

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

**Complaint no. :** 438 of 2023  
**Date of complaint :** 15.02.2023  
**Date of decision :** 10.08.2023

Smt. Ranjana Sethi  
R/o H. No. 1774,  
Near Geeta Convent School,  
Sector-16, Faridabad, Haryana-121002.

**Complainant**

**Versus**

Pivotal Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd.  
**Regd. Office at:** Plot No. 12, Sector 4,  
Faridabad, Haryana-121004.

**Respondent**

**CORAM:**

Sh. Vijay Kumar Goyal

**Member**

**APPEARANCE:**

Sh. Sajjal Dhawal (Advocate)  
Sh. Sidharth Sejwal (AR)

**Complainant  
Respondent**

**ORDER**

1. The present complaint has been filed by the complainant/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 under the provisions of the Act or the

*A*

Rules and regulations made there under or to the allottees 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 complainant, date of proposed handing over the possession, delay period, if any, have been detailed in the following tabular form:

S.N.	Particulars	Details
1	Name and location of the project	"Riddhi Siddhi" at sector 99, Gurgaon, Haryana
2	Nature of the project	Affordable Group housing
3	Project area	6.19375 acres
4	DTCP license no.	86 of 2014 dated 09.08.2014 valid upto 08.08.2019
5	RERA Registered/ not registered	Registered vide no. 236 of 2017 dated 19.09.2017 valid upto 08.08.2019
6	Registration extension vide no.	Harera/GGM/REP/RC/236/2017/EXT/177/2019 dated 30.12.2019 valid upto 31.08.2020
7	Unit no.	T7-1005, 10 <sup>th</sup> floor, Tower-T7 (page no. 19 of complaint)
8	Unit area admeasuring	487 sq. ft. (Carpet area) (page no. 19 of complaint)
9	Date of allotment	05.09.2015 (page no. 19 of complaint)
10	Date of builder buyer agreement	07.05.2016 (page no. 27 of complaint)
11	Date of building plan approval	17.10.2014 (page no. 20 of reply)
12	Environmental clearance dated	22.01.2016 (page no. 26 of reply)
13	Possession Clause	<b>8.1 EXPECTED TIME FOR HANDING OVER POSSESSION</b> <i>Except where any delay is caused on account of reasons expressly provided for under this Agreement and other situations beyond the reasonable control</i>

A



		<p><i>of the Company and subject to the Company having obtained the occupation/completion certificate from the competent authority(ies), the Company shall endeavour to complete the construction and handover the possession of the said Apartment within a period of 4 years from the date of grant of sanction of building plans for the Project or the date of receipt of all the environmental clearances necessary for the completion of the construction and development of the Project, whichever is later, subject to timely payment by the Allottee of all the amounts payable under this Agreement and performance by the Allottee of all other obligations hereunder.</i></p>
14	Due date of possession	22.01.2020 [Due date of possession calculated from the date of environmental clearance dated 22.01.2016]
15	Basic sale consideration	Rs.19,98,000/- (exclusive of taxes) (page no. 30 of complaint)
16	Amount paid by the complainant	Rs.21,56,903/- (including taxes) (As admitted by respondent on page no. 8 of reply)
17	Occupation certificate	Not yet obtained
18	Offer of possession	Not offered

**B. Facts of the complaint:**

3. The complainant has made the following submissions in the complaint:
1. That on the representation and advertisement by the respondent, the complainant booked a unit in the project named "Riddhi Siddhi" at Sector 99, Gurgaon, Haryana and was allotted a unit bearing no. T7-1005, 10<sup>th</sup> floor, Tower-T7 vide allotment letter dated 05.09.2015. Thereafter, a buyer's agreement was executed between the parties on

*Ah*



07.05.2016 for a basic sale consideration of Rs.19,98,000/- and she has paid a total sum of Rs.21,56,903.39/- in all.

- II. That as per clause 8.1 of the buyer's agreement, the possession of the unit was to be handed over by 22.01.2020 but the same has not been offered till date despite receiving major sum of money from her.
- III. That the respondent has not even paid any delay possession charges to the complainant till date. Therefore, she is seeking delay possession charges along with interest at prescribed rate from due date till actual delivery of the unit.
- IV. That due to above acts of the respondent the complainant has been unnecessarily harassed mentally as well as financially, therefore the respondent is liable to compensate the complainant on account of the aforesaid act of unfair trade practice.

**C. Relief sought by the complainant:**

4. The complainant sought following relief(s).
  - I. Direct the respondent to pay delayed possession charges at the prescribed interest per annum from the due date till actual delivery of the unit.
5. On the date of hearing, the authority explained to the respondent/promoter about the contraventions as alleged to have been committed in relation to section 11(4) (a) of the Act to plead guilty or not to plead guilty.

**D. Reply by the respondent.**

6. The respondent vide reply dated 31.03.2023 contested the complaint on the following grounds: -

A



- i. That the project named "Riddhi Siddhi" is a group housing project being developed in accordance with the provisions of the Affordable Housing Policy, 2013.
  - ii. That the complainant is seeking interest on the paid-up amount of Rs.21,56,903.39/-.
  - iii. That the project of the respondent was delayed on account of various intervening factors like lockdown imposed due to Covid-19 pandemic, shortage of labour, stopping of work by National Green Tribunal and other authorities due to increase in pollution etc.
  - iv. That the allotment price of the unit was fixed by the Government of Haryana in 2013, but the same has not been revised till date. Although the construction cost was increased manifold, but the Government of Haryana had failed to increase the allotment price.
  - v. That the entire construction has been done and the project is near to completion. However, the formalities of obtaining occupation certificate remains pending.
6. Copies of all the relevant documents have been filed and placed on record. Their authenticity is not in dispute. Hence, the complaint can be decided on the basis of those undisputed documents and submissions made by the complainant.

**E. Jurisdiction of the authority**

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

**E.I Territorial jurisdiction**

8. 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**

9. Section 11(4)(a) of the Act, 2016 provides that the promoter shall be responsible to the allottees 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.

10. 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 complainant at a later stage.

**F. Findings on objections raised by the respondent.**

**F.I Objection regarding delay due to force majeure circumstances**

11. The respondent-promoter has raised a contention that the construction of the project was delayed due to force majeure conditions such as various orders passed by the National Green Tribunal, Environment Pollution (Prevention & Control) Authority and delay in completion of

A





project due to Covid-19 pandemic. Since, there were circumstances beyond the control of respondent, so taking into consideration the above-mentioned facts, the respondent be allowed the period during which his construction activities came to stand still, and the said period be excluded while calculating the due date. But the plea taken in this regard is not tenable. The due date for completion of project is calculated from date of Environment Clearance i.e., 22.01.2016. Though there have been various orders issued by various competent authorities to curb the environment pollution, but these were for a short period of time and the fact that such type of orders is passed by the various competent Authorities from time to time were already known to the respondent-builder.

12. The respondent-promoter has raised the contention that the construction of the project was delayed due to reasons beyond the control of the respondent such as COVID-19 outbreak, lockdown due to outbreak of such pandemic and shortage of labour on this account. The authority put reliance judgment of Hon'ble Delhi High Court in case titled as *M/s Halliburton Offshore Services Inc. V/S Vedanta Ltd. & Anr. bearing no. O.M. P (I) (Comm.) no. 88/ 2020 and IAs 3696-3697/2020* dated 29.05.2020 which has observed that-

*"69. The past non-performance of the Contractor cannot be condoned due to the COVID-19 lockdown in March 2020 in India. The Contractor was in breach since September 2019. Opportunities were given to the Contractor to cure the same repeatedly. Despite the same, the Contractor could not complete the Project. The outbreak of a pandemic cannot be used as an excuse for non- performance of a contract for which the deadlines were much before the outbreak itself."*

A

13. In the present complaint also, the respondents were liable to complete the construction of the project in question and handover the possession of the said unit by 22.01.2020. The respondents are claiming benefit of lockdown which came into effect on 23.03.2020 whereas the due date of handing over of possession was much prior to the event of outbreak of Covid-19 pandemic. Therefore, the Authority is of the view that outbreak of a pandemic cannot be used as an excuse for non-performance of a contract for which the deadlines were much before the outbreak itself and for the said reason the said time period is not excluded while calculating the delay in handing over possession.

**G. Findings on the relief sought by the complainants.**

**G. I Direct the respondent to pay delayed possession charges at the prescribed interest per annum from the due date till actual delivery of the unit.**

14. In the present complaint, the complainant intends to continue with the project and is seeking delay possession charges as provided under the proviso to section 18(1) of the Act. Sec. 18(1) proviso reads as under.

***“Section 18: - Return of amount and compensation***

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

.....

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

15. Clause 8.1 of the buyer's agreement provides for handing over of possession and is reproduced below:

***8.1 EXPECTED TIME FOR HANDING OVER POSSESSION***

***“Except where any delay is caused on account of reasons expressly provided for under this Agreement and other situations beyond the reasonable control of the Company and subject to the Company having obtained the occupation/completion certificate from the competent authority(ies), the Company shall endeavour to complete the construction and handover the possession of the said Apartment***



*within a period of 4 years from the date of grant of sanction of building plans for the Project or the date of receipt of all the environmental clearances necessary for the completion of the construction and development of the Project, whichever is later, subject to timely payment by the Allottee of all the amounts payable under this Agreement and performance by the Allottee of all other obligations hereunder..”*

16. The Authority has gone through the possession clause of the agreement and observes that the respondent-developer proposed to handover the possession of the allotted unit within a period of 4 years the date of grant of sanction of building plans for the project (17.10.2014) or the date of receipt of all the environmental clearances (22.01.2016), whichever is later. Due date of handing over of possession is calculated from date of EC being later. 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. Despite existence of clause under policy provided due date of possession, the builder has misused its dominant position and laid various conditions shifting burden on the complainant.
17. **Admissibility of delay possession charges at prescribed rate of interest:** Proviso to section 18 provides that where an allottee does not intend to withdraw from the project, he shall be paid, by the promoter, interest for every month of delay, till the handing over of possession, at such rate as may be prescribed and it has been prescribed under rule 15 of the rules. Rule 15 has been reproduced as under:

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

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

Provided that in case the State Bank of India marginal cost of lending rate (MCLR) is not in use, it shall be replaced by such





*benchmark lending rates which the State Bank of India may fix from time to time for lending to the general public.*

18. 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.
19. 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., 07.03.2023 is **8.75%**. Accordingly, the prescribed rate of interest will be marginal cost of lending rate +2% i.e., **10.75%**.
20. The definition of term 'interest' as defined under section 2(za) of the Act provides that the rate of interest chargeable from the allottee by the promoter, in case of default, shall be equal to the rate of interest which the promoter shall be liable to pay the allottee, in case of default. The relevant section is reproduced below:

*"(za) "interest" means the rates of interest payable by the promoter or the allottee, as the case may be.*

*Explanation. —For the purpose of this clause—*

- (i) *the rate of interest chargeable from the allottee by the promoter, in case of default, shall be equal to the rate of interest which the promoter shall be liable to pay the allottee, in case of default;*
- (ii) *the interest payable by the promoter to the allottee shall be from the date the promoter received the amount or any part thereof till the date the amount or part thereof and interest thereon is refunded, and the interest payable by the allottee to the promoter shall be from the date the allottee defaults in payment to the promoter till the date it is paid;"*

21. Therefore, interest on the delay payments from the complainant shall be charged at the prescribed rate i.e., **10.75%** by the respondent/promoter which is the same as is being granted to it in case of delayed possession charges.

*ra*



22. On consideration of the circumstances, the documents, submissions made by the parties and based on the findings of the authority regarding contraventions as per provisions of rule 28, the Authority is satisfied that the respondent is in contravention of the provisions of the Act. By virtue of clause 8.1 of the agreement executed between the parties on 07.05.2016, the possession of the subject apartment was to be delivered within 4 years from the date of sanction of building plans or receipt of environmental clearance whichever is later. Therefore, the due date of handing over possession was 22.01.2020. The respondent has failed to handover possession of the subject apartment till date of this order. Accordingly, it is the failure of the respondent/promoter to fulfil its obligations and responsibilities as per the agreement to hand over the possession within the stipulated period. The authority is of the considered view that there is delay on the part of the respondent to offer of possession of the allotted unit to the complainant as per the terms and conditions of the buyer's agreement dated 07.05.2016 executed between the parties. Further, no OC/part OC has been granted to the project. Hence, this project is to be treated as on-going project and the provisions of the Act shall be applicable equally to the builder as well as allottee.
23. Section 19(10) of the Act obligates the allottee to take possession of the subject unit within 2 months from the date of receipt of occupation certificate. In the present complaint, the occupation certificate is yet not obtained. The respondent shall offer the possession of the unit in question to the complainant after obtaining occupation certificate and so, it can be said that the complainant shall come to know about the occupation certificate only upon the date of offer of possession.

A



Therefore, in the interest of natural justice, the complainant should be given two months' time from the date of offer of possession. This two month of reasonable time is being given to the complainant keeping in mind that even after intimation of possession practically one has to arrange a lot of logistics and requisite documents including but not limited to inspection of the completely finished unit but this is subject to that the unit being handed over at the time of taking possession is in habitable condition. It is further clarified that the delay possession charges shall be payable from the due date of possession i.e., 22.01.2020 till the expiry of 2 months from the date of valid offer of possession or actual handing over of possession and whichever is earlier.

24. Accordingly, it is the failure of the promoter to fulfil its obligations and responsibilities as per the agreement dated 07.05.2016 to hand over the possession within the stipulated period. Accordingly, the non-compliance of the mandate contained in section 11(4)(a) read with proviso to section 18(1) of the Act on the part of the respondent is established. As such, the allottee shall be paid, by the promoter, interest for every month of delay from due date of possession i.e., 22.01.2020 till the date of valid offer of possession plus 2 months or actual handing over of possession, whichever is earlier; at prescribed rate i.e., 10.75% p.a. as per proviso to section 18(1) of the Act read with rule 15 of the rules.

**H . Directions of the authority**

25. 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 shall pay delay possession interest at the prescribed rate i.e., 10.75% per annum for every month of delay on the amount paid by the complainant from due date of possession i.e., 22.01.2020 till the date of actual handing over of possession or till offer of possession plus 2 months after obtaining occupation certificate from the competent authority, whichever is earlier; as per proviso to section 18(1) of the Act read with rule 15 of the rules.
- ii. The respondent is directed to hand over the possession to the complainant allottee on payment of outstanding dues, if any, after adjustment of interest for the delayed period.
- iii. The rate of interest chargeable from the allottees by the promoter, in case of default shall be charged at the prescribed rate i.e., 10.75% by the respondent/promoter which is the same rate of interest which the promoter shall be liable to pay the allottees, in case of default i.e., the delayed possession charges as per section 2(za) of the Act.
- iv. The respondent shall not charge anything from the complainant which is not the part of the buyer's agreement.

26. Complaint stands disposed of.

27. File be consigned to registry.

  
(Vijay Kumar Goyal)  
Member

Haryana Real Estate Regulatory Authority, Gurugram

Dated: 10.08.2023