



## HARYANA REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY PANCHKULA

Website: [www.haryanarera.gov.in](http://www.haryanarera.gov.in)

Complaint no.:	1559 of 2023
Date of filing.:	14.08.2023
First date of hearing.:	14.09.2023
Date of decision.:	20.08.2024

1. Ashok Kumar Sethi S/o Late Sh. C.P. Sethi  
R/o B-1/1090-A, Vasant Kunj, New Delhi 110070
2. Rama Sethi W/o Sh. A.K. Sethi  
R/o B-1/1090-A, Vasant Kunj, New Delhi 110070
3. Ashish Sethi S/o Sh. A.K. Sethi  
R/o B-1/1090-A, Vasant Kunj, New Delhi 110070

....COMPLAINANTS

VERSUS

1. M/s BPTP Limited through its Managing Director  
Registered office at 28 ECE House, 1<sup>st</sup> floor, KG Marg, New Delhi- 110001
2. M/s BPTP Parkland Pride Limited  
Registered office at M-11, Middle Circle Connaught Circus,  
New Delhi- 110001

....RESPONDENTS

**CORAM:** Dr. Geeta Rathee Singh  
Chander Shekhar

**Member**  
**Member**

**Hearing:** 4<sup>th</sup>

**Present: -** Adv. Arjun Kundra, Learned counsel for the complainants  
Adv. Hemant Saini, Learned counsel for both the respondents.

**ORDER:**

1. Present complaint has been filed on 14.08.2023 by complainants 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 fulfill 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 proposed handing over the possession, delay period, if any, have been detailed in the following table:

S.No.	Particulars	Details
1.	Name of the project.	Park Elite Floors, Sector 75-89, Faridabad.

*Geeta Rathee*

2.	Nature of the project.	Residential
4.	RERA Registered/not registered	Not Registered
5.	Details of unit.	H-48-FF, measuring 1418 sq. ft. and re-allotment on 27.09.2012 and re-allotted unit no. PE-204-FF measuring 1510 sq. ft. (mentioned at page no.11 of the complaint book)
6.	Date of floor/builder buyer agreement	17.01.2013
7.	Due date of possession	17.01.2015
8.	Possession clause in BBA ( Clause 5.1)	Subject to Clause 14 herein or any other circumstances not anticipated and beyond the control of the seller/ confirming party or any restraints/restrictions from any courts/authorities but subject to the purchasers) having complied with all the terms and conditions of this Agreement and not being in default under any of the provisions of this Agreement including but not limited to timely payment of Total Sale Consideration and other charges and having complied with all provisions, formalities, documentations etc., as prescribed by the Seller Confirming Party whether under this Agreement or otherwise from time to time, the Seller/Confirming Party proposes



		<p>to offer the handing over the physical possession of Floor to the Purchaser(s) within a period of twenty four (24) months from the date of execution of floor buyer agreement or sanctioning of building plan whichever is later. The Purchaser(s) agrees and understands that the Seller/Confirming Party shall be entitled to a grace period of (180) one hundred and eighty days, after the expiry of thirty (24) months, for filing and pursuing the grant of an occupation certificate from the concerned authority with respect to the building of three independent residential floors including the floor. The Seller/Confirming Party shall give a Notice of Possession to the Purchasers with regard to the handing over of possession and the event the purchaser(s) fails to accept and take the possession of the said floor within 30 days thereof, the purchaser(s) shall be deemed to be custodian of the said floor from the date indicated in the notice of possession and the said floor shall remain at the risk and cost of the purchaser(s).</p>
8.	Total/Basic sale consideration	₹26,51,301.72/-
10.	Amount paid by complainants	₹27,31,465.27/-



11.	Offer of possession.	None
-----	----------------------	------

**B. FACTS OF THE PRESENT CASE AS STATED BY THE COMPLAINANTS IN THE COMPLAINT:**

3. Facts of complaint are that the complainants had booked a unit in the project of the respondents namely "Park Elite Floors" situated at Sector 75-89, Faridabad, Haryana in May 2009 upon payment of ₹3,00,000/- dated 31.05.2009 as booking amount. Complainants were initially allotted unit no. H-48-FF, measuring 1418 sq. ft. First Floor, Park Elite Floors, Parklands, Faridabad vide allotment letter dated 24.12.2009. On 27.09.2012, intimation has been received from respondents informing that re-allotment has been made in favor of complainants i.e., unit no. PE-204-FF, measuring 1510 sq. ft. First Floor, Park Elite Floors, Parklands, Faridabad. A builder buyer agreement was executed between both the parties on 17.01.2013. As per clause 5.1 of the agreement possession of the unit was to be delivered within a period of twenty-four (24) months from the date of execution of floor buyer agreement or sanctioning of building plan whichever is later. Complainants had alleged that the deemed date of possession is 17.01.2015 i.e 24 months from date of execution of agreement. However, till date no offer of possession was made by respondents. Further, from booking of the unit till date, the



respondents have never informed the complainant about any force majeure or any other circumstances which were beyond the reasonable control of the respondents and has led to delay in completion and development of the project within the time stipulated. The respondents were bound by terms and conditions of the agreement and deliver possession of the unit within time prescribed in the floor buyers agreement. However, the respondents have miserably failed to complete the project even after a lapse of more than nine years from due date of delivery of possession, respondents are not in a position to offer possession of the booked unit to the complainants. Basic sale price of the unit was fixed at ₹26,51,301.72/- out of which complainants had paid an amount of ₹27,31,465.27/-, i.e., more than basic sale consideration of the booked unit in the year 2009-2017. It is further stated that till date, the respondents have neither provided possession of the flat nor refunded the deposited amount along with interest. Therefore, complainants are left with no other option but to approach this Authority. Hence the present complaint has been filed.

### C. RELIEF SOUGHT

4. That the complainant seeks following relief and directions to the respondents:-



- i. Direct the respondents to deliver immediate possession of the unit PE-204-FF admeasuring 1510 sq. ft. in BPTP Park Elite floors, Parklands, Faridabad after due completion and receipt of occupancy and completion certificates along with all the promised amenities and facilities.
- ii. Direct the respondents to pay prescribed rate of interest as per the RERA Act, on the amount already paid by the complainants from the promised date of delivery i.e. 17<sup>th</sup> January 2015 till the actual physical delivery of possession and execution of conveyance deed.
- iii. Restrain the respondents from charging any amount from the complainants which do not form part of Floor Buyer's Agreement dated 17.01.2013 but not limited to enhanced charges, cost escalation charges, delay penalty/interest charges, GST charges, VAT charges, Club membership charges, etc. or direct respondent to refund/adjust any such charges which they have already received from the complainant.
- iv. Any other relief which the applicant is entitled for under the Real Estate (Regulation & Development) Act, 2016 and the Haryana State Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Rules, 2017.



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

5. Learned counsel for the respondents filed detailed reply on 18.12.2023 pleading therein:
6. Respondents have admitted allotment and execution of floor buyer agreement in favour of complainants. It is stated that in terms of builder buyer agreement (herein after referred as BBA) dated 17.01.2013 respondents had proposed to handover the possession of the unit within a period of 24 months from the execution of BBA or sanctioning of building plans whichever is later along with a grace period of 180 days. He relied upon judgment passed by Ld. Tribunal, Chandigarh in appeal no. 122 of 2022 titled as Emaar Mgf Land Ltd Vs. Laddi Paramjit Singh, which states that if grace period is mentioned in the clause, the benefit of the same be given. Although in present case deemed date of possession was also subject to force majeure conditions such as NGT order prohibiting construction activity, ban on construction by Supreme Court of India in M.C Mehta v. Union of India, ban by Environment Pollution (Prevention and Control) Authority. After lifting of the ban it took some time to mobilize the resources and begin construction of the project. Thereafter, due to the sudden outbreak of the coronavirus (COVID 19) all the activities across the country including the construction of the projects came to a halt. He submitted that force majeure on different accounts





including Covid-19 outbreak for relaxation be taken into consideration as Covid-19 outbreak lead to delay in handing over of possession, thus, the Covid-19 period may be taken as zero period for the purpose of calculation of delay possession interest. Secondly, timely payments by the complainants were essential for completion of project on time but due to number of defaulter allottees in the project including present complainant project got delayed.

7. Further, respondents have challenged the maintainability of the present complainant on the ground that builder buyer agreement with complainants was executed much prior coming into force of Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016. (RERA Act in brief). Therefore, agreement executed prior to coming into force of the Act or prior to registration of project with RERA cannot be reopened.
8. Respondents have submitted that respondent no.1 has issued a letter dated 17.08.2023 vide which several options were given to complainant to amicably settle the matter. Complainant has failed to choose from the available option as per terms and condition of the letter dated 17.08.2023, the option of refund along with at the rate 6% simple interest was availed by the complainant.
9. Respondents further stated that approval of building plans have been applied on 20.01.2014 and the same has been pending till date. As of



today, in light of non-approval of the building plans and in absence of occupancy certificate, possession cannot be handed over to complainants.

10. Lastly, respondent's counsel stated that two payments amounting to ₹1,27,800/- as inaugural discount and Rs. 82,328.60/- as timely payment discount were accounted or adjusted in the accounts of complainants by respondents as a good will gesture for making timely payments to respondents. He stated that the said two amount is included in the amounts paid by complainants and reflected in the account of complainants though same was never actually paid by them. Therefore, while taking into consideration total amount paid by complainants for the purpose of making calculation for delay interest, this one payment be deducted from total paid amounts by complainants.

#### **E. FINDINGS AND OBSERVATIONS OF THE AUTHORITY**

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

11. **Objection regarding execution of BBA prior to the coming into force of RERA Act,2016.**

One of the averments of respondents are that provisions of the RERA Act of 2016 will not apply on the agreements executed prior to coming into force of RERA Act,2016. Accordingly, respondents have argued that relationship of builder and buyer in this case will be regulated by the agreement previously executed between them and the same cannot



be examined under the provisions of RERA Act. In this regard, Authority observes that after coming into force the RERA Act, 2016, jurisdiction of the civil court is barred by Section 79 of the Act. Authority, however, is deciding disputes between builders and buyers strictly in accordance with terms of the provisions of flat-buyer agreements. After RERA Act of 2016 coming into force the terms of agreement are not re-written, the Act of 2016 only ensure that whatever were the obligations of the promoter as per agreement for sale, same may be fulfilled by the promoter within the stipulated time agreed upon between the parties. Issue regarding opening of agreements executed prior to coming into force of the RERA Act, 2016 was already dealt in detail by this Authority in complaint no. 113 of 2018 titled as **Madhu Sareen v/s BPTP Ltd** decided on 16.07.2018. Relevant part of the order is being reproduced below:

*“The RERA Act nowhere provides, nor can it be so construed, that all previous agreements will be re-written after coming into force of RERA. Therefore, the provisions of the Act, the Rules and the Agreements have to be interpreted harmoniously. However, if the Act or the Rules provides for dealing with certain specific situation in a particular manner, then that situation will be dealt with in accordance with the Act and the Rules after the date of coming into force of the Act and the Rules. However, before the date of coming into force of the Act and the Rules, the provisions of the agreement shall remain applicable. Numerous provisions of the Act saves the*



*provisions of the agreements made between the buyers and seller."*

Further, as per recent judgement of Hon'ble Supreme court in Newtech Promoters and Developers Pvt. Ltd Civil Appeal no. 6745-6749 of 2021 it has already been held that the projects in which completion certificate has not been granted by the competent Authority, such projects are within the ambit of the definition of on-going projects and the provisions of the RERA Act,2016 shall be applicable to such real estate projects, furthermore, as per section 34(c) it is the function of the Authority to ensure compliance of obligation cast upon the promoters, the allottees and the real estate agents under this Act, and the rules and regulations made thereunder, therefore this Authority has complete jurisdiction to entertain the captioned complaint.


Execution of builder buyer agreement is admitted by the respondent. Said builder buyer agreement is binding upon both the parties. As such, the respondent is under an obligation to hand over possession on the deemed date of possession as per agreement and in case, the respondent failed to offer possession on the deemed date of possession, the complainant is entitled to delay interest at prescribed rate u/s 18(1) of RERA Act.



**12. Objections raised by the respondents regarding force majeure conditions.**

The obligation to deliver possession within the period stipulated in the Builder Buyer Agreement i.e., 24 months from the date of execution of builder buyer agreement was not fulfilled by respondent. There is delay on the part of the respondent and the various reasons given by the respondent such as the NGT order, Covid outbreak etc. are not convincing enough as the due date of possession was in the year 2014 and the NGT order referred by the respondent pertains to year 2016, therefore the respondent cannot be allowed to take advantage of the delay on his part by referring upon directions issued by statutory bodies. As far as delay in construction due to outbreak of Covid-19 is concerned 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 has 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 septemeber,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.*



*The respondent was liable to complete the construction of the project and the possession of the said unit was to be handed over by September, 2019 and is claiming the benefit of lockdown which came into effect on 23.03.2020, whereas the due date of handing over possession was much prior to the event of outbreak of Covid-19 pandemic. Therefore, Authority is of view that outbreak of pandemic cannot be used as an excuse for non-performance of contract for which deadline was much before the outbreak itself. ”*

So, the plea of respondent to consider force majeure conditions towards delay caused in delivery of possession is without any basis and the same is rejected.

**13. Findings on the relief sought by the complainants i.e., to direct the respondents to handover possession of booked unit along with delayed possession interest at the prescribed rate of interest as per RERA Act, 2016 from the promised date of delivery of possession i.e. 17.01.2015 till the actual handing over of legal valid possession.**

i) In the present complaint, the complainant intends to continue with the project and is seeking delayed possession charges as provided under the proviso to Section 18 (1) of the Act, Section 18 (1) proviso reads as under:-

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

.....

*Fatuee*

*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".*

ii). Clause 5.1 of BBA provides for handing over of possession and is reproduced below:-

*Subject to Clause 13 herein or any other circumstances not anticipated and beyond the control of the seller/ confirming party or any restraints/restrictions from any courts/authorities but subject to the purchasers) having complied with all the terms and conditions of this Agreement and not being in default under any of the provisions of this Agreement including but not limited to timely payment of Total Sale Consideration and other charges and having complied with all provisions, formalities, documentations etc., as prescribed by the Seller Confirming Party whether under this Agreement or otherwise from time to time, the Seller/Confirming Party proposes to offer the handing over the physical possession of Floor to the Purchaser(s) within a period of twenty four (24) months from the date of execution of floor buyer agreement. The Purchaser(s) agrees and understands that the Seller/ Confirming Party shall be entitled to a grace period of (180) one hundred and eighty days, after the expiry of thirty (24) months, for filing and pursuing the grant of an occupation certificate from the concerned authority with respect to the plot on which the floor is situated. The Seller/Confirming Party shall give a Notice of Possession to the Purchasers with regard to the handing over of possession and the event the purchaser(s) fails to accept and take the*



*possession of the said floor within 30 days thereof, the purchaser(s) shall be deemed to be custodian of the said floor from the date indicated in the notice of possession and the said floor shall remain at the risk and cost of the purchaser(s).*

It is the argument of ld. counsel for complainants that after delay of almost nine years respondents had failed to fulfill his obligation to hand over possession of booked unit to complainants till date. Therefore, complainant's relief be allowed for handing over possession of booked unit along with delay interest.

Perusal of file reveals that complainants had applied for booking of unit in project of respondents in May 2009 and in total paid an amount of ₹27,31,465.27/- from the year 2009-2017 to respondents. Respondents had accepted the booking of unit in question and payments made by complainants but he took plea for delay of project due to reason beyond their control including force majeure on different ground which are already dealt with in preceding paragraphs of this order. Lastly, respondents had prayed for allowance of grace period mentioned in builder/floor buyer agreement. As per agreement clause 5.1 promoter had agreed to handover the possession of the unit in question within 24 months from the date of execution of floor buyer agreement or sanctioning of building plan which ever is later. The agreement further provides that promoter shall be entitled to a grace period of 180 days after expiry of 24 months for filing and pursuing the grant of occupation





certificate with respect to the unit in question. As a matter of fact, the promoter neither got the sanctioning of building plan nor applied to the concerned Authority for obtaining completion certificate/occupation certificate within the time limit prescribed by the respondent/promoter in the floor buyer agreement i.e immediately after completion of construction works within 24 months. Thus, the period of 24 months from execution of BBA expired on 17.01.2015. As per the settled principle no one can be allowed to take advantage of its own wrong. Accordingly, this grace period of 180 days cannot be allowed to the promoter.

14. Authority further observes that as per agreement clause 5.1 possession of the unit should have been delivered by 17.01.2015 but it is an admitted fact that respondents had miserably failed to fulfill their obligation to deliver the possession of the unit till date. Now, even after a lapse of nine years, respondents are not in a position to handover possession of the unit since, admittedly respondents company has yet not even got sanctioning of building plans then what to say for application for grant of occupation certificate. Complainants do not wish to withdraw from the project and are rather interested in getting the possession of his unit. Learned counsel for the complainants have clearly stated that complainants are ready to wait for possession of unit after completion of construction and receipt of occupation certificate. In the given circumstances, provisions of Section



18 of the Act clearly come into play by virtue of which while exercising the option of taking possession of the unit allottees are also entitled to receive interest from respondents for the entire period of delay caused at the rates prescribed. Respondents in this case have not made any offer of possession to the complainants till date. So, the Authority hereby concludes that the complainants are entitled for the delay interest from the deemed date of possession i.e., 17.01.2015 up to the date on which a valid offer is sent to them after receipt of occupation certificate. As per Section 18 of Act, interest shall be awarded at such rate as may be prescribed. 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;*

Rule 15 of HRERA Rules, 2017 provides for prescribed rate of interest which is as under:

**“Rule 15:** *“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 (NCLR) 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”..”*

15. 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., 20.08.2024 is 9.1%. Accordingly, the prescribed rate of interest will be MCLR + 2% i.e. 11.1%.
16. Hence, Authority directs respondent to pay delay interest to the complainant for delay caused in delivery of possession 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 11.1% (9.1% +



2.00%) from the due date of possession i.e. 17.01.2015 till the date of a valid offer of possession.

17. Authority has got calculated the interest on total paid amount from due date of possession i.e. 17.01.2015 till the date of this order i.e. 20.08.2024 which works out to ₹ 55,45,107.27/- and further monthly of ₹ 25,751/- as per detail given in the table below:

Sr. No.	Principal Amount (in ₹)	Deemed date of possession or date of payment whichever is later	Interest Accrued till 20.08.2024 (in ₹)
1.	23,92,208.08/-	17.01.2015 (Due date of possession)	25,49,137/-
2.	24,611/-	22.11.2016(payment made after due date of possession)	21,173/-
3.	3,14,646.19/-	04.09.2017(payment made after due date of possession)	2,43,332/-
<b>Total:</b>	27.31,465.27/-		28.13,642/-
<b>Monthly interest:</b>	27.31,465.27/-		25.751/-

18. Further, Id. counsel for complainants has also prayed that the respondents be restrained from charging any amount which does not form part of the builder buyer agreement dated 17.01.2013 from the complainants at the time of offer of possession. It is observed that the complainants had opted for a construction linked plan and made all payments as and when

*Ratna*

demanded by the respondents. Since the delay caused is attributed to the respondents, it cannot burden the complainants with the charges/taxes etc. which were not applicable at the time of deemed date of possession. Further, the payments which were to be made for services such as club membership charges shall be raised/demanded only at the time of offer of possession and offer of possession shall be as per the terms of agreement and in consonance with the provisions of the RERA Act, 2016, Rules and regulations and principles laid down by the Authority through various judgments like complaint no. 113/2018-Madhu Sareen Vs BPTP Ltd dated 16.07.2018.

19. Counsel for respondents have also stated that two payments amounting to ₹ 1,27,800/- as inaugural discount and ₹ 82,328.60/- as timely payment discount were credited into complainants account by respondents as a good will gesture for making timely payments to respondents. He stated that said amounts be deducted from the total paid amounts mentioned in account of complainants as said amounts were never actually paid by complainants. In this regard, Authority deems appropriate to not allow deduction of above mentioned two amounts from the paid amounts of complainants for two fold reasons. Firstly, complainants are not interested in withdrawing from the project and are willing to continue and wait till project gets completed, meaning thereby, complainants are sticking to their decision and showing their willingness to have the



booked unit for which they had already paid more than the basic sale price to the respondent in the year 2009-2017 itself. Secondly, it is obvious that respondents had credited those amounts in complainants account for making payments on or before time. Since, complainants have performed their part and are taking their unit for which they had paid in advance to respondents for which certain benefits were credited by respondents to complainants account. Now, respondents cannot be allowed to take those amounts back since complainants had completed their part of the agreement, however respondents have miserably failed to abide by terms of agreement.

#### **F. DIRECTIONS OF THE AUTHORITY**

20. 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) Respondents are directed to pay upfront delay interest of ₹ 28,13,642/- (till date of order i.e. 20.08.2024) to the complainants towards delay already caused in handing over the possession within 90 days from the date of this order and further monthly interest @ ₹ 25,751/- till the offer of possession after receipt of occupation certificate.




(ii) Complainants will remain liable to pay balance consideration amount to the respondents at the time of possession offered to them.

(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., 11.1% by the respondents/ Promoter which is the same rate of interest which the promoter shall be liable to pay to the allottees.

(iv) The respondents shall not charge anything from the complainants which is not part of the agreement to sell.

21. Disposed of. File be consigned to record room after uploading on the website of the Authority.

  
.....  
CHANDER SHEKHAR  
[MEMBER]

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