BEFORE THE HARYANA REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY, GURUGRAM

Date of decision: **07.07.2023**

NAME OF THE BUILDER		**RAHEJA DEVELOPERS LIMITED.**	
PROJECT NAME		**"RAHEJA REVANTA"**	
S. No.	**Case No.**	**Case title**	**APPEARANCE**
1.	CR/736/2021 /3676/2019	Sunita Duggirala and Shiv Prasad Duggirala V/S Raheja Developers Limited	Shri Nilotpal Shyam Advocate and Shri Garvit Gupta Advocate
2.	CR/737/2021 /3678/2019	Gaurav Garg and Pariksha Garg V/S Raheja Developers Limited	Shri Nilotpal Shyam Advocate and Shri Garvit Gupta Advocate
3.	CR/738/2021 /3677/2019	Sunita Jain and Neha Garg V/S Raheja Developers Limited	Shri Nilotpal Shyam Advocate and Shri Garvit Gupta Advocate

CORAM:

Shri Sanjeev Kumar Arora **Member**

ORDER

1. This order shall dispose of all the 3 complaints titled as above filed before the 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.

2. 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, "*Raheja Revanta*" (residential group housing colony) being developed by the same respondent/promoter i.e., M/s Raheja Developers Limited. The terms and conditions of the agreement to sell and allotment letter against the allotment of units in the upcoming project of the respondent/builder and fulcrum of the issues involved in both the cases pertains to failure on the part of the promoter to deliver timely possession of the units in question, seeking award of refund the entire amount along with intertest and the compensation.

3. The details of the complaints, reply to 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	**Raheja Developers Limited at "Raheja Revanta" situated in Sector 78, Gurugram, Haryana.**
Possession Clause: - **4.2 Possession Time and Compensation** *That the Seller shall sincerely endeavor to give possession of the Unit to the purchaser* ***within thirty-six (36) months in respect of 'TAPAS' Independent Floors and forty eight (48) months in respect of 'SURYA TOWER' from the date of the execution of the Agreement to sell*** *and after providing of necessary infrastructure specially road sewer & water in the sector by the Government, but subject to force majeure conditions or any Government/ Regulatory authority's action, inaction or omission and reasons beyond the control of the Seller.* ***However, the seller shall be entitled for compensation free grace period of six (6) months in case the construction is not completed within the time period mentioned above****. The seller on obtaining certificate for occupation and use by the Competent Authorities shall hand over the Unit to the Purchaser for this occupation and use and subject to the Purchaser having complied with all the terms and conditions of this application form & Agreement To sell. In the event of his failure to take over and /or occupy and use the unit provisionally and/or finally allotted within 30 days from the date of intimation in writing by the seller, then the same shall lie at his/her risk and cost and the Purchaser shall be liable to compensation @ Rs.7/- per sq. ft. of the super area per month as holding charges for the entire period of such delay....."*	

Sr. No	Complaint No., Case Title, and Date of filing of complaint	Reply status	Unit No.	Date of execution of agreement to sell	Due date of possession	Total Considerati on/Total Amount paid by the complainan ts in Rs.
1.	CR/736/2021/ 3676/2019 Sunita Duggirala and Shiv Prasad Duggirala V/S Raheja Developers Limited. Date of Filing of complaint 21.08.2019	Reply received on 05.0420 21	IF8-04, 3rd floor, Tower/block- IF-8 admeasuring 2548.700 sq. ft. [Page no. 74 of complaint]	08.02.2014 (Page no. 70 of complaint)	**08.08.2017** **(Note: -** 36 months from date of agreement i.e., 08.02.2014 + 6 months grace period**)**	TSC: - 1,83,11,063/- (As per customer ledger dated 16.12.2013 page no. 116 of the complaint) AP: - 1,38,55,728/- (As alleged by the complainant at page no. 15 of the CRA dated 21.04.2022)
2.	CR/737/2021/ 3678/2019 Gaurav Garg and Pariksha Garg V/S Raheja Developers Limited Date of Filing of complaint 21.08.2019	Reply received on 20.12.20 22	B-012, 1st floor, Tower/block- B admeasuring 1621.390 sq. ft. [Page no. 33 of complaint]	11.12.2012 [page no. 29 of complaint]	**11.06.2017** **(Note: -** 48 months from date of agreement i.e., 11.12.2012 + 6 months grace period**)**	TSC: - 1,24,99,760/- AP: - 1,15,58,379/- (As per customer ledger dated 15.07.2019 page no. 72 of the complaint)

3.	CR/738/2021/ 3677/2019 Sunita Jain and Neha Garg V/S Raheja Developers Limited Date of Filing of complaint 21.08.2019	Reply received on 20.12.2022	B-433, 43rd floor, Tower/block-B admeasuring 1197.830 sq. ft. [Page no. 36 of complaint]	27.12.2012 (Page no. 32 of the complaint)	**27.06.2017** **(Note:** - 48 months from date of agreement i.e., 27.12.2012 + 6 months grace period**)**	TSC: - 97,43,226/- AP: - 90,73,769/- (As per customer ledger dated 15.07.2019 page no. 76 of the complaint)

The complainants in the above complaints have sought the following reliefs:

1. Direct the respondent to refund the entire paid-up amount along with interest at the prescribed rate compounded quarterly and to be calculated from the date of payments made by the complainants.
2. Direct the respondent company to pay a cost of Rs.1,00,000/- towards the cost of the litigation.

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 against the promoter on account of violation of the agreement to sell and allotment letter against the allotment of units in the upcoming project of the respondent/builder and for not handing over the possession by the due date, seeking award of refund the entire paid-up amount along with interest and compensation.
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 also similar. Out of the above-mentioned case, the particulars of lead case ***CR/736/2021/3676/2019 case titled as Sunita Duggirala and Shiv Prasad Duggirala V/S Raheja Developers Limited*** are being taken into consideration for determining the rights of the allottee(s) qua refund the entire paid-up amount along with interest and others.

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/736/2021/3676/2019 case titled as Sunita Duggirala and Shiv Prasad Duggirala V/S Raheja Developers Limited.

S. N.	Particulars	Details
1.	Name of the project	"Raheja Revanta", Sector 78, Gurugram, Haryana
2.	Project area	18.7213 acres
3.	Nature of the project	Residential Group Housing Colony
4.	DTCP license no. and validity status	49 of 2011 dated 01.06.2011 valid up to 31.05.2021
5.	Name of licensee	Sh. Ram Chander, Ram Sawroop and 4 Others
6.	Date of environment clearances	23.10.2013 [Page no. 126 of complaint]
7.	Date of revised environment clearances	31.07.2017 [Page no. 136 of complaint]
8.	Date of revised building plans	24.04.2017 [Page no. 128 of reply]
9.	RERA Registered/ not registered	Registered vide no. 32 of 2017 dated 04.08.2017

10.	RERA registration valid up to	**31.01.2023** 5 Years from the date of revised Environment Clearance i.e., 31.07.2017 + 6 months in view of Covid-19
11.	Unit no.	IF8-04, 3rd floor, Tower/block- IF-8 (Page no. 74 of the complaint)
12.	Unit area admeasuring	2548.700 sq. ft. (Page no. 74 of the complaint)
13.	Date of execution of agreement to sell – Raheja Revanta	08.02.2014 (Page no. 70 of the complaint)
14.	Possession clause	**4.2 Possession Time and Compensation** *That the Seller shall sincerely endeavor to give possession of the Unit to the purchaser* ***within thirty-six (36) months in respect of 'TAPAS' Independent Floors*** *and forty eight (48) months in respect of 'SURYA TOWER' from the date of the execution of the Agreement to sell and after providing of necessary infrastructure specially road sewer & water in the sector by the Government, but subject to force majeure conditions or any Government/ Regulatory authority's action, inaction or omission and reasons beyond the control of the Seller.* ***However, the seller shall be entitled for compensation free grace period of six (6) months in case the***

		construction is not completed within the time period mentioned above. *The seller on obtaining certificate for occupation and use by the Competent Authorities shall hand over the Unit to the Purchaser for this occupation and use and subject to the Purchaser having complied with all the terms and conditions of this application form & Agreement To sell. In the event of his failure to take over and /or occupy and use the unit provisionally and/or finally allotted within 30 days from the date of intimation in writing by the seller, then the same shall lie at his/her risk and cost and the Purchaser shall be liable to compensation @ Rs.7/- per sq. ft. of the super area per month as holding charges for the entire period of such delay....."* (Page 84 of the complaint).
15.	Grace period	**Allowed** As per clause 4.2 of the agreement to sell, the possession of the allotted unit was supposed to be offered within a stipulated timeframe of 36 months plus 6 months of grace period. It is a matter of fact that the respondent has not completed the project in which the allotted unit is situated and has not obtained the occupation

		certificate by February 2017. As per agreement to sell, the construction of the project is to be completed by February 2017 which is not completed till date. **Accordingly, in the present case the grace period of 6 months is allowed.**
16.	Due date of possession	08.08.2017 (Note: - 36 months from date of agreement i.e., 08.02.2014 + 6 months grace period)
17.	Basic sale consideration as per BBA at page no. 105 of the complaint	Rs.1,76,04,228/-
18.	Total sale consideration as per customer ledger dated 16.12.2013 page no. 116 of the complaint	Rs.1,83,11,063/-
19.	Amount paid by the complainants	Rs.1,38,55,728/- (As alleged by the complainant at page no. 15 of the CRA dated 21.04.2022)
20.	Occupation certificate /Completion certificate	Not received
21.	Offer of possession	Not offered
22.	Delay in handing over the possession till date of filing complaint i.e., 21.08.2019	2 years and 13 days

B. Facts of the complaint

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

a. That the respondent company through their representative had approached the complainants and represented that the respondent's

residential project name "Raheja Revanta" will effectively serve the purpose of complainants and his family and has best of the amenities.

b. That the complainants shown its willingness to book a flat in the impugned project on the basis of huge announcement of the respondent company being a renowned builder i.e., Raheja Group with offer of 'luxury apartments' with the tag of 'first of its kind in Gurgaon' in the sprawling 18.7213 acres of land in the national capital region.

c. That the complainants received an email dated 01.05.2012 from the respondent wherein it was informed that that the third installment i.e., installment with regard to execution of agreement to sell has been sent to the complainants on 24.04.2012 along with the agreement to sell wherein it was further informed by it that they were required to return the signed copy of the agreement by 23.05.2012. The complainants sent the signed copy of the agreement to sell to the respondent for sending back the executed agreement duly signed and stamped by it to complainants. Further, vide email dated 01.06.2012, the complainants also raised objection with regard to Annexure-A of the agreement to sell and requested the respondent to send back the revised Annexure-A for the signature of the complainants. The complainants also requested the respondent to provide the executed copy of the agreement to sell to which the respondent promised to provide very soon. Subsequently when the complainants were looking for availing home loan in 2014, they were shocked to realise that they did not ever receive the duly executed copy of the agreement to sell by it. The said copy of duly executed agreement to sell was never received by the complainants,

neither the respondent provided any information with regard to the place wherein the said document dispatched by it. Therefore, it seems to be well thought out strategy on the part of the respondent to evade providing agreement to sell to the innocent home buyers like complainants wherein the respondent can easily and conveniently shift the liability on the complainants for non-execution of the agreement to sell. The complainants accordingly paid the third installment of Rs.20,73,416/- vide cheque dated 21.05.2012 in a good faith that the duly executed agreement to sell shall be provided by it at the earliest as promised by the respondent. However, sadly, the said agreement to sell was never received by the complainants till early 2014 wherein the complainants had to categorically agitated the issue of non-receipt of the duly executed agreement to sell with the respondent vide email dated 30.12.2013. It is a matter of record that the respondent raised several demands between 21.05.2012 and 08.02.2014 wherein several emails were also sent by it intimating the complainants about the delay payments and the delayed payment @ 18%p.a. compounded monthly for any such delay, however, never once the respondent updated about the status of executed agreement to sell. This was done despite the fact that all the demand on and after the demand with regard to execution of agreement to sell was raised to the complainants by the respondent. After the issue was agitated by the complainants with regard to non-receipt of the agreement to sell, the agreement to sell was finally entered into for **unit bearing no: IF8-04, 3rd floor, Independent Floors 8** in "Raheja Revanta" situated in Sector 78, Gurgaon and the agreement was made at New Delhi on 08.02.2014 between both the parties. However,

they were surprised to note that the original date of agreement to sell i.e., 08.02.2012 has been changed to 08.02.2014. However, by that time, the complainants had already paid a substantive amount (around 1 crore), therefore, they did not have the option but to sign on the dotted line with no other efficacious remedy in sight. Therefore, all the demands raised with regard to "on execution of agreement to sell" and thereafter are illegal; null & void as it is neither in accordance with the payment plan annexed with the agreement to sell nor in accordance with payment plan annexed with the application form. Without prejudice to the above, the date of execution of the agreement to sell shall be treated as the date on which the demand with regard to the said installment for "on execution of agreement to sell" was made due i.e. 23.05.2012 for all practical purposes as not doing so will not only make all the subsequent demand after the demand of second installments illegal and shall also cause irreparable loss to the complainants which would amount to travesty of justice.

d. That the respondent has claimed that they obtained License from Director General, Town & County Planning (DTCP), Haryana for development of residential group housing colony on the said land and building plans have already been approved.

e. That as per the aforesaid agreement to sale, the respondent agreed to sale convey/transfer the allotted unit no. IF8-04, 3rd floor, Independent Floors 8 in the impugned project with the right to exclusive use of parking space for sale consideration of Rs.1,43,73,735/- calculated at the rate of Rs.4575/- per sq. ft. super area and in addition to cost of

parking rights, club membership, electricity connection, IFMS, as per the payment plan annexed to the said agreement as Annexure "A", plus applicable taxes. Accordingly, the total consideration approximately comes as Rs.1,76,04,228/- out of which they have already paid a total amount of Rs.1,38,55,728/- to the respondent towards the consideration for the impugned flat including delay charges levied by the respondent in accordance with clause 3.14 of the agreement to sell. It is submitted that the said clause 3.14 is *ex facie* discriminatory *qua* clause 4.2 which were signed by the complainants in a situation wherein they do not an option but to sign on dotted line, therefore, the said clause is not binding on the complainants.

f. That the agreement to sell stipulates that on failure/delay in payment of the installments, the purchaser/complainants discharged interest @ 18% per annum from the due date of payment of installment on monthly compounded basis. It is a matter of record that they paid delayed payment charges of more than 5 lakh in order to comply with the terms of agreement to sell even though they were in liquidity crunch. The respondent did not hesitate to cancel the allotment of the complainants due to delay in payment which was restored back only after the payment of delayed payment charges of more than 5 lakhs. Therefore, they always complied with the terms and conditions of the agreement to sell however sadly no reciprocal promises were fulfilled by it.

g. That the respondent committed under the agreement to sale to handover the possession of the allotted unit, within 3 years from the date of execution of the agreement to sale. Further, it is clearly and

unambiguously understandable from the email exchanged between the parties that the delivery of possession of the impugned unit is of three years from the date of first payment i.e., from November 2011. The relevant clause 4.2 of the agreement to sale has not been reproduced for the sake of brevity. However, the respondent has failed to hand over the possession of the impugned flat to the complainant till today and the inordinate delay in handing over the possession is solely attributable to the respondent.

h. That as per clause 4.2 of the agreement to sale further provided that if respondent failed to complete construction of the said unit within forty-eight (36) months plus the grace period of six months from the date of execution of the agreement to sale, shall pay compensation @ 7/-per sq.ft. of the super area per month of the entire period of such delay which proportionate to the rental income for similar property in the area or average rental equivalent sized unit in the vicinity, whichever is higher. The said compensation clause is *ex facie* discriminatory in comparison to clause 3.7 of the agreement to sale and amounts to unfair trade practices in view of catena of judgments of Hon'ble National Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission. Further, the said compensation clause is also in direct conflict with the Act of 2016 and rules made there under. Therefore, the clause 4.2 of agreement to sale is ***non-est*** in law to the extent it deals with the compensation @ 7/-per sq. ft. of the super area per month, in view of the fact that it is repugnant to the explicit statutory provision and to that extent, the said portion clause 4.2 is severable from other clauses of agreement to sale. They crave leave of authority to

produce and rely upon relevant judgments at the time of oral hearing as may be required.

i. That they have paid over 78% (total Rs.1,38,55,650 /- paid) of the total consideration as per demand letter issued by it in accordance with the payment plan annexed in Annexure-A of the agreement to sale provided the date of execution of agreement to sell is accepted as May 2012 for all practical purposes. The said amount was paid only in the hope that the respondent in view of their grandiose claim would deliver possession well in time. To make the matter worst, the respondent completely failed to the deliver the possession of impugned unit even within the extended time Schedule also which was supposed to be taken for getting the occupancy certificate after completion of the construction. Regretfully, as per the work-site-activities as, noticed does not seem to be completed. After the expiry of the proposed day of handing over the possession, the respondent maliciously informed the complainants vide email dated 09.06.2017, to obtain the occupancy certificate by last quarter of 2018 which has already elapsed. Now, the respondent has come with a new deadline of July 2022 which is nothing but highly farcical. The respondent has further raised demand dated 16.04.2019 of Rs.8,04,929/- and 19.05.2019 of Rs.8,04,929/- with regard to installments for casting of third floor slab and fourth floor slab respectively. However, well before raising the said demands, the respondent has already breached the sanctity of the agreement of sell by not adhering to due date of possession clause and also with their malafide attempt to manipulate the complainants by not providing the

duly executed copy of the agreement to sell despite informing the complainants about the same whereas illegal demands were issued by it. In such circumstances, the Respondent company cannot be entrusted further with the hard-earned money of them as the agreement to sell has already become voidable at the option of the complainants in view of the inordinate delay in handing over the possession. The complainants wish to rescind the said agreement to sell and therefore, compelling them to pay the said demand dated 06.04.2019 of Rs.8,04,929/- and 19.05.2019 of Rs.8,04,929/- will amount to travesty of justice. It is noteworthy that the respondent is accumulating delayed payment penalty @18% p.a. compoundable wherein they have informed vide email dated 08.06.2019 that the total amount has become Rs.19,29,944/-. Further, there is practically no development in the construction of impugned project, so, in that case also, the correctness of the aforesaid demand is in question.

j. That it is a fit case wherein authority shall grant refund immediately along with the interest at the prescribed rate in view of the mandatory obligation as provided under section 18 of the Act, 2016 as well as on account of the acrimony of respondent wherein they obliterated the trust reposed on them by complainants by handing over their hard-earned money always on time and in accordance with the agreement to sell. The respondent company did not perform the required reciprocity which goes to very root of any bilateral agreement.

C. Relief sought by the complainants: -

9. The complainants have sought following relief(s)

a. Direct the respondent to refund the entire paid-up amount along with interest at the prescribed rate compounded quarterly and to be calculated from the date of payments made by the complainants.

b. Direct the respondent company to pay a cost of Rs.1,00,000/- towards the cost of the litigation.

10. On the date of hearing, the authority explained to the respondent /promoter on 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

11. The respondent contested the complaint on the following grounds: -

i. That the provisions of the Act, 2016 are not applicable to the present case and the arguments based on the said provisions are made only with the intention to mislead this authority. Nevertheless, it is clarified to avoid complications at the later stage of the case that the complainants booked a unit bearing no. IF8-04, 3rd floor, independent floor in TAPAS, "Raheja Revanta" on 29.10.2011. Booking on the said unit was done much prior to the coming of the Act, 2016 and the provisions laid therein cannot be applied with retrospective effect. The said project is registered under the provisions of law vide registration no. 32 of 2017 dated 04.08.2017.

ii. That the construction of the tower in which the unit allotted to the complainant is located is 80% complete and the respondent shall hand

over the possession of the same to the complainants after its completion subject to the complainants making the payment of the due installments amount and on availability of infrastructure facilities such as sector road and laying providing basic external infrastructure such as water, sewer, electricity, etc. as per terms of the application and agreement to sell.

iii. 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 60 of the booking application form and clause 14.2 of the buyer's agreement.

iv. That the complainant has not approached this authority with clean hands and has intentionally suppressed and concealed the material facts in the present complaint. The 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 respondent/builder is a reputed real estate company having immense goodwill, comprised of law abiding and peace-loving persons and has always believed in satisfaction of its customers. The respondent has developed and delivered several prestigious projects such as 'Raheja Atlantis' 'Raheja Atharva', and 'Raheja Vedanta' and in most of these projects large number of

families have already shifted after having taken possession and resident welfare associations have been formed which are taking care of the day to day needs of the allottees of the respective projects.

- That the project is one of the most Iconic Skyscraper in the making, a passionately designed and executed project having many firsts and is the tallest building in Haryana with highest infinity pool and club in India. The scale of the project required a very in-depth scientific study and analysis, be it earthquake, fire, wind tunneling facade solutions, landscape management, traffic management, environment sustainability, services optimization for customer comfort and public heath as well, luxury and iconic elements that together make it a dream project for customers and the developer alike. The world's best consultants and contractors were brought together such as Thorton Tamasetti (USA) who are credited with dispensing world's best structure such as Petronas Towers (Malaysia), Taipei 101(Taiwan), Kingdom Tower Jeddah (world' tallest under construction building in Saudi Arabia and Arabtec makers of Burj Khalifa, Dubai (presently tallest in the world), Emirates palace Abu Dhabi etc.
- That compatible quality infrastructure (external) was required to be able to sustain internal infrastructure and facilities for such an iconic project requiring facilities and service for over 4000 residents and

1200 Cars which cannot be offered for possession without integration of external infrastructure for basic human life be it availability and continuity of services in terms of clean water, continued fail safe quality electricity, fire safety, movement of fire tenders, lifts, waste and sewerage processing and disposal, traffic management etc. Keeping every aspect in mind this iconic complex was conceived as a mixture of tallest high-rise towers & low-rise apartment blocks with a bonafide hope and belief that having realized all the statutory changes and license, the government will construct and complete its part of roads and basic infrastructure facilities on time. Every customer including the complainant was well aware and was made well cautious that the respondent cannot develop external infrastructure as land acquisition for roads, sewerage, water, and electricity supply is beyond the control of them. Therefore, as an abundant precaution, the respondent company while hedging the delay risk on price offered made an honest disclosure in the application form itself in clause no. 5 of the terms and conditions.

- That the complainant, after checking the veracity of the project namely, 'Raheja's Revanta', Sector 78, Gurgaon had applied for allotment of an apartment vide its booking application form. The complainant agreed to be bound by the terms and conditions of the

application form. The complainant was aware from the very inception and had acknowledged in Clause 3 and 14 of the application form dated 01.06.2013 that the plans as approved by the concerned authorities are tentative in nature and that the respondent might have to effect suitable and necessary alterations in the layout plans as and when required.

- That the respondent raised payment demands from the complainants in accordance with the mutually agreed terms and conditions of allotment as well as of the payment plan and the complainants made the payment of the earnest money and part-amount of the total sale consideration and is bound to pay the remaining amount towards the total sale consideration of the unit along with applicable registration charges, stamp duty, service tax as well as other charges payable at the applicable stage.
- Despite the respondent fulfilling all its obligations as per the provisions laid down by law, the government agencies have failed miserably to provide essential basic infrastructure facilities such as roads, sewerage line, water and electricity supply in the sector where the said project is being developed. The development of roads, sewerage, laying down of water and electricity supply lines has to be undertaken by the concerned governmental authorities and is not within the power and control of the respondent. The

respondent cannot be held liable on account of non-performance by the concerned governmental authorities. The respondent company has even paid all the requisite amounts including the external development charges (EDC) to the concerned authorities. However, yet, necessary infrastructure facilities like 60-meter sector roads including 24 meter wide road connectivity, water and sewage which were supposed to be developed by HUDA parallelly have not been developed. There is no infrastructure activities/development in the surrounding area of the project-in-question. Not even a single sector road or services have been put in place by HUDA/GMDA/HSVP till date.

- That the respondent had also filed RTI application for seeking information about the status of basic services such as road, sewerage, water, and electricity. Thereafter, the respondent received reply from HSVP wherein it is clearly stated that no external infrastructure facilities have been laid down by the concerned governmental agencies. The respondent can't be blamed in any manner on account of inaction of government agencies.
- That furthermore two High Tension (HT) cables lines were passing through the project site which were clearly shown and visible in the zoning plan dated 06.06.2011. The respondent was required to get these HT lines removed and relocate such HT Lines for the

blocks/floors falling under such HT Lines. The respondent proposed the plan of shifting the overhead HT wires to underground and submitted building plan to DTCP, Haryana for approval, which was approved by the DTCP, Haryana. It is pertinent to mention that such HT Lines have been put underground in the revised Zoning Plan. The fact that two 66 KV HT lines were passing over the project land was intimated to all the allottees as well as the complainant. The Respondent had requested to M/s KEI Industries Ltd for shifting of the 66 KV S/C Gurgaon to Manesar Line from overhead to underground Revanta Project Gurgaon vide letter dated 01.10.2013. The HVPNL took more than one year in giving the approvals and commissioning of shifting of both the 66KV HT Lines. It was certified by HVPNL Manesar that the work of construction for laying of 66 KV S/C & D/C 1200 Sq. mm. XLPE Cable (Aluminium) of 66 KV S/C Gurgaon – Manesar line and 66 KV D/C Badshahpur – Manesar line has been converted into 66 KV underground power cable in the land of the respondent/promoter project which was executed successfully by M/s KEI Industries Ltd has been completed successfully and 66 KV D/C Badshahpur – Manesar Line was commissioned on 29.03.2015.

- That respondent got the overhead wires shifted underground at its own cost and only after adopting all necessary processes and

procedures and handed over the same to the HVPNL and the same was brought to the notice of District Town Planner vide letter dated 28.10.2014 requesting to apprise DGTCP, Haryana for the same. That as multiple government and regulatory agencies and their clearances were in involved/required and frequent shut down of HT supplies was involved, it took considerable time/efforts, investment and resources which falls within the ambit of the force majeure condition.

- That the construction of the tower in which the plot allotted to the complainant is located is 80% complete and the respondent shall hand over the possession of the same to the complainant after its completion subject to the complainants making the payment of the due installments amount and on availability of infrastructure facilities such as sector road and laying providing basic external infrastructure such as water, sewer, electricity etc. as per terms of the application and agreement to sell. The photographs showing the current status of the construction of the tower in which the unit allotted to the complaint is located. It is submitted that due to the above-mentioned conditions which were beyond the reasonable control of the respondent, the development of the township in question has not been completed and the respondent cannot be held liable for the same. The respondent is also suffering unnecessarily

and badly without any fault on its part. Due to these reasons the respondent has to face cost overruns without its fault. Under these circumstances passing any adverse order against the respondent at this stage would amount to complete travesty of justice.

- That GMDA, office of Engineer-VI, Gurugram vide letter dated 03.12.2019 has intimated to the respondent company that the land of sector dividing road 77/78 has not been acquired and sewer line has not been laid.
- That the origin of the present complaint is because an investor is unable to get required return due to bad real estate market. It is increasingly becoming evident, particularly by the prayers made in the background that there are other motives in mind by few who engineered this complaint using active social media.
- That the complaint has been worded as if simpleton apartment buyers have lost their monies and therefore, they must have their remedy. The present case also brings out how a few can misguide others to try and attempt abuse of the authority which is otherwise a statutory body to ensure delivery of apartments and safeguard of investment of every single customer who puts his life saving for a dream house and social security.
- That in the present case, as compared to others in the region, the building has been standing tall and with almost 1000 workers

working day and late night towards finishing the project to handover to the esteemed hundreds of customers in the waiting. Some flat buyers who had invested in the hope of rising markets, finding insufficient price rise–due to delay of Dwarka expressway, delay in development of allied roads and shifting of toll plaza engineered false and ingenious excuses to complain and then used social media to make other (non-speculator) flat buyers join them and make complaints, in all probability, by giving them an impression that the attempt may mean 'profit', and there is no penalty if the complaint failed.

v. That the three factors: (1) delay in acquisition of land for development of roads and infrastructure (2) delay by government in construction of the Dwarka Expressway and allied roads; and (3) oversupply of the residential units in the NCR region, operated to not yield the price rise as was expected by a few. This cannot be a ground for complaint for refund as the application form itself has abundantly cautioned about the possible delay that might happened due to non-performance by Government Agencies.

vi. That amongst those who booked (as one now sees) were two categories: (1) those who wanted to purchase a flat to reside in future; and (2) those who were looking at it as an investment to yield profits on resale. For each category a lower price for a Revanta type Sky

Scaper was an accepted offer even before tendering any money and bilaterally with full knowledge and clear declarations by taking on themselves the possible effect of delay due to infrastructure.

vii. That in the present case, keeping in view the contracted price, the completed (and lived-in) apartment including interest and opportunity cost to the respondent may not yield profits as expected than what envisaged as possible profit. The completed building structure as also the price charged may be contrasted with the possible profit's v/s cost of building investment, effort and intent. It is in this background that the complaint, the prevailing situation at site and this response may kindly be considered. The present complaint has been filed with malafide motives and the same is liable to be dismissed with heavy costs payable to the respondent.

12. Copies of all the relevant documents have been filed and placed on the record. Their authenticity is not in dispute. Hence, the complaint can be decided on the basis of these undisputed documents and submissions made by the parties.

E. Jurisdiction of the authority

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

E.I Territorial jurisdiction

14. As per notification no. 1/92/2017-1TCP dated 14.12.2017 issued by Town and Country Planning Department, Haryana the jurisdiction of Haryana Real Estate Regulatory Authority, Gurugram shall be entire Gurugram district for all purposes. In the present case, the project in question is situated within the planning area of Gurugram district. Therefore, this authority has complete territorial jurisdiction to deal with the present complaint.

E.II Subject-matter jurisdiction

15. 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.*

16. 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.

17. Further, the authority has no hitch in proceeding with the complaint and to grant a relief of refund in the present matter in view of the judgement passed by the Hon'ble Apex Court in ***Newtech Promoters and Developers Private Limited Vs State of U.P. and Ors. 2021-2022 (1) RCR (Civil), 357*** *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 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."*

18. Hence, in view of the authoritative pronouncement of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case mentioned above, the authority has the jurisdiction to

entertain a complaint seeking refund of the amount and interest on the refund amount.

F. Findings on the objections raised by the respondent

F.I. Objections regarding the complainant being investor.

19. The respondent has taken a stand that the complainants are investors and not consumers therefore, it is not entitled to the protection of the Act and to file the complaint under section 31 of the Act. The respondent also submitted that the preamble of the Act states that the Act is enacted to protect the interest of consumers of the real estate sector. The authority observes that the respondent is correct in stating that the Act is enacted to protect the interest of consumers of the real estate sector. It is settled principle of interpretation that the preamble is an introduction of a statute and states main aims & objects of enacting a statute but at the same time preamble cannot be used to defeat the enacting provisions of the Act. Furthermore, it is pertinent to note that any aggrieved person can file a complaint against the promoter if he contravenes or violates any provisions of the Act or rules or regulations made thereunder. Upon careful perusal of all the terms and conditions of the apartment buyer's agreement, it is revealed that the complainants are buyers and have paid total price of **Rs.1,38,55,728/-** towards purchase of an apartment in the project of the promoter. At this stage, it is important to stress upon the definition of term allottee under the Act, the same is reproduced below for ready reference:

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

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

F. II Objection regarding jurisdiction of authority w.r.t. buyer's agreement executed prior to coming into force of the Act.

21. Another objection raised the respondent that the authority is deprived of the jurisdiction to go into the interpretation of, or rights of the parties inter-se in accordance with the flat buyer's agreement executed between the parties and no agreement for sale as referred to under the provisions

of the Act or the said rules has been executed inter se parties. The authority is of the view that the Act nowhere provides, nor can be so construed, that all previous agreements will 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 will be dealt with in accordance with the Act and the rules after the date of coming into force of the Act and the rules. 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."*

22. Also, 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."*

23. The agreements are sacrosanct save and except for the provisions which have been abrogated by the Act itself. Further, it is noted that the 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, statutes, instructions, directions issued thereunder and are not unreasonable or exorbitant in nature.

F.III Objection regarding agreements contains an arbitration clause which refers to the dispute resolution system mentioned in agreement

24. The agreement to sell entered into between the two side on 08.02.2014 contains a clause 14.2 relating to dispute resolution between the parties. The clause reads as under: -

> *"All or any disputes arising out or touching upon in relation to the terms of this Application/Agreement to Sell/ Conveyance Deed including the interpretation and validity of the terms thereof and the respective rights and obligations of the parties shall be settled through arbitration. The arbitration proceedings shall be governed by the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 or any statutory amendments/ modifications thereof for the time being in force. The arbitration proceedings shall be held at the office of the seller in New Delhi by a sole arbitrator who shall be appointed by mutual consent of the parties. If there is no consensus on appointment of the Arbitrator, the matter will be referred to the concerned court for the same. In case of any proceeding, reference etc. touching upon the arbitrator subject including any award, the territorial jurisdiction of the Courts shall be Gurgaon as well as of Punjab and Haryana High Court at Chandigarh".*

25. 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. Therefore, by applying same analogy the presence of arbitration clause could not be construed to take away the jurisdiction of the authority.

26. 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 complainants and builders 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 8 of the Arbitration Act."

27. 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 paras are 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."

28. Therefore, in view of the above judgements and considering the provision of the Act, the authority is of the view that complainants are well within their rights 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.

G. Findings on the relief sought by the complainant.

G.I. Direct the respondent to refund the entire paid-up amount along with interest at the prescribed rate compounded quarterly and to be calculated from the date of payments made by the complainants.

29. 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 at the prescribed rate as provided under section 18(1) of the Act. 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)

30. As per clause 4.2 of the agreement to sell dated 08.02.2014 provides for handing over of possession and is reproduced below:

4.2 Possession Time and Compensation
That the Seller shall sincerely endeavor to give possession of the Unit to the purchaser ***within thirty-six (36) months in respect of 'TAPAS' Independent Floors and forty eight (48) months in respect of 'SURYA TOWER' from the date of the execution of the Agreement to sell*** *and after providing of necessary infrastructure specially road sewer & water in the sector by the Government, but subject to force majeure conditions or any Government/ Regulatory authority's action, inaction or omission and reasons beyond the control of the Seller.* ***However, the seller shall be entitled for compensation free grace period of six (6) months in case the construction is not completed within the time period mentioned above.*** *The seller on obtaining certificate for occupation and use by the Competent Authorities shall hand over the Unit to the Purchaser for this occupation and use and subject to the Purchaser having complied with all the terms and conditions of this application form & Agreement To sell. In the event of his failure to take over and /or occupy and use the unit provisionally and/or finally allotted within 30 days from the date of intimation in writing by the seller, then the same shall lie at his/her risk and cost and the Purchaser shall be liable to compensation @ Rs.7/- per sq. ft. of the super area per month as holding charges for the entire period of such delay....."*

31. At the outset, it is relevant to comment on the preset possession clause of the agreement wherein the possession has been subjected to providing necessary infrastructure specially road, sewer & water in the sector by the government, but subject to force majeure conditions or any government/regulatory authority's action, inaction or omission and

reason beyond the control of the seller. 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 making payment as per the plan 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 a clause in the agreement to sell 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 a mischievous clause in the agreement and the allottee is left with no option but to sign on the dotted lines.

32. **Due date of handing over possession and admissibility of grace period:** As per clause 4.2 of the agreement to sell, the possession of the allotted unit was supposed to be offered within a stipulated timeframe of 36 months plus 6 months of grace period, in case the construction is not complete within the time frame specified. It is a matter of fact that the respondent has not completed the project in which the allotted unit is situated and has not obtained the occupation certificate by February 2017. However, the fact cannot be ignored that there were circumstances beyond the control of the respondent which led to delay incompletion of

the project. Accordingly, in the present case the grace period of 6 months is allowed.

33. **Admissibility of refund along with prescribed rate of interest:** The complainants are seeking refund the amount paid by them at the prescribed rate interest. However, the allottee intends to withdraw from the project and is seeking refund of the amount paid by it 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.*

34. 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.

35. 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., 07.07.2023 is **8.70%.** Accordingly, the prescribed rate of interest will be marginal cost of lending rate +2% i.e., **10.70%.**

36. On consideration of the circumstances, the documents, submissions and based on the findings of the authority regarding contraventions as per provisions of rule **28(1),** the authority is satisfied that the respondent is in contravention of the provisions of the Act. By virtue of clause 4.2 of the agreement to sell dated form executed between the parties on 08.02.2014, the possession of the subject unit was to be delivered within a period of 36 months from the date of execution of buyer's agreement which comes out to be 08.02.2017. As far as grace period is concerned, the same is allowed for the reasons quoted above. Therefore, the due date of handing over of possession is 08.08.2017.

37. 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 plot 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.

38. The due date of possession as per agreement for sale as mentioned in the table above is **08.08.2017** and there is delay of 2 years and 13 days on the date of filing of the complaint. The authority has further, observes that even after a passage of more than 5.10 years till date neither the construction is complete nor the offer of possession of the allotted unit has been made to the allottee by the respondent/promoter. The authority is of

the view that the allottee cannot be expected to wait endlessly for taking possession of the unit which is allotted to it and for which they have paid a considerable amount of money towards the sale consideration. It is also pertinent to mention that complainant has paid almost 79% of sale consideration till 2016. Further, the authority observes that there is no document place on record from which it can be ascertained that whether the respondent has applied for occupation certificate/part occupation certificate or what is the status of construction of the project. In view of the above-mentioned fact, the allottees intend to withdraw from the project and is well within the right to do the same in view of section 18(1) of the Act, 2016.

39. Moreover, 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 allottees 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....."*

40. 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."*

41. 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 it in respect of the unit with interest at such rate as may be prescribed.

42. Accordingly, the non-compliance of the mandate contained in section 11(4)(a) read with section 18(1) of the Act on the part of the respondent is established. As such, the complainants are entitled to refund of the entire amount paid by him at the prescribed rate of interest i.e., @ 10.70% p.a. (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.

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

43. The complainants are seeking above mentioned relief w.r.t. compensation. Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in case titled as ***M/s Newtech Promoters and Developers Pvt. Ltd. V/s State of Up & Ors. 2021-2022(1) RCR (C)***, 357 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.

F. Directions of the authority

44. 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 by it from each of the complainant(s) 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 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 full realization of the 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/complainant.

45. This decision shall mutatis mutandis apply to cases mentioned in para 3 of this order.

46. Complaints stand disposed of. True certified copy of this order shall be placed in the case file of each matter.

47. File be consigned to registry.

Dated: 07.07.2023

(Sanjeev Kumar Arora)
Member
Haryana Real Estate
Regulatory Authority,
Gurugram