



## HARYANA REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY PANCHKULA

Website: www.haryanarera.gov.in

Complaint no.:	2852 of 2019
Date of filing:	17.12.2019
First date of hearing:	04.02.2020
Date of decision:	31.08.2023

**Amit Kumar Mishra and another**

House No.115, Arya Nagar, Assandh Road,  
Near Forest office, Panipat-132103

.....COMPLAINANTS

Versus

**Aegis Homes Ltd**

Registered office at EF-10, Second  
Floor, Inderpuri, New Delhi – 110012

.....RESPONDENT

**CORAM:** Nadim Akhtar Member  
Dr. Geeta Rathee Singh Member

**Present:** - Mr. Akshat Mittal, Id counsel for the complainant.  
Mr. Sanjay Jain, Id counsel for the respondent.

### ORDER (NADIM AKHTAR- MEMBER)

1. Present complaint has been filed on 17.12.2019 by complainant under Section 31 of the Real Estate (Regulation & Development)

Act, 2016 (for short Act of 2016) read with Rule 28 of the Haryana Real Estate (Regulation & Development) Rules, 2017 for violation or contravention of the provisions of the Act of 2016 or the Rules and Regulations made thereunder, wherein it is inter-alia prescribed that the promoter shall be responsible to fulfil all the obligations, responsibilities and functions towards the allottee as per the terms agreed between them.

**A. UNIT AND PROJECT RELATED DETAILS**

2. The particulars of the project, the details of sale consideration, the amount paid by the complainant, date of handing over of the possession, if any, have been detailed in the following table:

S.No.	Particulars	Details
1.	Name of the project	"Address by Aegis Scheme", Sector -32, Karnal
2.	Name of the promoter	Aegis Homes Ltd
3.	RERA registered/not registered	Unregistered
4.	Unit no.	C105, 1 <sup>st</sup> floor of CrownTower
5.	Unit area	600 sq. fts. approx
6.	Date of allotment	08.09.2014
7.	Date of builder buyer agreement	Not executed
8.	Possession clause in BBA	<i>Clause 14 of Provisional Alottement letter "Developer shall make all possible endeavour to hand over possession of the apartment to provisional allottee within a reasonable time, may be within</i>

		<i>42 months from date of draw, i.e., 29 June 2014+ 6 months grace period, otherwise company will pay penalty of Rs. 20 per sq.ft per month to provisional allottee."</i>
9.	Due date of offer of possession	29.06.2018
10.	Total sale consideration	₹18,76,500/-
11.	Amount paid by complainants	₹ 8,05,050/-
12.	Offer of possession	No offer of possession

### **B. FACTS OF THE COMPLAINT**

3. That the respondent floated a scheme for the development of residential township to be constructed and developed on the land situated in the revenue estates of Karnal, Haryana under the name and style of "ADDRESS BY AEGIS SCHEME" situated at Sector 32, Karnal.
4. That the complainants applied for allotment of the unit against total sale consideration of Rs.18,76,500/- on 04/05/2014 by paying a sum of Rs.11,000/-, the receipt is attached as Annexure C-1.
5. That it was intimated to the complainants that their application was amongst the few to receive discount, and accordingly, the complainants made the payment of Rs.2,00,000/- as booking amount, which was confirmed vide receipt dated 24/07/2014 issued



by the respondent company against the booking no. AA/BK/5185.  
Receipt is annexed as Annexure C-2.

6. That complainants made following payments in favour of the respondent:
  - i. Vide Cheque No. 411691 dated 2.07.2014 drawn on SBI Bank, Kurukshetra for Rs.3,39,440/-
  - ii. Vide Cheque no. 000007 dated 27.03.2017 drawn on SBI Bank, Kurukshetra for Rs.2,54,610/-
7. That total payment of Rs.8,05,050/- has been duly made as and when called for by the respondent company. The receipts/payment confirmation of the same is attached as Annexure C-4-colly-
8. That respondent has clearly violated the provisions as enumerated under section 13 of the Act by accepting a sum of more than 10% of the total cost of the apartment in question without first entering into a proper written agreement and registration of the same.
9. That the letter of provisional allotment qua the unit in question, i.e., Unit No. C-105, 1st Floor in Crown Tower in "ADDRESS BY AEGIS was issued by the respondents on 08.09.2014. Copy of the allotment letter is annexed as Annexure C-4.
10. That as per the allotment letter, the possession of the unit in question was to be handed over to the allottees/complainants within a period of 42 months from the date of draw, i.e., 29.06.2014,



along with grace period of 6 months. However, the fact remains that the respondent has failed to deliver possession of the unit even after more than 5 years of the payment of booking amount towards the same and more than 5 years of allotment of the same.

11. That complainants who have regularly been paying all the installments as demanded by the respondent qua the unit in question and regularly been contacting the respondents for delivery of the possession of the same, but all in vain.

12. That it is pertinent to mention herein that the complainants had earlier moved a complaint before the Hon'ble Adjudicating Officer, Panchkula vide complaint No. 2279 of 2019. The same was withdrawn vide order dated 19.11.2019 and liberty was given to file a fresh complaint before the Hon'ble Authority. It was also specifically mentioned in the order dated 19.11.2019 that the fee already paid by the complainants will be adjusted towards the fee payable for filing fresh complaint before Real Estate Regulatory Authority, Panchkula. The Same is Annexed as Amexxure-C-6.

**C. RELIEFS SOUGHT**

13. Complainants have sought following reliefs :

- i. To direct the respondent to refund the entire deposited amount of Rs.8,05,050/- which has been deposited against the property in question so booked by the complainant along with 24% interest



+2% (penal interest) on the amount from the respective dates of deposit till its actual realization within 90 days, according to Section 18(1) Real Estate (Regulation And Development) Act 2016 read with Rule 15 & 16 of Haryana Real Estate (Regulation & Development) Rules 2017.

- ii. To direct the respondent to pay the penalty as per the allotment letter.
- iii. To direct the respondent to pay a sum of Rs.2,50,000/- on account of grievance and frustration caused to the complainant by the miserable attitude of the respondents and deficiency in service and for causing mental agony caused to complainant along with interest from the date of filing the present complaint till its realization.
- iv. The registration, if any, granted to the respondent for the project namely; "ADDRESS BY AEGIS" situated at the revenue estates of Karnal, under the Act read with relevant Rules may be revoked under Section 7 of the the Act for violating the provisions of the Act.
- v. The complaint may be allowed with costs and litigation expenses of Rs.75,000/-.
- vi. Any other relief, as this Hon'ble Authority may deem fit and appropriate in the facts and circumstances of the instant complaint.



**D. REPLY SUBMITTED ON BEHALF OF RESPONDENT**

14. A short reply dated 29.05.2023 is filed by respondent stating therein that project of respondent is near completion and the possession is likely to be delivered in next two months.
15. That the project of the respondent was delayed due to the pandemic Covid-19 prevalent in the country.
16. That the RERA Panchkula has given the extension of time to the respondent for the completion of work by July, 2023. Copy of the time extension granted by the Haryana Real Estate Regulatory Authority, Panchkula vide letter dated 09.06.2022 is annexed as Annexure R-A.
17. That respondent reserves his right for filing detailed reply in case of need.

**E. ARGUMENTS OF LEARNED COUNSEL FOR COMPLAINANT AND RESPONDENT**

18. Ld counsel for both the parties reiterated their submissions as mentioned in complaint and reply.

**F. ISSUE FOR ADJUDICATION**

19. Whether the complainants are entitled to refund of amount deposited by them along with interest in terms of Section 18 of Act of 2016?



**G. OBSEVATIONS AND DECISION OF AUTHORITY**

20. Authority has gone through rival contentions. In light of the background of the matter as captured in this order and also the arguments submitted by both the parties, Authority observes that complainants vide booking No. AA/BK/5185 dated 08.09.2014 booked a unit in the real estate project "Address by Aegis Scheme" being developed by the promoter, situated at Sector 32, Karnal by paying a booking amount of Rs.2,00,000/- vide receipt dated 24.07.2014. Further made payment of ₹3,39,440/- vide receipt dated 24.07.2014 and of ₹2,54,610/- vide receipt dated 31.03.2017. Subsequently, complainants were allotted unit no.C105, 1<sup>st</sup> floor, of Crown Tower, in project "Address by Aegis Scheme" Sector 32, Karnal vide provisional allotment letter dated 08.09.2014 which is annexed as Annexure C-4. That means, complainants had paid a total of Rs.8,05,050/- against the basic sale price of Rs.18,76,500/-
21. The complainants are aggrieved by the fact that despite making timely payments against the basic sale price, there is no construction going on at the project site.
22. Respondent had filed short reply dated 29.05.2023 mentioning therein that the construction and development of the project got delayed due to covid-19 outbreak in the year 2020, now the project





is near completion and shall be ready for handing over possession in two months time from the date of reply.

23. It is pertinent to mention here that respondent/ promoter had filed the short reply on 29.05.2023 despite availing several opportunities to file detailed reply. In this regard, Authority had imposed cost of ₹25,000/- payable to the Authority on 30.05.2023. Therefore, Authority deems fit to rely upon the short reply filed by the respondent in absence of detailed reply.

24. From the reply dated 29.05.2023, it is observed that respondent had not disputed allotment of the unit; signing of the letter of provisional allotment dated 08.09.2014; deemed date of handing over of possession; amount of Rs.8,05,050/- against basic sale price of Rs.18,76,500/- paid by the complainants for the unit in the short reply. Also, respondent has not mentioned about any date for completion of project in its reply nor argued about the same. Further as per clause-4 of the mentioned letter of provisional allotment, the allottee was liable to pay further amount of basic sale price only after approval of the layout plan and grant of all valid licences by the authorities to the developer, an intimation regarding the same was to be given by the developer in due course of time. It is important to mention here that on one hand vide the said letter of provisional allotment, the promoter had allotted unit



no.C-105 on 1<sup>st</sup> floor, measuring 600 sq.ft. in the project “Address by Aegis Scheme”, Sector 32, Karnal to the complainants, whereas on the other hand, the promoter in clause-6 of the same allotment letter mentions that the allotment is provisional as the layout/building plans of the complex have yet not been approved by the competent authority and as such a valid licence has yet not been issued to the developer. It implies that the promoter had provisionally allotted a unit to the complainant without even having a valid licence to construct and develop an affordable housing colony in Sector 32, Karnal. Thus, the promoter allotted a unit and collected payment against it even without having the competency and requisite permission to do so.

25. During the course of hearing in the matter, it came to the notice of the Authority that there is no licence issued by the Director of Town & Country Planning in favour of Aegis Value Home Ltd. for development and construction of an affordable housing colony namely; “Address by Aegis Scheme”, located at Sector 32, Karnal. In order to adjudicate the complaint for refund, the status of the project is required to be ascertained. For this purpose, the Authority vide its interim orders dated 17.05.2022 appointed Ld. CTP, HRERA, Panchkula as the local commissioner. Ld. CTP submitted his report on 07.07.2022, wherein it is mentioned that



the promoter M/s Aegis Value Home Ltd. is developing an “affordable group housing colony” namely; “Smart Homes Karnal” on land measuring 5.653 acres in Sector 32-A, Karnal and the same is also registered with the Authority vide registration No.265 of 2017, now valid upto 23.07.2023. It is also mentioned in the report that the Director of the Company, Shri Divey Sindhu Dhamija informed that the said project was being marketed/promoted in different names such as “Ananda Phase-I”, “Aegis Scheme”, “Aegis Smart Value Homes”. However, during course of hearing, Authority observes that as per the letter of provisional allotment, the unit allotted to the complainants in “Address by Aegis Scheme” is situated in Sector 32 and not in Sector 32-A, Karnal. In order to remove ambiguity surrounding the exact location of the project where the unit is located, the Authority directed the respondent vide its interim order dated 6.12.2022 to submit on affidavit all the project that are being developed by the respondent company at Karnal. The respondent on 28.02.2023 on affidavit submitted that the respondent company is carrying out two projects at Karnal namely; “Aegis Smart Home” and “Aegis Wood”. In this affidavit, there is no mention of the project “Address by Aegis Scheme” in which the unit of the allottee is situated. Accordingly, in order to clarify the matter, information was sought from the Project Branch



of the Authority wherein it was informed that the respondent had got registered the project namely; "Smart Homes Karnal", which is an affordable housing colony in Sector 32-A, Karnal vide registration no.265 of 2017. The Project Branch further informed that a promoter namely; "Aegis Skyhigh Housing Corporation Pvt. Ltd" is developing a plotted colony namely; "Affordable Residential Plotted Colony" in Sector 32, Karnal. There exists no information neither in the Authority nor on the website of DTCP regarding development and construction of an affordable housing colony in Sector 32, Karnal by the respondent. Further, the fact that subsequent to the signing of the letter of provisional allotment, the builder never executed a builder buyer agreement raises serious doubts whether the promoter ever received any permission/licence for development of an affordable housing colony in Sector 32, Karnal. No documents were placed on record by respondent to show that the allotment of the unit in question was done, as per norms prescribed as per Affordable Housing Policy 2013. Possibility could not be ruled out that the promoter allotted unit to the complainant under some pre-launch scheme, which were common in pre-RERA times.

26. Further, as per clause-14 of the allotment letter, possession was to be handed over within a period of 42 months from the date of



draw, i.e., 29.06.2014 plus six months grace period, i.e., by, 29.06.2018. However, respondent promoter failed to complete the project and hand over the possession by the said date. Also, during course of hearing respondent has not disclosed a specific date for completion of project. Therefore, respondent failed to fulfill its duty to hand over possession of unit on time. This gives the right in favour of complainant to withdraw from the project and avail the relief of refund.

27. The respondent promoter had taken a plea that the delay happened due to outbreak of Covid-19 in 2020. However, since the event of outbreak of Covid-19 in the year 2020 occurred post the promised deemed date of possession, i.e., 27.12.2019. Thus, the promoter cannot be allowed to take benefit of any force majeure event that occurred after the lapse of the stipulated period for handing over of possession. In this regard, Hon'ble Delhi High Court in case titled as *M/s Halliburton Offshore Services Inc. vs Vedanta Ltd. & Anr. bearing OMP (1) (Comm.) No.88/2020 and I.A.s 3696-3697/2020* dated 29.05.2020 had observed that :

*“69. The past non-performance of the contractor cannot be condoned due to 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 pandemic cannot be used as an excuse for non-*



*performance of a contract for which the deadline was much before the outbreak itself.*

Hence, the plea of the respondent regarding delay due to Covid-19 stands rejected and the complainant is well within its rights under section 18 of the RERA Act to demand refund of the amount paid along with interest.

28. Further, Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of "***Newtech Promoters and Developers Pvt. Ltd. versus State of Uttar Pradesh and others*** " in Civil Appeal no. 6745-6749 of 2021 has highlighted that the allottee has an unqualified right to seek refund of the deposited amount if delivery of possession is not done as per terms agreed between them. Para 25 of this judgement is reproduced below:

*"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."*

The decision of the Supreme Court settles the issue regarding the right of an aggrieved allottee such as in the present case seeking refund of the paid amount along with interest on account of delayed delivery of possession. As complainants wishes to withdraw from the project of the respondent , therefore, Authority finds it to be fit case for allowing refund in favour of complainants. Further, it is pertinent to mention that vide order dated 30.05.2023, Authority had imposed cost of ₹25,000/- payable to the Authority. Part of order dated 30.05.2023 is reproduced below for reference:

*"2. L.d. counsel for respondent apprised the Authority that reply in each case was filed in the registry yesterday only i.e. 29.05.2023. Perusal of order dated 02.03.2023 reveals that respondent was directed to file reply within three weeks time with advance copy to the complainants. Such actions of respondent in filing of reply one day before the date of hearing appears to be a delay tactics on the part of the respondent. Even on the last date of hearing, i.e., 02.03 2023 respondent had filed documents one day prior to the date of hearing,i.e., 1.03.2023. Therefore, Authority deems it*



*fit to impose a cost of Rs.10.000/- each in complaint no. 180 of 2021, 649 of 2019.1230 of 2020, 1598 of 2022 and 2217 of 2019 payable to Authority within four weeks. In complaint no. 1 of 2021 respondent is directed to pay a cost of Rs.25.000/- payable to the Authority within one week. In complaint no. 401 of 2021, 402 of 2021,509 of 2020, 981 of 2019, 721 of 2021, 1420 of 2020, 2299 of 2019, 2851 of 2019 and 2852 of 2019 respondent is directed to pay a cost of Rs. 25,000/- each to the Authority within four weeks."*

In this regard respondent had filed an application dated 27.06.2023 for waiving off above mentioned cost stating that reply was filed one day before the date of hearing with no intention to delay the proceedings. W.r.t said application Authority observes that respondent was granted sufficient time to file reply within time bound manner and no justified reason has been furnished by respondent for causing delay in filing reply. Therefore said application for waiving off cost is dismissed. Respondent is directed to pay cost of ₹25,000/- payable to Authority.

29.The definition of term 'interest' is defined under Section 2(za) of the Act which is as under:

*(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;*

30. Rule 15 of HRERA Rules, 2017 provides for prescribed rate of interest which is 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".*

31. Consequently, as per website of the state Bank of India i.e., <https://sbi.co.in>, the highest marginal cost of lending rate (in short MCLR) as on date, i.e., 31.08.2023 is 8.75%. Accordingly, the prescribed rate of interest will be MCLR + 2% i.e., 10.75%.

32. From above discussion, it is amply proved on record that the respondent has not fulfilled its obligations cast upon him under RERA Act, 2016 and the complainants are entitled for refund of



deposited amount along with interest. Thus, respondent will be liable to pay the complainants interest from the date the amounts were paid till the actual realization of the amount. Authority directs respondent to refund to the complainants the paid amount of ₹8,05,050/- along with interest at the rate prescribed in Rule 15 of Haryana Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Rules, 2017, i.e., at the rate of SBI highest marginal cost of lending rate (MCLR)+ 2 % which as on date works out to 10.75% (8.75% + 2.00%) from the date amounts were paid till the actual realization of the amount. Authority has got calculated the total amount along with interest calculated at the rate of 10.75% till the date of this order and total amount works out to ₹15,20,357/- as per detail given in the table below:

Sr.no.	Principal Amount	Date of payment	Interest Accrued till 31.08.2023
1.	11,000/-	04.05.2014	11,038/-
2.	2,00,000/-	24.07.2014	1,95,915/-
3.	3,39,440/-	24.07.2014	3,32,507/-
4.	2,54,610/-	31.03.2017	1,75,847/-
Total	₹8,05,050/-		₹7,15,307/-




Total amount to be refunded by respondent to the complainant= ₹8,05,050/- + ₹7,15,307/- = ₹15,20,357/-

33. The reliefs claimed under clause (ii) and (iv) are not pressed by the complainant during the course of proceeding nor argued.

Therefore, reliefs are rejected.

34. Further, the complainant is seeking litigation charges, deficiency of service and mental agony. It is observed that Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in Civil Appeal Nos. 6745-6749 of 2027 titled as "*M/s Newtech Promoters and Developers Pvt Ltd. V/s State of U.P. & ors.*" (supra,), has held that an allottee is entitled to claim compensation & litigation charges under Sections 12, 14, 18 and Section 19 which is to be decided by the learned Adjudicating Officer as per section 71 and the quantum of compensation & litigation expense shall be adjudged by the learned Adjudicating Officer having due regard to the factors mentioned in Section 72. The adjudicating officer has exclusive jurisdiction to deal with the complaints in respect of compensation & legal expenses. Therefore, the complainant is advised to approach the Adjudicating Officer for seeking the relief of litigation expenses.



**H. DIRECTIONS OF THE AUTHORITY**

35. Hence, the Authority hereby passes this order and issues following directions under Section 37 of the Act to ensure compliance of obligation cast upon the promoter as per the function entrusted to the Authority under Section 34(f) of the Act of 2016:

- i. Respondent is directed to refund the entire amount of ₹15,20,357/- to the complainant. Further directed to pay cost of ₹25,000/- payable to the Authority as imposed vide order dated 30.05.2023 as application for waive off of cost has been dismissed by the Authority.
- ii. A period of 90 days is given to the respondent to comply with the directions given in this order as provided in Rule 16 of Haryana Real Estate (Regulation & Development) Rules, 2017 failing, which legal consequences would follow.

36. **Disposed of.** File be consigned to record room after uploading of the order on the website of the Authority.

  
.....  
**DR.GEETA RATHEE SINGH**  
**[MEMBER]**

  
.....  
**NADIM AKHTAR**  
**[MEMBER]**