

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

Complaint no.:	1493 of 2021
First date of hearing:	07.05.2021
Date of decision:	24.02.2023

1. Mahender Kumar
2. Babita Goel

Both RR/o 2/423, Aggarwal Colony, Bahadurgarh,
Haryana-124507

Complainants

Versus

Ansal Housing Ltd.

Office address: 606, 6th floor, Indra Prakash, 21,
Barakhamba Road, New Delhi-110001

Respondent

CORAM:

Shri Sanjeev Kumar Arora

Member

APPEARANCE:

Shri. Rajan Kumar Hans (Advocate)

Complainants

Smt. Meena Hooda (Advocate)

Respondent

ORDER

1. The present complaint dated 18.03.2021 has been filed by the complainants/allottee under section 31 of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016 (in short, the Act) read with rule 28 of the Haryana Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Rules, 2017 (in short, the Rules) for violation of section 11(4)(a) of the Act wherein it is *inter alia* prescribed that the promoter shall be responsible for all obligations, responsibilities and functions as provided under the

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

A. Unit and project related details

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

Sr. No.	Particulars	Details
1.	Name of the project	"Ansal Heights 86", Sector 86, Gurugram.
2.	Total area of the project	12.843 acres
3.	Nature of the project	Group housing colony
4.	DTCP license no.	48 of 2011 dated 29.05.2011 valid upto 28.05.2017
5.	Name of licensee	Resolve Estate Pvt. Ltd.
6.	Registered/not registered	Not registered
7.	Unit no.	C-1202 [pg. 24 of complaint]
8.	Area of the unit	1895 sq. ft. [pg. 24 of complaint]
9.	Date of execution of buyer's agreement with original allottee	10.09.2012 [pg. 21 of complaint]
10.	Date of transfer of unit in name of the complainants	18.04.2013 [pg. 39 of complaint]
11.	Possession clause	31. <i>The developer shall offer possession of the unit any time, within a period of 42 months from the date of execution of the agreement or within 42 months from the date of</i>

		<p><i>obtaining all the required sanctions and approval necessary for commencement of construction, whichever is later subject to timely payment of all dues by buyer and subject to force majeure circumstances as described in clause 32. Further, there shall be a grace period of 6 months allowed to the developer over and above the period of 42 months as above in offering the possession of the unit."</i></p> <p><i>(Emphasis supplied)</i></p> <p>[pg. 29 of complaint]</p>
12.	Due date of possession	10.09.2016 (Note: 42 months from date of agreement i.e., 10.09.2012 as date of start of construction is not known + 6 months grace period allowed being unqualified)
13.	Basic sale consideration as per payment plan annexed with BBA at page 37 of complaint.	₹ 71,62,816.75/-
14.	Total amount paid by the complainants as alleged by the complainants on pg. 7 of complaint	₹ 55,42,452/-
15.	Email requesting for refund of the amount paid by the complainants	22.02.2021 [pg. 51 of complaint]
16.	Offer of possession	Not offered
17.	Occupation Certificate	Not obtained

B. Facts of the complaint

3. The complainants have pleaded the complaint on the following facts:

- a. That the lead complainant Mahender Kumar is a resident of 2/423, Aggarwal colony, Bahadurgarh (Haryana) 124507. That the respondent Ansal Housing Limited (previously known as Ansal Housing & Construction Ltd.), is a company incorporated under the

- Companies Act, 1956 having its registered office at: 606, 6th floor, Indra Prakash, 21, Barakhamba Road, New Delhi - 110001 and its communication address at Ansal Plaza Mall, 2nd Floor, Sector 1, Vaishali, Ghaziabad (U.P) - 201010.
- b. That the project in question is known as "Ansal Heights 86" located at Sector 86, Gurgaon. That the residential unit in question is flat no. C-1202 on twelfth floor, 3 BHK+SQ admeasuring 1895 sq. ft super area. That as per Sec 2(zk) of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016, the respondent falls under the category of "Promoter" and is bound by the duties and obligations mentioned in the said act and is under the territorial jurisdiction of this Hon'ble Regulatory Authority.
 - c. That on 10.09.2012, the original allottee Mr. Ranjit Gupta s/o Sh. Tek Chand Gupta booked the unit from the respondent company. That a pre-printed, one-sided builder buyer agreement between the original buyer Mr. Ranjit Gupta and the respondent builder was executed on date 10.09.2012.
 - d. That in the 199th report of the law commission of India on 'unfair (procedural & substantive) terms in contract" wherein it was stated that "a contract or a term thereof is substantively unfair if such contract or the term thereof is in itself harsh, oppressive or unconscionable to one of the parties".
 - e. That the Hon'ble Haryana Real Estate Regulatory Authority Gurugram, in the matter of complainants no. 2998 of 2019 titled as **Umesh Pandit Vs. Ansal Housing** limited has already settled the matter that the date of possession would be 48 months from the

date of builder buyer agreement. Hence the date of possession in this case would be 10.09.2016.

- f. That as per the term & conditions of the builder buyer agreement, the cost of unit was arrived at Rs. 71,62,817/-. That the payment plan of the company was a construction linked payment plan whereas the last 5% of the amount was to be paid at the possession.
- g. That on 18.04.2013 the complainants bought the unit from the original allottee, and this change was duly endorsed by the respondent builder on the builder buyer agreement. That the complainants have already paid over 77.4% of the agreed amount i.e., Rs. 55,42,452/- till date to the respondent.
- h. That the respondent totally failed to comply with the provision of the builder buyer agreement regarding the possession date but aggressively pushed the complainants to pay up more money in contravention to the terms & conditions of the builder buyer agreement. That is why the complainants stopped the payment of the further demand as the builder failed miserably in keeping the promise of the possession date.
- i. That the complainants waited patiently but months went by, and the respondent was not committed to its words on the possession date and the complainants was forced to call them multiple times to remind the respondent to comply with the committed date of possession. That the complainants is an end user and wanted the house to live peacefully with his family and could not wait more so he verbally asked the company to cancel the unit first in **September**

2018 and multiple times thereafter as he was fed up with the delayed tactics of the respondent.

- j. That the time went by, but the complainants had to patiently wait for the unit cancellation and the refund proceeds from the company, but the respondent did not budge and did not even provide any reply on the matter even after many follow ups and numerous visits to their office.
- k. That the complainants are not happy with the functioning of the company and the project is already delayed by 4.5 years and there is no certainty as to when they will deliver the project as they have defaulted on their licenses and have still not registered the project with the Haryana real estate regulatory authority.
- l. That the main grievance of the complainants in the present complainants from respondent. The builder is that the complainants is an end user who wished to live in the apartment, but the respondent has miserably failed in its duty to the possession of the unit on time and due to the delayed possession of the unit by the respondent the complainants decided not to continue with the unit.
- m. That as per section 18 of the RERA Act. 2016, the promoter is liable to refund the amount and pay interest at the prescribed rate of interest and compensation to the allottees of an apartment, building or project for a delay or failure in handing over such possession as per the terms and agreement of the sale.

C. Relief sought by the complainants:

4. The complainants have sought following reliefs:

- a. Refund entire amount paid (₹55,42,452/-) by the complainants along with the interest.
5. On the date of hearing, the authority explained to the respondents/promoter about the contravention as alleged to have been committed in relation to section 11(4) (a) of the Act to plead guilty or not to plead guilty.

D. Reply by the respondent.

6. The respondent has contested the complaint on the following grounds:
 - a. That the present complaint is neither maintainable nor tenable by both law and on facts. It is submitted that the present complaint is not maintainable before this Hon'ble Authority. The complainants have filed the present complaint seeking refund and interest for the alleged delay in delivering possession of the unit booked by the complainants.
 - b. That even otherwise, the complainants have no locus-standi or cause of action to file the present complaint. The present complaint is based on an erroneous interpretation of the provisions of the Act as well as an incorrect understanding of the terms and conditions of the buyer's agreement dated 10.09.2013, as shall be evident from the submissions made in the following paragraphs of the present reply.
 - c. The respondent is a public limited company registered under the Companies Act, 1956 having its registered office at 606, Indraprakash, 21, Barakhamba Road, New Delhi-110001. The present reply is being filed by the respondent through its duly authorized representative named Mr. Vaibhav Chaudhary, whose

authority letter is attached herewith. The above said project relates to License no.48 of 2011 dated 29.05.2011 received from the Director General Town and Country Planning (DGTCP), Haryana, Chandigarh over the land measuring 12.843 acres details of the same are given in builder buyer agreement, situated within the revenue estate of Village Nawada-Fatehpur, Gurugram, which falls within Sector-86, Gurugram, Manesar-Urban Development Plan.

- d. The relief sought in the complaint by complainants is based on false and frivolous grounds and they are not entitled to any discretionary relief from this hon'ble authority as the person does not come with clean hands may be thrown out without going into the merits of the case. However, the true facts of the case are that the land of the project is owned and possessed by the respondent through its subsidiary M/s Resolve Estates Pvt. Ltd., having its Registered Office at 153, Okhla Industrial Estate, Phase-III, New Delhi-110020 and possessed by the through its subsidiary M/s Optus Corona Developers Pvt. Ltd., having registered office at J 181, Saket, New Delhi and M/s Samyak Project Pvt. Ltd., having its registered office at 111, First Floor, Antriksh Bhawan, K.G. Marg, and New Delhi.
- e. That the complainants approached the respondent sometime in the year 2011 for purchase of an independent unit in its upcoming residential project "Ansal Heights-86" (hereinafter "the project") situated in Sector 86, Village Nawada, Fatehpur, Gurgaon. It is submitted that the complainants prior to approaching the respondent, had conducted extensive and independent enquiries regarding the project and it was only after the complainants was

fully satisfied with regard to all aspects of the project, including but not limited to the capacity of the respondent to undertake development of the same, that the complainants took an independent and informed decision to purchase the unit, uninfluenced in any manner by the respondent.

- f. That thereafter the complainants vide application form dated 30.11.2011 applied to the respondent for provisional allotment of a unit in the project. The complainants, in pursuance of the aforesaid application form, was allotted an independent unit bearing no. C-1202 in the said project. The complainants consciously and wilfully opted for a construction linked plan for remittance of the sale consideration for the unit in question and further represented to the respondent that the complainants shall remit every instalment on time as per the payment schedule. The respondent had no reason to suspect the bonafide of the complainants. The complainants further undertook to be bound by the terms and conditions of the application form.
- g. It is further submitted that despite there being a number of defaulters in the project, the respondent itself infused funds into the project and has diligently developed the project in question. It is also submitted that the construction work of the project is swinging on full mode and the work will be completed within prescribed time period as given by the respondent to the authority.
- h. That without prejudice to the aforesaid and the rights of the respondent, it is submitted that the respondent would have handed over the possession to the complainants within time had there been

no force majeure circumstances beyond the control of the respondent, there had been several circumstances which were absolutely beyond and out of control of the respondent such as orders dated 16.07.2012, 31.07.2012 and 21.08.2012 of the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court duly passed in civil writ petition no.20032 of 2008 through which the sucking /extraction of water was banned which is the backbone of construction process, simultaneously orders at different dates passed by the Hon'ble National Green Tribunal restraining thereby the excavation work causing Air Quality Index being worse, may be harmful to the public at large without admitting any liability. Apart from these the demonetization is also one of the main factors to delay in giving possession to the home buyers as demonetization caused abrupt stoppage of work in many projects. The payments especially to workers to only buy liquid cash. The sudden restriction on withdrawals led the respondent unable to cope with the labour pressure. However, the respondent is carrying its business in letter and spirit of the builder buyer agreement as well as in compliance of other local bodies of Haryana Government.

- i. That, it is submitted that the complaint is not maintainable and tenable under the eyes of law, as the complainants has not approached the hon'ble authority with clean hands and not disclosed the true and material facts relates to this case of complaint. The complainants, thus, have approached the hon'ble authority with unclean hands and suppressed and concealed the material facts and proceedings which has direct bearing on the very

maintainability of purported complaint and if there had been disclosure of these material facts and proceedings the question of entertaining the present complaint would have not arising in view of the case law titled as *S.P. Chengalvaraya Naidu Vs. Jagan Nath* reported in 1994 (1) SCC Page-1, in which the Hon'ble Apex Court of the land opined that non-disclosure of material facts and documents amounts to a fraud on not only the opposite party, but also upon the hon'ble authority and subsequently the same view was taken by even Hon'ble National Commission in case titled as *Tata Motors Vs. Baba Huzoor Maharaj* bearing RP No.2562 of 2012 decided on 25.09.2013.

7. Copies of all the documents have been filed and placed on record. The authenticity is not in dispute. Hence, the complaint can be decided on the basis of theses undisputed documents.

E. Jurisdiction of the authority

8. The authority observed that it has territorial as well as subject matter jurisdiction to adjudicate the present complaint for the reasons given below.

E.I. Territorial jurisdiction

9. As per notification no. 1/92/2017-1TCP dated 14.12.2017 issued by Town and Country Planning Department, 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

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

Section 11

.....

(4) The promoter shall-

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

Section 34-Functions of the Authority:

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

11. So, in view of the provisions of the Act quoted above, the authority has complete jurisdiction to decide the complaint regarding non-compliance of obligations by the promoter as per provisions of section 11(4)(a) of the Act leaving aside compensation which is to be decided by the adjudicating officer if pursued by the complainants at a later stage.
12. Further, the authority has no hitch in proceeding with the complaint and to grant a relief of refund in the present matter in view of the judgement passed by the Hon'ble Apex Court in ***Newtech Promoters and Developers Private Limited Vs State of U.P. and Ors.*** SCC Online SC 1044 decided on 11.11.2021 wherein it has been laid down as under:

"86. From the scheme of the Act of which a detailed reference has been made and taking note of power of adjudication delineated with the regulatory authority and adjudicating officer, what finally culls out is that although the Act indicates the distinct expressions like 'refund', 'interest', 'penalty' and 'compensation', a conjoint reading of Sections 18 and 19 clearly manifests that when it comes to refund of the amount, and interest on the refund amount, or directing payment of

interest for delayed delivery of possession, or penalty and interest thereon, it is the regulatory authority which has the power to examine and determine the outcome of a complaint. At the same time, when it comes to a question of seeking the relief of adjudging compensation and interest thereon under Sections 12, 14, 18 and 19, the adjudicating officer exclusively has the power to determine, keeping in view the collective reading of Section 71 read with Section 72 of the Act. If the adjudication under Sections 12, 14, 18 and 19 other than compensation as envisaged, if extended to the adjudicating officer as prayed that, in our view, may intend to expand the ambit and scope of the powers and functions of the adjudicating officer under Section 71 and that would be against the mandate of the Act 2016."

13. Furthermore, the said view has been reiterated by the Division Bench of Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court in "**Ramprastha Promoter and Developers Pvt. Ltd. Versus Union of India and others dated 13.01.2022 in CWP bearing no. 6688 of 2021**". The relevant paras of the above said judgment reads as under:

"23) The Supreme Court has already decided on the issue pertaining to the competence/power of the Authority to direct refund of the amount, interest on the refund amount and/or directing payment of interest for delayed delivery of possession or penalty and interest thereupon being within the jurisdiction of the Authority under Section 31 of the 2016 Act. Hence any provision to the contrary under the Rules would be inconsequential. The Supreme Court having ruled on the competence of the Authority and maintainability of the complaint before the Authority under Section 31 of the Act, there is, thus, no occasion to enter into the scope of submission of the complaint under Rule 28 and/or Rule 29 of the Rules of 2017.

24) The substantive provision of the Act having been interpreted by the Supreme Court, the Rules have to be in tandem with the substantive Act.

25) In light of the pronouncement of the Supreme Court in the matter of M/s Newtech Promoters (supra), the submission of the petitioner to await outcome of the SLP filed against the judgment in CWP No.38144 of 2018, passed by this Court, fails to impress upon us. The counsel representing the parties very fairly concede that the issue in question has already been decided by the Supreme Court. The prayer made in the complaint as extracted in the impugned orders by the Real Estate Regulatory Authority fall within the relief pertaining to refund of the amount; interest on the refund amount or directing payment of interest for delayed delivery of possession. The power of adjudication

and determination for the said relief is conferred upon the Regulatory Authority itself and not upon the Adjudicating Officer."

14. Hence, in view of the authoritative pronouncement of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of **M/s Newtech Promoters and Developers Private Limited Vs State of U.P. and Ors. (supra)**, and the Division Bench of Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court in "**Ramprastha Promoter and Developers Pvt. Ltd. Versus Union of India and others. (supra)**", the authority has the jurisdiction to entertain a complaint seeking refund of the amount paid by allottee alongwith interest at the prescribed rate.

F. Findings on the relief sought by the complainants.

F.1. Refund entire amount paid by the complainants along with the interest.

15. In the present complaint, the complainants intend to withdraw from the project and are seeking return of the amount paid by them in respect of subject unit along with interest. Sec. 18(1) of the Act is reproduced below for ready reference:

"Section 18: - Return of amount and compensation

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

(a) in accordance with the terms of the agreement for sale or, as the case may be, duly completed by the date specified therein; or

(b) due to discontinuance of his business as a developer on account of suspension or revocation of the registration under this Act or for any other reason,

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

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

*prescribed.”
(Emphasis supplied)*

16. Clause 31 of the BBA dated 10.09.2012 provides for the handing over of possession and is reproduced below for the reference:

“31. The developer shall offer possession of the unit any time, within a period of 42 months from the date of execution of the agreement or within 42 months from the date of obtaining all the required sanctions and approval necessary for commencement of construction, whichever is later subject to timely payment of all dues by buyer and subject to force majeure circumstances as described in clause 32. Further, there shall be a grace period of 6 months allowed to the developer over and above the period of 42 months as above in offering the possession of the unit.”

17. 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 application, and the complainants not being in default under any provisions of this agreement and compliance with all provisions, formalities and documentation as prescribed by the promoter. The drafting of this clause and incorporation of such conditions are not only vague and uncertain but so heavily loaded in favour of the promoter and against the allottee that even a single default by the 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 flat buyer's agreement by the promoter are 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.

Admissibility of grace period: The respondent/promoter has raised the contention that the construction of the project was badly affected on account of the orders dated 16.07.2012, 31.07.2012 and 21.08.2012 of the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court duly passed in civil writ petition no.20032 of 2008 through which the sucking /extraction of water was banned which is the backbone of construction process, simultaneously orders at different dates passed by the Hon'ble National Green Tribunal restraining thereby the excavation work causing Air Quality Index being worse, may be harmful to the public at large without admitting any liability. Apart from these the demonetization is also one of the main factors to delay in giving possession to the home buyers as demonetization caused abrupt stoppage of work in many projects.

18. The promoter has proposed to hand over the possession of the apartment within a period of 42 months from date of agreement or from the date of approvals required for the commencement of construction which whichever is later. The due date of possession is calculated from the date of execution of BBA i.e., 10.09.2012 as the date of construction is not known. The period of 42 months expired on 10.03.2016. Since in the present matter the BBA incorporates unqualified reason for grace period/extended period of 6 months in the possession clause accordingly, the grace period of 6 months is allowed to the promoter being unqualified. Therefore, the due date of possession comes out to be 10.09.2016.

19. Keeping in view the fact that the allottee complainants 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. The due date of possession as per agreement for sale as mentioned in the table above is **10.09.2016** and there is delay of 4 years 6 months 8 days on the date of filing of the complaint.
20. The occupation certificate/completion certificate of the project where the unit is situated has still not been obtained by the respondent-promoter. The authority is of the view that the allottee cannot be expected to wait endlessly for taking possession of the allotted unit and for which he has paid a considerable amount towards the sale consideration and as observed by Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in ***Ireo Grace Realtech Pvt. Ltd. Vs. Abhishek Khanna & Ors., civil appeal no. 5785 of 2019, decided on 11.01.2021.***

".....The occupation certificate is not available even as on date, which clearly amounts to deficiency of service. The allottees cannot be made to wait indefinitely for possession of the apartments allotted to them, nor can they be bound to take the apartments in Phase 1 of the project....."

21. 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 as under:

"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."

22. 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) of the Act. 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.
23. 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 sections 71 & 72 read with section 31(1) of the Act of 2016.
24. **Admissibility of refund along with prescribed rate of interest:** The complainants are seeking refund of the amount paid along with interest. Section 18 of the Act read with rule 15 of the rules provide that in case the allottee intends to withdraw from the project, the respondent shall refund of the amount paid by the allottee in respect of the subject unit

with interest at prescribed rate as provided under rule 15 of the rules.

Rule 15 has been reproduced as under:

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

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

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

25. 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.
26. Consequently, as per website of the State Bank of India i.e., <https://sbi.co.in>, the marginal cost of lending rate (in short, MCLR) as on date i.e., **24.02.2023** is 8.70%. Accordingly, the prescribed rate of interest will be marginal cost of lending rate +2% i.e., 10.70%.
27. The authority hereby directs the promoter to return the amount received by him i.e., ₹ 55,42,452/- 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 Rules *ibid*.


G. Directions of the authority

28. Hence, the authority hereby passes this order and issue the following directions under section 37 of the Act to ensure compliance of

obligations casted upon the promoter as per the functions entrusted to the authority under section 34(f) of the Act:

- i. The respondent/promoter is directed to refund the entire amount of ₹ 55,42,452/- paid by the complainants along with prescribed rate of interest @ 10.70% p.a. as prescribed under rule 15 of the rules from the date of each payment till the date of refund of the deposited amount.
 - ii. A period of 90 days is given to the respondent to comply with the directions given in this order and failing which legal consequences would follow.
 - iii. The respondent is further directed not to create any third-party rights against the subject unit before the full realization of paid-up amount along with interest thereon to the complainants, and even if, any transfer is initiated with respect to subject unit, the receivable shall be first utilized for clearing dues of allottee-complainants.
29. Complaint stands disposed of.
30. File be consigned to registry.

HARERA
GURUGRAM


(Sanjeev Kumar Arora)
Member

Haryana Real Estate Regulatory Authority, Gurugram

Dated: 24.02.2023