination letter dated 22.08.2012 issued by the appellant.

26. The further arguments of the appellant is that the interest at the prescribed rate on the payments which has been made by the respondent-allottee after he stepped into shoes of the original allottees i.e. 22.08.2012, shall be payable from the date on which the payments have been made. It is clarified that the payments made by the respondent-allottee after the date i.e. 22.08.2012, he stepped into the shoes of the original allottees shall be from the date the respective payments have been made by the respondent -allottee to the appellant-promoter.

27. No other issue was pressed before us.

28. Thus, keeping in view of our above discussion, the present appeal is partly allowed as per the aforesaid observations.

29. The amount of Rs. 34,70,148/- deposited by the appellant-promoter with this Tribunal as pre-deposit to comply with the provisions of proviso to Section 43(5) of the Act, along

Appeal No. 268 of 2020

with interest accrued thereon, be sent to the Ld. Authority for disbursement to the respondent-allottee, excess amount may be remitted to the appellant, subject to tax liability, if any, as per law and rules.

30. No order as to costs.

31. Copy of this judgment be communicated to both the parties/learned counsel for the parties and the learned Haryana Real Estate Regulatory Authority, Gurugram.

32. File be consigned to the record.

Announced:
January 06,2023

Inderjeet Mehta
Member (Judicial)
Haryana Real Estate Appellate Tribunal
Chandigarh

Anil Kumar Gupta
Member (Technical)

rajni