

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

**Complaint no. :** 768 of 2019  
**Date of first hearing:** 30.07.2019  
**Date of decision :** 20.08.2019

1. M/s Puri Construction Pvt. Ltd.
  2. M/s Florentine Estate of India Ltd.
- Office at:** 4-7B, GF, Tolstoy House,  
Tolstoy Marg, New Delhi.

**Complainants**

Versus

Mr. Sumeet Goel,  
R/o: 154, Neb Sarai Village,  
New Delhi- 110068.

**Respondent**

**CORAM:**

Shri Samir Kumar  
Shri Subhash Chander Kush

**Member**  
**Member**

**APPEARANCE:**

Shri Himanshu Juneja

Authorised representative on  
behalf of the complainants

None present

For the respondent

**ORDER**

1. A complaint dated 06.03.2019 was filed under section 31 of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016 read with rule 28 of the Haryana Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Rules, 2017 by the complainants M/s Puri Constructions Ltd. And another against the respondent-allottee Mr. Sumeet Goel in respect of unit described below in the project 'Emerald Bay', Sector 104, Gurugram on account of violation of obligations of the respondent-allottee for not

**AUTHENTICATED**

SRISHTI MOR  
LEGAL ASSISTANT



taking possession of the apartment in question and for non payment of due instalments by the allottee which is in violation of section 19(6) of the Act.

2. Since the apartment buyer's agreement for the apartment in question has been executed on 04.10.2013 i.e. prior to the commencement of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016, so the penal proceedings cannot be initiated retrospectively. Hence, the authority has decided to treat this complaint as an application for non-compliance of statutory obligations on the part of allottee under section 34(f) of the Act.
3. The particulars of the complaint are as under: -

|     |  |  |
|-----|--|--|
| 1.  | Name and location of the project   | "Emerald Bay" in Sector 104, Gurugram    |
| 2.  | Nature of real estate project  | Group housing complex                    |
| 3.  | Project area   | 15.337 acres                             |
| 4.  | Apartment/unit no.   | B2-1803,18 <sup>th</sup> floor, tower B2 |
| 5.  | Unit area  | 1700 sq. ft.                             |
| 6.  | Registered/ not registered   | Registered vide no. 136 of 2017          |
| 7.  | Revised date of completion as per RERA registration certificate                  | 28.02.2020                               |
| 8.  | DTCP license   | 68 of 2012                               |
| 9.  | Date of apartment buyer's agreement  | 04.10.2013                               |
| 10. | Total consideration as per apartment buyer's agreement (Pg. 82 of the complaint) | Rs. 1,70,86,214/-                        |
| 11. | Total amount paid by the   | Rs. 1,48,49,144.31/-                     |

**AUTHENTICATED**

**SRISHTI MOR**  
LEGAL ASSISTANT



|     |  |  |
|-----|--|--|
|     | respondent as per sales customer ledger dated 22.02.2019 (page 179 of complaint)   |  |
| 12. | Payment plan   | Possession linked payment plan   |
| 13. | Due date of delivery of possession as per clause 11(a): within 48 months from date of execution of agreement + 180 days grace period | 04.04.2018   |
| 14. | Date of receipt of occupation certificate (annexure P5, page 175 of complaint)   | 21.11.2018   |
| 15. | Offer of possession (annexure P6, page 177 of complaint)   | 24.12.2018   |
| 16. | Delay in handing over possession   | 8 months 20 days   |
| 17. | Penalty as per clause 15 of the apartment buyer's agreement dated 04.10.2013   | Rs. 5/- per sq. ft. of super area per month for first 6 months of delay;<br>Rs. 10/- per sq. ft. of super area per month for up to 12 months of delay;<br>Rs. 15/- per sq. ft. of super area per month for delay beyond 12 months; |

4. The details provided above have been checked on the basis of the record available in the case file which have been provided by the complainant and the respondent. An apartment buyer agreement dated 04.10.2013 is available on record for unit no. B2-1803, 18<sup>th</sup> floor, block B2, admeasuring 1700 sq. ft. in the project 'Emerald Bay' according to which the due date of possession comes out to be 04.04.2018. Possession of the same has been offered by the complainant-developer vide letter on 24.12.2018, but the respondent did not turn up to

**AUTHENTICATED**

**SRISHTI MOR**  
LEGAL ASSISTANT



take the possession by paying the outstanding dues which is in violation of section 19 (6) of the Act *ibid*.

5. Taking cognizance of the complaint, the authority issued notice to the respondent for filing reply and for appearance. The case came up for hearing on 30.07.2019, 20.08.2019 . The reply has been filed on behalf of the respondent on 26.03.2019 which has been perused by the authority.

#### **FACTS OF THE COMPLAINT**

6. The complainants submitted that they have launched a residential group housing project by the name of 'Emerald Bay' in Sec-104, Gurgaon in the first quarter of year 2013 and the respondent has made a booking of an apartment no. B2-1803 in January 2013, after carrying out the due diligence about the property.
7. The complainants and respondent entered into buyers agreement with the respondent on 4<sup>th</sup> December, 2013. The detailed terms and conditions governing the contractual obligations of the parties were detailed and described in the said buyers agreement. As per the agreed terms of the agreement, the time period for completion of the construction, subject to force majeure conditions and subject to respondent making timely payments was agreed between the parties as 48 months from the date of execution of the buyers agreement with a grace period of 6 months for applying and obtaining occupation certificate.

**AUTHENTICATED**

**SRISHTI MOR**  
LEGAL ASSISTANT



8. The complainants submitted that the respondent failed to adhere to the agreed terms of the buyers agreement since the very beginning and started making defaults in making timely payments of sale consideration as per agreed payment plan. The respondent sent an email dt. 31.10.2013 to the petitioners, for granting him time extension for payment of due instalments.
9. The complainants accepted the request of the respondent seeking extension of time period for making payment, vide its email dt. 06.11.2013.
10. During the currency of the agreement, the respondent made further defaults in the payment of the instalments and ultimately the respondent had requested the complainant vide email dt. 31.08.2015, to change his agreed payment plan from 'construction linked payment plan' (CLP) to 'possession linked payment plan' (PLP).
11. The complainants submitted that in good faith and purely in keeping with the company's policy of keeping the customer happy the complainants accepted the request of the complainant, vide its email dt. 02.09.2015 and changed the payment plan of the respondent from CLP to PLP.
12. The time period for completion of construction was subject to force majeure conditions as well as subject to timely payment of instalments by the respondent. But the respondent did not adhere to the agreed payment plan and defaulted on various occasions in making timely payments.





13. Apart from the defaults of the respondent and breach in the agreed terms and conditions of buyers agreement in making timely payments, the major force majeure conditions affecting the construction during currency of the buyers agreement are as under:

A) **Demonetization**: The complainants had awarded the construction of the project to M/s. Simplex Infrastructure Limited, which is one of the leading construction company of India. The said contractor/ company undertaking the construction of the Project could not undertake construction for approx. 3-4 months during the period of Demonetization. Like other industries, real estate industry was also worst sufferer during period of demonetization as the contractor could not make payment to the labour in cash and the work at site got halted for 3-4 months as the labour went to their hometowns and had impacted the planned pace of construction thereafter. The said event of Demonetization was one such event which was not foreseen by anyone including respondent in 2013 at the time of entering into buyers agreement, rather the said event of demonetization has occurred in our country only twice in 71 years of independence.

B) **NGT Order**: There were specific orders of National Green Tribunal for stopping all construction activities in the whole National Capital Region for two successive years 2016 & 2017, when pollution levels were alarmingly high and the construction activities were stopped for certain time period. This too resulted in delays of 3-4 months as labour





went back to their hometowns and this also resulted in impacting planned pace of construction. This event also could not be foreseen in 2013 at the time of entering into buyers agreement, as such directions were never issued by any court till such dates of 2016 and 2017.

C) **Non-Payment of Instalments by Allottees** including the respondent: Several allottees including the respondent were in default of the agreed payment plan and the payment of construction linked instalments was delayed on several occasions. The construction/development of the project is dependent upon the allottees including respondent to fulfill their obligations of making timely payments. The respondent has been in default of making timely payments on several occasions as explained herein, hence the delay in completion of construction for a period of 6-12 months is duly covered by the above stated force majeure conditions and also due to defaults of the respondent. Rather the non-payment of timely instalments by the respondent amounts to default on the part of respondent and will result in automatic extension of time periods for completion of construction. The respondent in total has committed default of 42 months in making timely payments, hence the said period will be added to the time period prescribed in the agreement for completion of construction.

D) **Inclement weather conditions viz. Gurugram:** Due to heavy rainfall in Gurugram in the year 2016 and unfavorable weather conditions, all the construction



activities were stopped as the whole town was waterlogged and gridlocked as a result of which the construction came to standstill for many weeks and was widely reported in the media. Even various institutions were ordered to be shut down/closed for many days during that year due to adverse/severe weather conditions.

- E) **Lack of Civic Infrastructure:** The State of Haryana has miserably failed to provide the basic civic infrastructure to all the new sectors falling on the Dwarka Expressway despite payment of hundreds of crores of rupees towards EDC and IDC by the respondent and other developers. Till date the State of Haryana has not been able to complete the construction of much publicized Dwarka Expressway even after expiry of more than 11 years of publication of Development Plan of Gurugram, Haryana. The state agencies responsible for providing water supply and electricity in new sectors have also failed to provide the same on time. All these factors have impacted the pace of construction. HUDA failed to lay any water pipe lines near the site of the complainant and the complainant was reliant on HUDA STP treated water from far away sites which was unavailable many a times. Adequate and accessible water supply for construction is a basic necessity and non availability of the same seriously hampered progress. Even Dwarka Expressway Association has filed a Civil Writ Petition in High Court of Punjab and Haryana seeking directions against the authorities to provide basic





infrastructure and amenities, which is pending adjudication. It is pertinent to mention here that the total sale consideration of the present unit of the respondent, includes more than Rs. 14 Lacs, towards taxes and EDC and IDC, which stand paid to the government agencies.

In view of the above stated force majeure conditions/events, and also the time period for which the respondent committed the default in making payment of timely instalments, the time period to complete the construction comes to June 2019 and the complainant has already obtained the occupation certificate of the project on 21.11.2018 i.e. within the prescribed timelines.

14. The complainants after receipt of the Occupation Certificate in November, 2018 has intimated the respondent and his relatives- Anil Goel and Sanjay Goel, who have got two separate booking of apartments, in the personal meeting about the impending occupation certificate as the application for obtaining occupation certificate was made in August 2018.
15. The respondent to avoid the discharge of his obligations as per the agreed terms and conditions of the buyers agreement and to eke out of the booking/allotment on frivolous grounds, as the market rates of the real estate apartments on Dwarka Expressway have seen downwards trend in last 5 years due to non-operational Dwarka Expressway, firstly filed a frivolous petition before National Company Law Tribunal New Delhi, claiming himself and his relatives as Financial Creditors and also thereafter sent a false and frivolous email dt. 7.12.2018 to the

**AUTHENTICATED**

**SRISHTI MOR**  
LEGAL ASSISTANT



complainant seeking refund of the amounts paid by it along with interest thereon, though knowing very well that the complainants have received the occupation certificate of the project.

16. As per the agreed clause no. 1.4 and other provisions of the Buyers agreement, the respondent is required to make payment of total price as per payment plan being part of the buyers agreement and also to keep the complainant indemnified against all losses, damages etc. for non-payment of the dues and/or total price of the apartment. The complainant has already completed the project and has intimated about offer of possession of the apartment to the respondent and has invested huge amounts towards the project on the basis of reciprocal promises/commitments/obligations of the respondent to make payment of total price. It is quite evident that the respondent does not want to fulfill his contractual obligations on the basis of which the complainant has developed the project as the respondent does not want to make payment of agreed sale price to the complainant as is evident from his email. Hence this petition.
17. As per section 19(6) of RERA Act, the statute has enumerated the duties cast upon the allottees and as per the provisions of the said section the respondent is liable to make all payments on time as agreed between the promoter and homebuyer and is also liable to adhere to the obligations cast upon him in the Buyers Agreement and the respondent-allottee has failed to do so and is in complete breach default of the terms and conditions of the

buyers agreement, hence the present petition for directing the respondent to fulfill his obligations. The present petition be read in consonance with the provisions contained in the section 31, 37 and section 19(6) and (7) of the RERA Act.

14. The complainants have been adhering to all the provisions/clauses/terms and conditions agreed between the respondent-allottee and the promoter and respondent – allottee has been in default thereof. Hence the present petition seeking directions against the respondent to fulfill his part of obligations mentioned agreement to sale and duties cast upon allottees under RERA Act.

**ISSUES TO BE DETERMINED:**

15. The complainants have raised the following issues:
- i. Whether the respondent has committed default/breach of the terms and conditions of the agreement by not making timely payments?
  - ii. Whether the complainants are entitled to recover the amounts of outstanding dues and amount of balance sale consideration from the respondent?
  - iii. Whether the hon'ble authority can issue directions against the respondent as per provisions of section 37 read with 19(6) (7) and section 31 of Act?

**RELIEFS SOUGHT BY THE COMPLAINANTS**

16. The complainants are seeking the following reliefs:
- i. Direct the respondent to make payment of outstanding amounts as well as balance sale consideration and other

**AUTHENTICATED**  
**SRISHTI MOR**  
LEGAL ASSISTANT

charges amounting of Rs. 34,66,842/- along with interest at the rate prescribed under the Haryana RERA rules and Act.

- ii. Respondent be directed to make payment of Rs. 14,92,900/- towards the stamp duty charges in terms of the agreement regarding unit no. B2-1803 in project Emerald Bay, Sec-104, Gurugram.

**RESPONDENT REPLY:**

17. The respondent denied the averments and contentions urged in the complaint individually and collectively. The respondent submitted on the page titled as "information regarding complaint", the complainant has stated falsely that the amount paid by the complainant is Rs. 1,45,92,060/-. The respondent submitted that no amount has been paid by the complainant to the respondent.
18. The respondent submitted on the page titled as "information regarding complaint", the complainant has stated that the remaining amount was payable by the respondent on 02.07.2015. As per the provisions of the Limitation Act, the said complaint ought to have been filed within 3 years from the date when cause of action arose and as such the claims made by the complainant are time barred. Thus, the captioned complaint is liable to be dismissed on this ground.
19. The respondent submitted that the complainant and its authorized representative/ signatory knowingly made false statements and are liable to be proceeded under section 340 of the Code of Criminal Procedure Act, 1973.

**AUTHENTICATED**  
SRISHTI MOR  
LEGAL ASSISTANT

20. The respondent submitted that admittedly vide email dated 07.12.2018 they sought cancellation of the allotment and refund of the money. However, the complainant failed to respond to the said email or provide refund to the respondent.
21. The respondent submitted that once the respondent has cancelled the allotment, the complainant cannot compel the respondent to make payment or to purchase the apartment. Such demand for refund had been made much prior to filing of the captioned complaint. Thus, the complainant is liable to return the amount in terms of section 18 of the Act *ibid*.
22. The respondent submitted that he has filed an insolvency petition bearing no. IB no. 1662(PB)/2018 before the NCLT titled as "M/s Puri Construction Pvt. Ltd. v. Sanjay Goel against complainant on the same cause of action as alleged by him in the captioned complaint. The complainant been aggrieved by the said proceedings has already filed a writ petition bearing no. W.P.(C) no. 196/2019 titled as 'M/s Puri Construction Pvt. Ltd. v. Union of India and others' before the Supreme Court of India, which is pending adjudication. Further vide order dated 19.02.2019 the proceedings of the case have been stayed. Upon this ground the complaint is liable to be dismissed.
23. It is evident that the complainant has concealed complete details of the aforesaid proceedings and the complainant has not approached this authority with clean hands. In terms of the same the complaint is liable to be dismissed with heavy costs.

**AUTHENTICATED**  
SRISHTI MOR  
LEGAL ASSISTANT

24. The respondent denied the averment and contentions alleged by the complainant.
25. The respondent submitted that the complainant had offered to of the respondent that the payment plan would be changed from construction linked to possession linked but it was never consented to the respondent.
26. The grounds mentioned by the respondent regarding the force majeure conditions affecting the construction of the said project including demonetization, order passed by the Hon'ble NGT, on non-payment of instalments by the allottees etc., but also pleaded before the NCLT as well as in CP No. IB-1351(PB)/2018 and they were not given much weightage.
27. The total consideration of the said apartment was Rs. 1,70,86,214/- and the total amount paid by the respondent is Rs. 1,45,43,078.31/-
28. The respondent submitted that the complainant arbitrarily and without explanation executed the ABA on 04.10.2013. That the respondent vide email dated 07.12.2018 requested the complainant for cancelling the allotment of said apartment and demanded refund of entire amount.
29. The respondent submitted that he filed the petition before NCLT vide no. IB no. 1662 (PB)/2018. The NCLT was pleased to initiate corporate insolvency resolution process against the complainant vide order 10.01.2019.
30. The respondent submitted that 19.02.2019 the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India stayed the proceeding of the said petition pending

before NCLT in writ petition bearing no. W.P. (C) No.196/2019 titled "M/s Puri Construction Pvt. Ltd. vs. Union of India and others" filed by the complainant. The respondent submitted that on 01.03.2019, the said petition was adjourned sine die by the NCLT.

**DETERMINATION OF ISSUES:**

31. As regards **issue no. 1, 2 and 3 raised by the complainants**, it is evident from perusal of records that as per clause 11(a) of the apartment buyer's agreement dated 04.10.2013, the complainants had agreed to deliver the possession of the apartment in question within a period of 48 months plus 180 days grace period from the date of execution of apartment buyer's agreement. The due date of delivery of possession on calculation comes out to be 04.04.2018 and the complainants have offered the possession on 24.12.2018 after receipt of occupation certificate on 21.11.2018. However, the respondent did not turn up to take the physical possession of the apartment on payment of outstanding dues.

32. Since, the respondent has defaulted in making payment of outstanding dues and taking possession of the apartment in question, so there is a violation of terms and conditions of apartment buyer's agreement and also violation of obligation of allottee under section 19(6) of the Act on the part of respondent.

**FINDINGS OF THE AUTHORITY:**

33. The authority has complete subject matter jurisdiction to decide the complaint regarding non-compliance of obligations by the

**AUTHENTICATED**  
SRISHTI MOR  
LEGAL ASSISTANT

promoter as held in *Simmi Sikka v/s M/s EMAAR MGF Land Ltd.* leaving aside compensation which is to be decided by the adjudicating officer if pursued by the complainant at a later stage. As per notification no. 1/92/2017-1TCP dated 14.12.2017 issued by Town & Country Planning Department, the jurisdiction of Real Estate Regulatory Authority, Gurugram shall be entire Gurugram District for all purpose with offices situated in Gurugram. In the present case, the project in question is situated within the planning area of Gurugram District, therefore this authority has complete territorial jurisdiction to deal with the present complaint.

34. None is present on behalf of the respondent despite service and calling the matter twice. Hence the respondent is proceeded ex parte on the basis of the material facts available on record.
35. As per clause 11(a) of the builder buyer agreement dated 04.10.2013 for unit no. B-2,1803, 18<sup>th</sup> floor, block B2 in the project Emerald Bay, sector 104, Gurugram possession as to be handed over to the buyer within a period of 48 months from the date of execution of the agreement i.e. 04.10.2013 + 180 days grace period which comes out to be 04.04.2018. Respondent/buyer has already paid Rs. 1,48,49,144.31/- to the respondent against a total sale consideration of Rs. 1,70,86,214/-. Complainant-builder has offered the possession of the unit to the respondent on 24.12.2018 after receipt of occupation certificate on 21.1..2018 but the respondent is not coming forward to take over the possession of the unit and payment of balance dues.

**DECISION AND DIRECTIONS OF THE AUTHORITY:**

**AUTHENTICATED**  
**SRISHTI MOR**  
LEGAL ASSISTANT



36. The authority exercising its power under section 37 of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016 hereby issues the following directions to the parties in the interest of justice and fair play:

- i. The respondent is directed to take over the possession of the unit on payment of balance dues along with prescribed rate of interest i.e. 10.45% per annum to the complainants within a period of one month.
- ii. The complainants are also liable to pay late delivery charges, if any, at the prescribed rate which is being levied on the respondent.



Haryana Real Estate Regulatory Authority, Gurugram

Date: 20.07.2019

20.08.2019

Corrected judgement uploaded on 25.09.2019



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

Complaint no. : 768 of 2019  
Date of first hearing: 30.07.2019  
Date of decision : 20.08.2019

1. M/s Puri Construction Pvt. Ltd.
  2. M/s Florentine Estate of India Ltd.
- Office at:** 4-7B, GF, Tolstoy House,  
Tolstoy Marg, New Delhi.

**Complainants**

Versus

Mr. Sumeet Goel,  
R/o: 154, Neb Sarai Village,  
New Delhi- 110068.

**Respondent**

**CORAM:**

Shri Samir Kumar  
Shri Subhash Chander Kush

**Member**  
**Member**

**APPEARANCE:**

Shri Himanshu Juneja

Authorised representative on  
behalf of the complainants

None present

For the respondent

**ORDER**

1. A complaint dated 06.03.2019 was filed under section 31 of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016 read with rule 28 of the Haryana Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Rules, 2017 by the complainants M/s Puri Constructions Ltd. And another against the respondent-allottee Mr. Sumeet Goel in respect of unit described below in the project 'Emerald Bay', Sector 104, Gurugram on account of violation of obligations of the respondent-allottee for not

**AUTHENTICATED**

**SRISHTI MOR**  
LEGAL ASSISTANT

taking possession of the apartment in question and for non payment of due instalments by the allottee which is in violation of section 19(6) of the Act.

2. Since the apartment buyer's agreement for the apartment in question has been executed on 04.10.2013 i.e. prior to the commencement of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016, so the penal proceedings cannot be initiated retrospectively. Hence, the authority has decided to treat this complaint as an application for non-compliance of statutory obligations on the part of allottee under section 34(f) of the Act.

3. The particulars of the complaint are as under: -

|     |  |   |
|-----|--|---|
| 1.  | Name and location of the project   | "Emerald Bay" in Sector 104, Gurugram     |
| 2.  | Nature of real estate project  | Group housing complex                     |
| 3.  | Project area   | 15.337 acres                              |
| 4.  | Apartment/unit no.   | B2-1803, 18 <sup>th</sup> floor, tower B2 |
| 5.  | Unit area  | 1700 sq. ft.                              |
| 6.  | Registered/ not registered   | Registered vide no. 136 of 2017           |
| 7.  | Revised date of completion as per RERA registration certificate                  | 28.02.2020                                |
| 8.  | DTCP license   | 68 of 2012                                |
| 9.  | Date of apartment buyer's agreement  | 04.10.2013                                |
| 10. | Total consideration as per apartment buyer's agreement (Pg. 82 of the complaint) | Rs. 1,70,86,214/-                         |
| 11. | Total amount paid by the   | Rs. 1,48,49,144.31/-                      |

**AUTHENTICATED**

**SRISHTI MOR**  
LEGAL ASSISTANT

|     |  |  |
|-----|--|--|
|     | respondent as per sales customer ledger dated 22.02.2019 (page 179 of complaint)   |  |
| 12. | Payment plan   | Possession linked payment plan   |
| 13. | Due date of delivery of possession as per clause 11(a): within 48 months from date of execution of agreement + 180 days grace period | 04.04.2018   |
| 14. | Date of receipt of occupation certificate (annexure P5, page 175 of complaint)   | 21.11.2018   |
| 15. | Offer of possession (annexure P6, page 177 of complaint)   | 24.12.2018   |
| 16. | Delay in handing over possession   | 8 months 20 days   |
| 17. | Penalty as per clause 15 of the apartment buyer's agreement dated 04.10.2013   | Rs. 5/- per sq. ft. of super area per month for first 6 months of delay;<br>Rs. 10/- per sq. ft. of super area per month for up to 12 months of delay;<br>Rs. 15/- per sq. ft. of super area per month for delay beyond 12 months; |

4. The details provided above have been checked on the basis of the record available in the case file which have been provided by the complainant and the respondent. An apartment buyer agreement dated 04.10.2013 is available on record for unit no. B2-1803, 18<sup>th</sup> floor, block B2, admeasuring 1700 sq. ft. in the project 'Emerald Bay' according to which the due date of possession comes out to be 04.04.2018. Possession of the same has been offered by the complainant-developer vide letter on 24.12.2018, but the respondent did not turn up to

**AUTHENTICATED**

**SRISHTI MOR**  
LEGAL ASSISTANT

take the possession by paying the outstanding dues which is in violation of section 19 (6) of the Act *ibid*.

5. Taking cognizance of the complaint, the authority issued notice to the respondent for filing reply and for appearance. The case came up for hearing on 30.07.2019, 20.08.2019 . The reply has been filed on behalf of the respondent on 26.03.2019 which has been perused by the authority.

#### **FACTS OF THE COMPLAINT**

6. The complainants submitted that they have launched a residential group housing project by the name of 'Emerald Bay' in Sec-104, Gurgaon in the first quarter of year 2013 and the respondent has made a booking of an apartment no. B2-1803 in January 2013, after carrying out the due diligence about the property.
7. The complainants and respondent entered into buyers agreement with the respondent on 4<sup>th</sup> December, 2013. The detailed terms and conditions governing the contractual obligations of the parties were detailed and described in the said buyers agreement. As per the agreed terms of the agreement, the time period for completion of the construction, subject to force majeure conditions and subject to respondent making timely payments was agreed between the parties as 48 months from the date of execution of the buyers agreement with a grace period of 6 months for applying and obtaining occupation certificate.

**AUTHENTICATED**

**SRISHTI MOR**  
LEGAL ASSISTANT

8. The complainants submitted that the respondent failed to adhere to the agreed terms of the buyers agreement since the very beginning and started making defaults in making timely payments of sale consideration as per agreed payment plan. The respondent sent an email dt. 31.10.2013 to the petitioners, for granting him time extension for payment of due instalments.
9. The complainants accepted the request of the respondent seeking extension of time period for making payment, vide its email dt. 06.11.2013.
10. During the currency of the agreement, the respondent made further defaults in the payment of the instalments and ultimately the respondent had requested the complainant vide email dt. 31.08.2015, to change his agreed payment plan from 'construction linked payment plan' (CLP) to 'possession linked payment plan' (PLP).
11. The complainants submitted that in good faith and purely in keeping with the company's policy of keeping the customer happy the complainants accepted the request of the complainant, vide its email dt. 02.09.2015 and changed the payment plan of the respondent from CLP to PLP.
12. The time period for completion of construction was subject to force majeure conditions as well as subject to timely payment of instalments by the respondent. But the respondent did not adhere to the agreed payment plan and defaulted on various occasions in making timely payments.

**AUTHENTICATED**  
SRISHTI MOR  
LEGAL ASSISTANT

13. Apart from the defaults of the respondent and breach in the agreed terms and conditions of buyers agreement in making timely payments, the major force majeure conditions affecting the construction during currency of the buyers agreement are as under:

A) **Demonetization**: The complainants had awarded the construction of the project to M/s. Simplex Infrastructure Limited, which is one of the leading construction company of India. The said contractor/ company undertaking the construction of the Project could not undertake construction for approx. 3-4 months during the period of Demonetization. Like other industries, real estate industry was also worst sufferer during period of demonetization as the contractor could not make payment to the labour in cash and the work at site got halted for 3-4 months as the labour went to their hometowns and had impacted the planned pace of construction thereafter. The said event of Demonetization was one such event which was not foreseen by anyone including respondent in 2013 at the time of entering into buyers agreement, rather the said event of demonetization has occurred in our country only twice in 71 years of independence.

B) **NGT Order**: There were specific orders of National Green Tribunal for stopping all construction activities in the whole National Capital Region for two successive years 2016 & 2017, when pollution levels were alarmingly high and the construction activities were stopped for certain time period. This too resulted in delays of 3-4 months as labour

**AUTHENTICATED**  
SRISHTI MOR  
LEGAL ASSISTANT

went back to their hometowns and this also resulted in impacting planned pace of construction. This event also could not be foreseen in 2013 at the time of entering into buyers agreement, as such directions were never issued by any court till such dates of 2016 and 2017.

C) **Non-Payment of Instalments by Allottees** including the respondent: Several allottees including the respondent were in default of the agreed payment plan and the payment of construction linked instalments was delayed on several occasions. The construction/development of the project is dependent upon the allottees including respondent to fulfill their obligations of making timely payments. The respondent has been in default of making timely payments on several occasions as explained herein, hence the delay in completion of construction for a period of 6-12 months is duly covered by the above stated force majeure conditions and also due to defaults of the respondent. Rather the non-payment of timely instalments by the respondent amounts to default on the part of respondent and will result in automatic extension of time periods for completion of construction. The respondent in total has committed default of 42 months in making timely payments, hence the said period will be added to the time period prescribed in the agreement for completion of construction.

D) **Inclement weather conditions viz. Gurugram:** Due to heavy rainfall in Gurugram in the year 2016 and unfavorable weather conditions, all the construction

AUTHENTICATED

SRISHTI MOR  
LEGAL ASSISTANT



activities were stopped as the whole town was waterlogged and gridlocked as a result of which the construction came to standstill for many weeks and was widely reported in the media. Even various institutions were ordered to be shut down/closed for many days during that year due to adverse/severe weather conditions.

E) **Lack of Civic Infrastructure**: The State of Haryana has miserably failed to provide the basic civic infrastructure to all the new sectors falling on the Dwarka Expressway despite payment of hundreds of crores of rupees towards EDC and IDC by the respondent and other developers. Till date the State of Haryana has not been able to complete the construction of much publicized Dwarka Expressway even after expiry of more than 11 years of publication of Development Plan of Gurugram, Haryana. The state agencies responsible for providing water supply and electricity in new sectors have also failed to provide the same on time. All these factors have impacted the pace of construction. HUDA failed to lay any water pipe lines near the site of the complainant and the complainant was reliant on HUDA STP treated water from far away sites which was unavailable many a times. Adequate and accessible water supply for construction is a basic necessity and non availability of the same seriously hampered progress. Even Dwarka Expressway Association has filed a Civil Writ Petition in High Court of Punjab and Haryana seeking directions against the authorities to provide basic

AUTHENTICATED

SRISHTI MOR  
LEGAL ASSISTANT

infrastructure and amenities, which is pending adjudication. It is pertinent to mention here that the total sale consideration of the present unit of the respondent, includes more than Rs. 14 Lacs, towards taxes and EDC and IDC, which stand paid to the government agencies.

In view of the above stated force majeure conditions/events, and also the time period for which the respondent committed the default in making payment of timely instalments, the time period to complete the construction comes to June 2019 and the complainant has already obtained the occupation certificate of the project on 21.11.2018 i.e. within the prescribed timelines.

14. The complainants after receipt of the Occupation Certificate in November, 2018 has intimated the respondent and his relatives- Anil Goel and Sanjay Goel, who have got two separate booking of apartments, in the personal meeting about the impending occupation certificate as the application for obtaining occupation certificate was made in August 2018.
15. The respondent to avoid the discharge of his obligations as per the agreed terms and conditions of the buyers agreement and to eke out of the booking/allotment on frivolous grounds, as the market rates of the real estate apartments on Dwarka Expressway have seen downwards trend in last 5 years due to non-operational Dwarka Expressway, firstly filed a frivolous petition before National Company Law Tribunal New Delhi, claiming himself and his relatives as Financial Creditors and also thereafter sent a false and frivolous email dt. 7.12.2018 to the

**AUTHENTICATED**  
**SRISHTI MOR**  
LEGAL ASSISTANT

complainant seeking refund of the amounts paid by it along with interest thereon, though knowing very well that the complainants have received the occupation certificate of the project.

16. As per the agreed clause no. 1.4 and other provisions of the Buyers agreement, the respondent is required to make payment of total price as per payment plan being part of the buyers agreement and also to keep the complainant indemnified against all losses, damages etc. for non-payment of the dues and/or total price of the apartment. The complainant has already completed the project and has intimated about offer of possession of the apartment to the respondent and has invested huge amounts towards the project on the basis of reciprocal promises/commitments/obligations of the respondent to make payment of total price. It is quite evident that the respondent does not want to fulfill his contractual obligations on the basis of which the complainant has developed the project as the respondent does not want to make payment of agreed sale price to the complainant as is evident from his email. Hence this petition.
17. As per section 19(6) of RERA Act, the statute has enumerated the duties cast upon the allottees and as per the provisions of the said section the respondent is liable to make all payments on time as agreed between the promoter and homebuyer and is also liable to adhere to the obligations cast upon him in the Buyers Agreement and the respondent-allottee has failed to do so and is in complete breach default of the terms and conditions of the

buyers agreement, hence the present petition for directing the respondent to fulfill his obligations. The present petition be read in consonance with the provisions contained in the section 31, 37 and section 19(6) and (7) of the RERA Act.

14. The complainants have been adhering to all the provisions/clauses/terms and conditions agreed between the respondent-allottee and the promoter and respondent – allottee has been in default thereof. Hence the present petition seeking directions against the respondent to fulfill his part of obligations mentioned agreement to sale and duties cast upon allottees under RERA Act.

**ISSUES TO BE DETERMINED:**

15. The complainants have raised the following issues:
- i. Whether the respondent has committed default/breach of the terms and conditions of the agreement by not making timely payments?
  - ii. Whether the complainants are entitled to recover the amounts of outstanding dues and amount of balance sale consideration from the respondent?
  - iii. Whether the hon'ble authority can issue directions against the respondent as per provisions of section 37 read with 19(6) (7) and section 31 of Act?

**RELIEFS SOUGHT BY THE COMPLAINANTS**

16. The complainants are seeking the following reliefs:
- i. Direct the respondent to make payment of outstanding amounts as well as balance sale consideration and other

**AUTHENTICATED**  
SRISHTI MOR  
LEGAL ASSISTANT

- charges amounting of Rs. 34,66,842/- along with interest at the rate prescribed under the Haryana RERA rules and Act.
- ii. Respondent be directed to make payment of Rs. 14,92,900/- towards the stamp duty charges in terms of the agreement regarding unit no. B2-1803 in project Emerald Bay, Sec-104, Gurugram.

**RESPONDENT REPLY:**

17. The respondent denied the averments and contentions urged in the complaint individually and collectively. The respondent submitted on the page titled as "information regarding complaint", the complainant has stated falsely that the amount paid by the complainant is Rs. 1,45,92,060/-. The respondent submitted that no amount has been paid by the complainant to the respondent.
18. The respondent submitted on the page titled as "information regarding complaint", the complainant has stated that the remaining amount was payable by the respondent on 02.07.2015. As per the provisions of the Limitation Act, the said complaint ought to have been filed within 3 years from the date when cause of action arose and as such the claims made by the complainant are time barred. Thus, the captioned complaint is liable to be dismissed on this ground.
19. The respondent submitted that the complainant and its authorized representative/ signatory knowingly made false statements and are liable to be proceeded under section 340 of the Code of Criminal Procedure Act, 1973.

**AUTHENTICATED**  
SRISHTI MOR  
LEGAL ASSISTANT

20. The respondent submitted that admittedly vide email dated 07.12.2018 they sought cancellation of the allotment and refund of the money. However, the complainant failed to respond to the said email or provide refund to the respondent.
21. The respondent submitted that once the respondent has cancelled the allotment, the complainant cannot compel the respondent to make payment or to purchase the apartment. Such demand for refund had been made much prior to filing of the captioned complaint. Thus, the complainant is liable to return the amount in terms of section 18 of the Act *ibid*.
22. The respondent submitted that he has filed an insolvency petition bearing no. IB no. 1662(PB)/2018 before the NCLT titled as "M/s Puri Construction Pvt. Ltd. v. Sanjay Goel against complainant on the same cause of action as alleged by him in the captioned complaint. The complainant been aggrieved by the said proceedings has already filed a writ petition bearing no. W.P.(C) no. 196/2019 titled as 'M/s Puri Construction Pvt. Ltd. v. Union of India and others' before the Supreme Court of India, which is pending adjudication. Further vide order dated 19.02.2019 the proceedings of the case have been stayed. Upon this ground the complaint is liable to be dismissed.
23. It is evident that the complainant has concealed complete details of the aforesaid proceedings and the complainant has not approached this authority with clean hands. In terms of the same the complaint is liable to be dismissed with heavy costs.

**AUTHENTICATED**  
SRISHTI MOR  
LEGAL ASSISTANT

24. The respondent denied the averment and contentions alleged by the complainant.
25. The respondent submitted that the complainant had offered to of the respondent that the payment plan would be changed from construction linked to possession linked but it was never consented to the respondent.
26. The grounds mentioned by the respondent regarding the force majeure conditions affecting the construction of the said project including demonetization, order passed by the Hon'ble NGT, on non-payment of instalments by the allottees etc., but also pleaded before the NCLT as well as in CP No. IB-1351(PB)/2018 and they were not given much weightage.
27. The total consideration of the said apartment was Rs. 1,70,86,214/- and the total amount paid by the respondent is Rs. 1,45,43,078.31/-
28. The respondent submitted that the complainant arbitrarily and without explanation executed the ABA on 04.10.2013. That the respondent vide email dated 07.12.2018 requested the complainant for cancelling the allotment of said apartment and demanded refund of entire amount.
29. The respondent submitted that he filed the petition before NCLT vide no. IB no. 1662 (PB)/2018. The NCLT was pleased to initiate corporate insolvency resolution process against the complainant vide order 10.01.2019.
30. The respondent submitted that 19.02.2019 the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India stayed the proceeding of the said petition pending

before NCLT in writ petition bearing no. W.P. (C) No.196/2019 titled "M/s Puri Construction Pvt. Ltd. vs. Union of India and others" filed by the complainant. The respondent submitted that on 01.03.2019, the said petition was adjourned sine die by the NCLT.

**DETERMINATION OF ISSUES:**

31. As regards **issue no. 1, 2 and 3 raised by the complainants**, it is evident from perusal of records that as per clause 11(a) of the apartment buyer's agreement dated 04.10.2013, the complainants had agreed to deliver the possession of the apartment in question within a period of 48 months plus 180 days grace period from the date of execution of apartment buyer's agreement. The due date of delivery of possession on calculation comes out to be 04.04.2018 and the complainants have offered the possession on 24.12.2018 after receipt of occupation certificate on 21.11.2018. However, the respondent did not turn up to take the physical possession of the apartment on payment of outstanding dues.

32. Since, the respondent has defaulted in making payment of outstanding dues and taking possession of the apartment in question, so there is a violation of terms and conditions of apartment buyer's agreement and also violation of obligation of allottee under section 19(6) of the Act on the part of respondent.

**FINDINGS OF THE AUTHORITY:**

33. The authority has complete subject matter jurisdiction to decide the complaint regarding non-compliance of obligations by the

**AUTHENTICATED**  
SRISHTI MOR  
LEGAL ASSISTANT





promoter as held in *Simmi Sikka v/s M/s EMAAR MGF Land Ltd.* leaving aside compensation which is to be decided by the adjudicating officer if pursued by the complainant at a later stage. As per notification no. 1/92/2017-1TCP dated 14.12.2017 issued by Town & Country Planning Department, the jurisdiction of Real Estate Regulatory Authority, Gurugram shall be entire Gurugram District for all purpose with offices situated in Gurugram. In the present case, the project in question is situated within the planning area of Gurugram District, therefore this authority has complete territorial jurisdiction to deal with the present complaint.

34. None is present on behalf of the respondent despite service and calling the matter twice. Hence the respondent is proceeded ex parte on the basis of the material facts available on record.
35. As per clause 11(a) of the builder buyer agreement dated 04.10.2013 for unit no. B-2,1803, 18<sup>th</sup> floor, block B2 in the project Emerald Bay, sector 104, Gurugram possession as to be handed over to the buyer within a period of 48 months from the date of execution of the agreement i.e. 04.10.2013 + 180 days grace period which comes out to be 04.04.2018. Respondent/ buyer has already paid Rs. 1,48,49,144.31/- to the respondent against a total sale consideration of Rs. 1,70,86,214/-. Complainant-builder has offered the possession of the unit to the respondent on 24.12.2018 after receipt of occupation certificate on 21.1.2018 but the respondent is not coming forward to take over the possession of the unit and payment of balance dues.

**DECISION AND DIRECTIONS OF THE AUTHORITY:**



36. The authority exercising its power under section 37 of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016 hereby issues the following directions to the parties in the interest of justice and fair play:

- i. The respondent is directed to take over the possession of the unit on payment of balance dues along with prescribed rate of interest i.e. 10.45% per annum to the complainants within a period of one month.
- ii. The complainants are also liable to pay late delivery charges, if any, at the prescribed rate which is being levied on the respondent.



Haryana Real Estate Regulatory Authority, Gurugram

Date: 20.07.2019

Judgement uploaded on 05.09.2019

