



HARERA
GURUGRAM

Complaint No. 3530 of 2019

Complaint no. 4060 of 2021

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

Complaint no. : 3530 of 2019
Date of filing : 30.08.2019
complaint: 13.11.2019
First date of hearing: 10.05.2023
Date of decision

Mr. Krishan Kumar
R/O: - Plot No-209, Block-T, Phase-I, Sec-109, New Palam
Vihar Gurgaon

Complainant

Versus

M/s Vsr Infratech Pvt Ltd
Regd. office: Corporate Office Ground Floor Plot No.-14
Sec-44 Gurgaon

Respondent

CORAM:
Shri Ashok Sangwan

Member

APPEARANCE:

Sh. Virender Singh (Advocate)
Sh. Shriya Takkar (Advocate)

Complainant
Respondent

ORDER

1. The present complaint dated 29.01.2020 has been filed by the complainant/allottees 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 provisions of the act or the rules and regulations made there under or to the allottees as per the agreement for sale executed *inter se*.

2. The complaint has been received on 30.08.2019 and reply has been filed by the respondent. The complainant generated new proforma B by complaint No. 4060 of 2021. The said complaint i.e., complaint no. 3530 of 2019 is clubbed with complaint No. 4060 of 2021.

A. Unit and project details

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

S. No.	Heads	Information
1.	Name of the project	"114 Avenue", Sector 114, Gurugram, Haryana
2.	Project area	2.968 acres
3.	Nature of the project	Commercial Colony
4.	DTCP license no. and validity status	72 of 2011 dated 27.07.2011 valid up to 20.07.2024
5.	Name of licensee	AMD Estate & Developers Pvt. Ltd.
6.	RERA Registered/ not registered	Registered vide no. 53 of 2019 dated 30.09.2019



7.	Unit no.	6B-25, 6 th floor (Page no. 39 of complaint)
8.	Unit area admeasuring	784.70 sq. ft. (Page no. 38 of complaint)
9.	Date of start of construction	01.01.2012 (As per the project details)
10.	Date of execution of agreement to sell	12.10.2012 (Page no. 37 of the complaint)
11.	Possession clause	32 Possession The company shall give possession of the said unit within 36 months of signing of this agreement or within 36 months from the date of start of construction of the said building whichever is later. (Page 42 of the complaint).
12.	Due date of possession	12.10.2015 (Calculated from the date of execution of agreement to sell)
13.	Total sale consideration	Rs.52,71,615/- (As per on page 39 of complaint)
14.	Amount paid by the complainant	Rs.43,27,084/- (As alleged by the complainant in facts on page 10 of complaint)
15.	Occupation certificate	17.02.2021 (As per on page 154 of reply)
16.	Offer of possession	23.03.2021

(As per on page 158 of reply)

B. Fact of the complaint

4. The complainant booked a commercial unit in the project namely "114 Avenue" located in sector 114, Gurgaon. The complainant was allotted a unit bearing 6B-25, 6th floor admeasuring 784.70 sq. ft. for a total sale consideration of Rs. .52,71,615/-
5. That the complainant asked at the time of booking to provide the allotment letter and to execute the Buyer's Agreement, but the respondent gave false excuses and delayed stating one reason or another. Thereafter the respondent created an undue pressure to give money as per its demands without executing Buyer's Agreement and it is also to state that by that time period the complainant had already made a payment of substantial amount out of the total sale consideration.
6. That after several requests the respondent executed the buyer's agreement on 12.10.2012. As per clause 32 of the buyer's agreement the unit was to be handed over within 36 months of signing of this agreement or within 36 months from the date of start of construction of the said building whichever is later. As per this the due date comes out to be 12.10.2015.
7. That thereafter the respondent kept on demanding money from the complainant on false pretexts such as raising the construction at a very fast pace and the complainant with a hope that the possession of the unit will be handed over in some time after the completion of construction , the





complainant continued to pay the same on good faith but all the demands made by the respondent were not as per the level of construction .

8. That the complainant has paid an amount of Rs. 43,27,084/- till date. The payment plan opted was construction linked. The complainant has made payments on the demands of the respondent and the same were duly accepted and receipts were provided against the payments made.
9. That as huge time had been lapsed, the complainant therefore made several calls to the customer care and marketing departments to seek the status of the construction , but the complainant was never provided with a satisfactory response and the respondent's officials made false and frivolous statements and gave false assurances that the construction is in full swing and the unit shall be handed over within the agreed time .
10. That the complainant visited the site in the month of July , 2019 and was shocked to realise that the project was getting delayed as very slow construction was being carried out . The complainant also noticed that external work in the building, the landscape work and other such developments and facilities are not completed till date.
11. That almost a period of 99 months has been lapsed from the date of booking of the apartment and further a period of almost 82 months have gone since the agreement was executed between the complainant and the respondent. Despite passing of huge time the respondent had deliberately failed to handover the possession of the unit to the complainant.

12. That the cause of action arose when the respondent failed to handover the possession of the unit as agreed upon. The complainant has filed the present complaint for refund of the total paid up amount.

C. Relief sought by the complainant:

13. The complainants have sought following relief(s):

- 1) Direct the respondent to refund Rs. 43,27,084/ along with prescribed rate of interest paid by the complainant.
- 2) Direct the respondent to pay cost of litigation of Rs. 1,00,000/-

14. On the date of hearing, the authority explained to the respondent/ promoters 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 builder by way of written reply made following submissions:

15. That the respondent has acted in accordance with the terms and conditions of the space buyer's agreement executed between the parties on their own free will. The complainants were duly informed about the Schedule of possession as per Clauses 32 of the space buyer's agreement entered into between the complainant and respondent.

16. That in the present case as per the space buyer's agreement dated 12.10.2012, the respondent was supposed to hand over the possession within a period of 36 months of signing of this Agreement i.e. 12.10.2012

✓



or within 36 months from the date of start of construction of the said building i.e. in the year 2012 whichever is later. It is submitted that the later date is the date of execution of the agreement i.e. 12.10.2012 and the possession date comes out to be 12.10.2015. However, the said timeline was subject to force majeure conditions. That it is submitted that as per Clause 32 of the buyer's agreement which clearly states that respondent shall be entitled to extension of time for delivery of possession of the said premises if such performance is prevented or delayed due to conditions as mentioned therein. That despite exercising diligence and continuous pursuance of project to be completed, project of the respondent could not be completed as prescribed for the following reasons:

- a. That it is pertinent to mention here that the project in question was launched in the year 2010 and is right on the Dwarka expressway, which was supposed to be completed by the State of Haryana by the end of 2012. That the star purpose of launching the project and object of the complainants buying the project was the connectivity of Dwarka expressway which was promised by the State Government to be completed in the year 2012. That it is reiterated that the only approach road to the project in this Dwarka Expressway which is still not complete and is likely to take another year or so. There being no approach

W



road available it was initially not possible to make the heavy trucks carrying construction material to the project site and after a great difficulty and getting some kacha paths developed, materials could be supplied for the project to get completed which took a lot extra time. Even now the Govt has not developed and completed the basic infrastructure, despite the fact that EDC/IDC were both deposited with the State Government on time. The Dwarka Expressway was earlier scheduled to be completed by the year 2012, by the State Government of Haryana, but later failed to develop the said road. In the year 2017, NHAI (National Highway Authority of India) joined to complete the Dwarka Expressway, but again both State Government as well as NHAI again missed the deadlines and still the Expressway is incomplete, now likely to be completed by the year 2022, if the deadline is adhered to be these agencies. That in this view of the circumstances as detailed above the respondent developer can by no means be expected to complete a project which does not even have an approach road to be constructed by the State. Thus the respondent cannot be held accountable for the delay in the project and State of Haryana and

✓



NHAI, are responsible, hence answerable for the delay in completing Dwarka expressway, which in turn has caused the delay of the present project. That completion of Dwarka expressway which in turn affected the completion of the project in question was beyond the control of the Respondent. Thus, for just and fair adjudication of this complaint both State of Haryana and NHAI are necessary parties to the present proceedings for the purpose of causing the delay in the project and thus they are jointly and severally liable for the delay of the project and pay compensation to the complainant.

b. It is submitted that in the year, 2012 on the directions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, the mining activities of minor minerals (which includes sand) were regulated. The Hon'ble Supreme Court directed framing of Modern Mineral Concession Rules. Reference in this regard may be had to the judgment of "*Deepak Kumar v. State of Haryana, (2012) 4 SCC 629*". The competent authorities took substantial time in framing the rules and in the process the availability of building materials including sand which was an important raw material for development of



the said Project became scarce in the NCR as well as areas around it.

- c. The company faced the problem of sub soil water which persisted for a period of 6 months and hampered excavation and construction work. The problem still persists, and we are taking appropriate action to stop the same.
- d. The company is facing the labour problem for last 3 years continuously which slowed down the overall progress of the project and in case the company remains to face this problem in future, there is a probability of further delay of project.
- e. The contractor of the project stopped working due to his own problems and the progress of project was completely at halt due to stoppage of work at site. It took almost 9 months to resolve the issues with contractor and to remobilize the site.
- f. The building plans were approved in January 2012 and company had timely applied for environment clearances to competent authorities, which was later forwarded to State Level Environment Impact Assessment Authority, Haryana. Despite of our best endeavour we only got environment clearance

1/5



certificate on 28.05.2013 i.e. almost after a period of 17 month from the date of approval of building plans.

- g. The typical design of fifth floor slab casting took a period of more than 6 month to design the shutting plans by structural engineer which hampered the overall progress of work.
- h. The infrastructure facilities are yet to be created by competent authority in this sector is also a reason for delay in overall project. The drainage, sewerage and other facility work not yet commenced by competent authority.
- i. It is worth mentioning here that there was a stay on construction in furtherance to the direction passed by the Hon'ble NGT. In furtherance of the above-mentioned order passed by the Hon'ble NGT.
- j. That the sudden surge requirement of labour and then sudden removal has created a vacuum for labour in NCR region. That the projects of not only the respondent but also of all the other Developers/Builders have been suffering due to such shortage of labour and has resulted in delays in the projects beyond the control of any of the developers. That in addition the respondent



states that this further resulted in increasing the cost of construction to a great extent.

- k. That the Ministry of environment and Forest and the Ministry of mines had imposed certain restrictions which resulted in a drastic reduction in the availability of bricks and availability of Sand which is the most basic ingredient of construction activity. That said ministries had barred excavation of topsoil for manufacture of bricks and further directed that no more manufacturing of bricks be done within a radius of 50 km from coal and lignite-based thermal power plants without mixing 25% of ash with soil.
- l. That shortage of bricks in region has been continuing ever since and the respondent had to wait many months after placing order with concerned manufacturer who in fact also could not deliver on time resulting in a huge delay in project.
- m. That sand which is used as a mixture along with cement for the same construction activity was also not available in the abundance as is required since mining Department imposed serious restrictions against manufacturing of sand from Aravali region.

- n. That this acute shortage of sand not only delayed the project of the answering Respondent but also shot up the prices of sand by more than hundred percent causing huge losses to Respondent.
- o. That in addition the current Govt. has on 8th Nov. 2016 declared demonetization which severely impacted the operations and project execution on the site as the labourers in absence of having bank accounts were only being paid via cash by the sub-contractors of the company and on the declaration of the demonetization, there was a huge chaos which ensued and resulted in the labourers not accepting demonetized currency after demonetization.
- p. That in July 2017 the Govt. of India further introduced a new regime of taxation under the Goods and Service Tax which further created chaos and confusion owing to lack of clarity in its implementation. That ever since July 2017 since all the materials required for the project of the company were to be taxed under the new regime it was an uphill task of the vendors of building material along with all other necessary materials required for construction of the project wherein the auditors and CA's across the country were advising everyone to wait for



clarities to be issued on various unclear subjects of this new regime of taxation which further resulted in delays of procurement of materials required for the completion of the project.

- q. That it is further submitted that there was a delay in the project also on account of violations of the terms of the agreement by several allottees. That because of the recession in the market most the allottees have defaulted in making timely payments and this accounted to shortage of money for the project which in turn also delayed the project.
- r. It is further submitted that the Government of India declared nationwide lockdown due to COVID 19 Pandemic effective from 24th March, 2020 midnight. It is submitted that the construction and development of the project was affected due to this reason as well. This Hon'ble Authority has vide its order dated 26.05.2020 invoked the force majeure clause.

17. That after making sincere efforts despite the force majeure conditions, the applicant/respondent completed the construction and thereafter applied for the Occupancy Certificate (OC) on 15.07.2020. However, it took considerable time in grant of OC and was finally received by the Petitioner

✓



on 17.02.2021 i.e almost after a period of 7 months from the date of application for grant of OC.

18. That the OC has been received by the respondent company on 17.02.2021.

That immediately after the receipt of the OC on 17.02.2021, the respondent company sent a letter dated 23.03.2021 along with the statement of accounts requesting the complainant to come forward and clear his dues and start the process of fit outs.

19. It is submitted that the complainant itself has been a chronic defaulter and has delayed in making payments of instalments on most of the occasions despite several reminders. It is submitted that the complainant was very well aware that he was under an obligation to make timely payments. That it is submitted that despite receiving various reminders the complainant failed to clear its outstanding dues and perform its contractual obligations, the complainant had chosen to approach this Hon'ble Authority with a frivolous complaint only with a malafide intention to unjustly enrich itself and in one way or the other cover-up its own breaches and non-performance of its contractual obligations. Hence, the complainant is not entitled to any relief whatsoever from this Hon'ble Authority. It is the well settled law as held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India; a defaulter is not entitled to get any equitable relief.

20. That the complainant has failed to make timely payments and is a chronic defaulter and therefore is liable to pay delayed interest on outstanding

4

due payment. It is submitted that the complainant defaulted in making payments and accordingly reminders were issued to the complainant vide letters dated 12.08.2013, 24.08.2013, 11.06.2018.

21. That once the project is complete and Occupation Certificate has been granted on 17.02.2021 then no case of refund is made out. It is further submitted that if refund is allowed, other buyers/ customers who have invested their hard earned money in the complex will suffer irreparable losses and the complex will never be made fully occupied if such an approach continues. Thus, to protect the interest of one person, the Hon'ble Adjudicating Authority can't jeopardize the interest of others who are genuine purchasers and are not mere speculators.
22. That as already stated in the aforesaid paragraphs, the complainant is not entitled to refund of the amount and the contents are reiterated herein and not repeated for the sake of brevity. That in addition it is further submitted that the Occupation Certificate has already been issued by the competent Authorities after due inspection and verification on 17.02.2021 and thus the project is complete in all respect and any order of refund after the completion of project will gravely affect the respondent and will be against the well settled principle of law as already held by this Hon'ble AO and the Hon'ble Authority RERA. That this Hon'ble AO and the Hon'ble Authority RERA has taken a consistent view that refund cannot be allowed in projects where substantial development has already taken place and

thus any order of refund in the present case, where the OC has been received will be against the principle of Doctrine of Precedent.

23. All other averments made in the complaint were denied in toto.

24. 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

25. 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

26. 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

27. 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.

28. 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.
29. 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. (Supra)** and 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

lw



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."

30. Hence, in view of the authoritative pronouncement of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the cases 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 force majeure conditions:

31. The respondent/promoter has raised the contention that the construction of the tower in which the unit of the complainants is situated, has been delayed due to force majeure circumstances such as, labour had the problem which slowed down the construction, implementation of various social schemes by Government of India, demonetisation, lockdown due to covid-19 various orders passed by NGT, tax, mining activities and sub soil water, Dwarka expressway etc. But all the pleas advanced in this regard are devoid of merit. Though some allottees may not be regular in paying the amount due but whether the interest of all the stakeholders

hr

concerned with the said project be put on hold due to fault of on hold due to fault of some of the allottees. Thus , the promoter respondent cannot be given any leniency on based of aforesaid reasons. It is well settled principle that a person cannot take benefit of his own wrongs.

32. The respondent also took a plea that the construction at the project site was delayed due to Covid-19 outbreak. In the instant complaint, the due date of handing over of possession comes out to be 12.10.2015. Thus, the promoter respondent cannot be given any leniency on based of aforesaid reasons and it is well settled principle that a person cannot take benefit of his own wrong.

G. Findings on the relief sought by the complainant

G.I Direct the respondent to refund Rs. 43,27,084/ along with prescribed rate of interest paid by the complainant.

33. The complainant was allotted a unit in the project of the respondent for a total sale consideration of Rs. 52,71,615/-. The builder buyer's agreement was executed on 12.10.2012. The possession of the subject unit was to be handed over within 36 months of signing of this agreement or within 36 months from the date of start of construction of the said building whichever is later. The due date of completion of project and offering possession of the unit comes out 12.10.2015. But the respondent had not obtained the occupation certificate till the date of filing of complaint. The occupation certificate was obtained on 17.02.2021 and the possession was offered on 23.03.2021.

✓

34. The complainant filed the present complaint on 30.08.2019 seeking refund of the paid-up amount. The complainant filed the present complaint even before receiving the occupation certificate and before the possession was offered. The complainant had already made up his mind regarding refund of the paid-up amount and seeking refund by filing of the present complaint.
35. Keeping in view the fact that the allottee complainant wishes to withdraw from the project and demanding return of the amount received by the promoter in respect of the unit with interest on failure of the promoter to complete or inability to give possession of the unit in accordance with the terms of agreement for sale or duly completed by the date specified therein. The matter is covered under section 18(1) of the Act of 2016.
36. The due date of possession as per agreement for sale as mentioned in the table above is 12.10.2015 and there is delay of 3 years 10 months 18 days on the date of filing of the complaint.
37. The occupation certificate /part occupation certificate of the buildings/towers where allotted unit of the complainant is situated is received after filing of application by the complainant for return of the amount received by the promoter on failure of promoter to complete or unable to give possession of the unit in accordance with the terms of the agreement for sale or duly completed by the date specified therein. The complainant-allottee has already wished to withdraw from the project



and the allottee has become entitled his right under section 19(4) to claim the refund of amount paid along with interest at prescribed rate from the promoter as the promoter fails to comply or unable to give possession of the unit in accordance with the terms of agreement for sale. Accordingly, the promoter is liable to return the amount received by him from the allottee in respect of that unit with interest at the prescribed rate

38. Further in the judgement of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the cases of Newtech Promoters and Developers Private Limited Vs State of U.P. and Ors. (supra) 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. it was observed:

25. *The unqualified right of the allottee to seek refund referred Under Section 18(1)(a) and Section 19(4) of the Act is not dependent on any contingencies or stipulations thereof. It appears that the legislature has consciously provided this right of refund on demand as an unconditional absolute right to the allottee, if the promoter fails to give possession of the apartment, plot or building within the time stipulated under the terms of the agreement regardless of unforeseen events or stay orders of the Court/Tribunal, which is in either way not attributable to the allottee/home buyer, the promoter is under an obligation to refund the amount on demand with interest at the rate prescribed by the State Government including compensation in the manner provided under the Act with the proviso that if the allottee does not wish to withdraw from*



the project, he shall be entitled for interest for the period of delay till handing over possession at the rate prescribed.

39. The promoter is responsible for all obligations, responsibilities, and functions under the provisions of the Act of 2016, or the rules and regulations made thereunder or to the allottee as per agreement for sale under section 11(4)(a). The promoter has failed to complete or unable to give possession of the unit in accordance with the terms of agreement for sale or duly completed by the date specified therein. Accordingly, the promoter is liable to the allottee, as 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 the unit with interest at such rate as may be prescribed.
40. This is without prejudice to any other remedy available to the allottee including compensation for which allottee may file an application for adjudging compensation with the adjudicating officer under section 71 read with section 31(1) of the Act of 2016.
41. The authority hereby directs the promoter to return the amount received by him i.e. Rs. 43,27,084/- with interest at the rate of 10.70% (the State Bank of India highest marginal cost of lending rate (MCLR) applicable as on date +2%) as prescribed under rule 15 of the Haryana Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Rules, 2017 from the date of each payment till the actual date of refund of the amount within the timelines provided in rule 16 of the Haryana Rules 2017 ibid

W

G.II Direct the respondent to pay cost of litigation of Rs. 1,00,000/-

42. The complainants are seeking above mentioned relief w.r.t. compensation. Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in civil appeal nos. 6745-6749 of 2021 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 & litigation charges 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 & litigation expense shall be adjudged by the adjudicating officer having due regard to the factors mentioned in section 72. The adjudicating officer has exclusive jurisdiction to deal with the complaints in respect of compensation & legal expenses. Therefore, the complainants are advised to approach the adjudicating officer.

H. Directions of the authority

43. 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 /promoter is directed to refund the amount received from the complainant i.e., Rs. 43,27,084/- along with interest at the rate of 10.70% p.a. as prescribed under rule 15 of the Haryana Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Rules,

✓



2017 from the date of each payment till the actual date of refund of 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.

44. Complaint stands disposed of.

45. File be consigned to registry.

(Ashok Sangwan)
Member

Haryana Real Estate Regulatory Authority, Gurugram

Dated: 10.05.2023