



HARYANA REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY PANCHKULA

Website: www.haryanarera.gov.in

Complaint no.:	1938 of 2023
Date of filing:	26.09.2023
Date of first hearing:	02.11.2023
Date of decision:	27.08.2024

Mr. Rapaka Shashi Shekhar, S/o Sh. Rapaka V Murthy,

Through Attorney Mr. Abhishek Rana

R/o K-1065, Sector-23, Raj Nagar,

Ghaziabad, Uttar Pradesh- 201001

...COMPLAINANT

Versus

1. Choice Real Estate Developers Pvt. Ltd,
Regd. Office at 14/185-14/186, Ground Floor,
Malviya Nagar, Main Shivalik Road,
New Delhi -110017

2. Vipul Limited
Regd. Office at Regus Rectangle, level-4,
Rectangle 1, D-4, Commercial Complex,
Saket, New Delhi- 110017

...RESPONDENTS

Abhishek Rana

CORAM: Dr. Geeta Rathee Singh
Chander Shekhar

Member
Member

Present: - Adv. Ajay Singh, counsel for complainant, through VC.
 Adv. Vineet Sehgal, Counsel for respondents through VC

ORDER (DR. GEETA RATHEE SINGH - MEMBER)

1. Present complaint has been filed on 26.09.2023 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 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 have been detailed in following table:

S. No.	Particulars	Details
1.	Name of project	Pratham Apartments, Sector-10 A, at Village Bawal, Rewari, Haryana.
2.	Nature of the Project	Group Housing Project
3.	RERA registered/not registered	Registered vide registration no. 38 of 2018
4.	Date of Allotment	03.10.2013

Geeta Rathee

5.	Flat no.	106 and 206, Tower- 03
6.	Flat area	1125 sq.ft. each(149.57 sq. mts.)
7.	Date of builder buyer agreement	14.01.2014
8.	Deemed Date of Possession	14.01.2019 As per clause 8(8.1)(a), on fulfilment of all conditions as stated therein, possession is to be delivered within 60 months from date of signing agreement plus 90 days as grace period for applying and obtaining the Occupation Certificate in phases in respect of different towers of Group Housing Complex.
9.	Total sale price	₹33,92,244/- each
10.	Amount paid by complainant	₹30,63,546/- each
11.	Offer of possession	Not made

B. FACTS OF THE CASE AS STATED IN THE COMPLAINT FILED BY THE COMPLAINANT

3. That the complainant booked two units no. 106 and 206, admeasuring 1125 sq ft. (super area) each in the respondents' project i.e. "Pratham Apartments" in Bawal, Sector 10 A, District Rewari, Haryana in the year 2013 for a total

Rathee

sale consideration of Rs.32,32,372/- per unit. The complainant paid Rs.4,00,000/- and Rs.3,33,550/- to respondent as demanded in respect of unit no.106 on 22.04.2013 and 24.09.2013 respectively. Similarly, he paid Rs.4,00,000/- and Rs.3,33,550/- for unit no. 206 on 22.04.2013 and 24.09.2013 respectively. Thereafter, vide separate allotment letters dated 03.10.2013 in respect of the said units, respondents allotted the respective units no. 106 and 206 to complainant.

4. That subsequently, aforesaid initial purchase price was unilaterally revised by the respondents under the pretext of revision in the allotted area of the individual units from 1125 sq. ft. to 1160 sq. ft., aggregating to Rs.33,32,935/- per unit as notified in flat buyer agreement in respect of both units dated 14.01.2014.
5. That complainant submits that till the execution of the flat buyer agreement, possession of the said units was to be handed over in 36 months; however it was unilaterally changed to 60 months in the agreement, without any prior notification or discussion with the complainant along-with a further grace period of 90 days for applying and obtaining the occupation certificate. He further submits that until 08.11.2013, he had already pad more than 1/3 rd of the total purchase consideration, therefore he was left with no choice but to agree to such unilateral revision in plans/ timelines and consideration.



6. Furthermore, the above said revised purchase price of Rs.33,32,935/- was again revised unilaterally to Rs.33,92,244/- per unit as per the statement of account dated 10.10.2018 provided by respondents. Complainant paid up various amounts as demanded by respondents according to schedule of payment plan provided to him. The total amount that stands paid is Rs.30,63,546/- separately in respect of both the units, hence total net amount that stands paid is Rs.61,27,092/-.
7. That complainant has constantly followed up with the respondents, however no positive response was received. When he demanded refund of the entire amount paid to respondents, they chose to maintain a stoic silence with regard to the same and only issued an email dated 06.11.2019, informing the complainant herein that the construction work at the site had stopped between 01.11.2019 to 08.11.2019 on account of orders passed by competent authorities / tribunal. Further, another email was issued by the respondents herein on 12.03.2021 which again reflected that the work was nowhere near completion. Thereafter, the complainant issued a legal notice dated 20.02.2021 to respondents through his lawyer, seeking refund of the consideration paid by him. However, despite contacting respondents again and again for the completion of the project, nothing has been done by the respondents apart from giving false assurances.



8. That a bare perusal of the terms and conditions of the flat buyer agreement establishes the fact that respondents were conscious that 'Time' of performance of the obligations stipulated in the agreements particularly time for handing over the possession of the developed flat was essence of the allotment in question and therefore, after receiving considerable amount, respondents were legally bound to hand over the actual physical possession of the flat/apartment/unit in question, free from all encumbrances whatsoever within a maximum period of 60 (sixty) months and further 90 (ninety) days grace period. Further, it was claimed that the respondents possess all the requisite approvals; however, a perusal of some of the clauses of the agreement would suggest that some approvals were yet to be obtained at the time of the agreement. The respondents thus, played mischief and defrauded the buyers/investors by shrewdly tailoring the agreement at variance with oral assurances and representations.
9. Further, while time is of the essence in respect to the obligations of the complainant, the reciprocal commitments of the respondent establish that respondent have not been subjected to same standard. The subsequent actions of respondent establish that such non-reciprocal provisions were inserted with a view to defeat the ability of complainant to secure his rights under the agreement.



10. That the grievance of complainant is further aggravated by the fact that even after lapse of 2 years from the deadline for delivery of possession of the said units, there seems to be no clarity in relation to the project completion date. One, the 8 days' (i.e. 01.11.2019 to 08-11-2019) force majeure period communicated vide email dated 06.11.2019 cannot be allowed as the same has transpired after the expiry of the original completion date i.e. 14.01.2019. Nevertheless, even if the same were to be excluded, over 7 years have elapsed since the signing of the allotment letter dated 10.10.2013, and payment of over 1/3rd of the total consideration in respect of the said Units (now almost the entire consideration has been paid), with completion nowhere in sight. All this while, the respondents are getting illegal enrichment which itself is an illegal act and thus is not sustainable in the eyes of law.
11. That it is evident from the above narration of the facts that the intention of respondents was to mislead and cheat the present complainant of the hard-earned money by making misleading and misrepresenting themselves to be a promising real estate developer. In fact the respondents never intended to develop, construct and complete the said project under scanner.
12. That the flat buyer agreement was a highly one-sided agreement and apart from other detrimental clauses as far as the complainant was concerned; the



most draconian was non-availability of any clause which permitted an option of exit for the buyers. That it is pertinent to highlight that even the slightest delay in payment by complainant has attracted interest up to 18% p.a. while the corresponding obligations upon respondent are nearly non-existent in comparison. It is further noteworthy that disproportionate sums charged at the allotment stage and the completely one-sided terms and conditions stipulated in the allotment letters both dated 03.10.2013 and the flat buyer agreements both dated 14.01.2014 run afoul of the provisions of the Indian Contract Act, 1872 and are indicative of the impunity and high-handedness in the respondent's dealings with innocent and un-suspecting consumers/allottees. Moreover, respondents have been acting with impunity and continue to breach several provisions of the flat buyer agreement without any accountability and complainant is aggrieved by such contemptuous conduct and wishes to cancel the allotment and secure refund of his hard earned money along-with applicable interest.

C. RELIEF SOUGHT:

13. In view of the facts mentioned above, complainant humbly prays for the following reliefs:-
 - i. Direct the respondents to forthwith refund the entire amount of Rs.61,27,092/- paid by complainant, along with interest @ 18% p.a.



on compound basis upon each and every payment as made by complainant from the date of receipt of respective payments as provided inter alia in section 18 of the Act till the date of actual realization;

- ii. Direct the respondents to pay a further compensation of Rs.30,00,000/- on account of harassment, mental agony and undue hardship caused to complainant on account of unfair practices, deficiency in service and fraudulent misrepresentations.
- iii. The respondent-developer be directed further to remit/ pay a sum of Rs. 1,75,000/- towards the costs of litigation expenses.
- iv. To pay pendente lite and future interest @ 18% to complainant on the relief prayed in the preceding paragraphs. The complainant in his complaint has prayed for refund of entire amount collected from him along-with interest @18% p.a. as per section 18 of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act 2016, in the facts and circumstances of present case.
- v. Any other relief which this Hon'ble Authority may deem fit be granted in favor of the complainant and against the respondent.


Rattue

D. REPLY:

14. Respondent has submitted reply on 28.03.2024 in the registry. Respondent has submitted as follows:-

- a. That the complainant has concealed the fact that the respondents have duly intimated him with regard to various restrain orders having been passed against the construction activities by the Hon'ble NGT on various occasions, which ultimately acted like Force Majeure and caused unwanted delay in finishing the project. Further, in the present scenario of Covid-19 pandemic the construction activities on all the project sites have virtually stalled since March 2020 and the same has caused delay in finalizing the development works and handing over the possession of the Apartment to the complainant. The intimation of same was duly sent to the complainant but the said fact has been concealed by the complainant while filing the present complaint.
- b. That as a part of its business, the respondents had acquired and purchased the land admeasuring 9.60 acres situated within the revenue estate of village Bawal, Sector-10 A, Tehsil & District, Rewari, Haryana with a view to promote and develop a group housing colony known as "Pratham Apartments".



- c. That the complainant only after being completely satisfied in all respects with respect to project has booked a flat/residential unit in the Group Housing Project known as "Pratham Apartments" and vide application in the month of August 2013 had applied for provisional registration of a residential unit in the aforesaid group housing complex i.e. "Pratham Apartments".
- d. That the respondent company in furtherance of the application form so submitted by the complainant and the earnest money so received from the complainant, accordingly made the provisional allotment of two residential flats bearing No. 106 and 206 in Tower-3, in the aforesaid group housing in favor of complainant. It is further submitted that the respondent company along with said allotment letter had sent the terms and conditions for allotment of flat as well as schedule of payment which was construction linked plan, as opted by the complainant. The allotment letter, terms and conditions for allotment of flat were voluntarily agreed by the complainant.
- e. That the respondent company, on 14.01.2014 sent the 'Flat Buyer Agreement' to the complainant, which was voluntarily and consciously executed by the complainant and in terms thereof he had assumed and undertaken to perform the terms and conditions of the agreement.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Rathee', is written over a faint circular watermark of the Panchkula District Panchayat. The signature is stylized and includes a horizontal line underneath.

- f. That they have acted fairly and made every endeavor to perform their part of responsibility in completing the project work and handing over the possession of the flat in issue to the complainant at the earliest but it is only due to force majeure and covid 19 pandemic that the completion of project has been delayed. However sincere efforts have been undertaken with promise to offer possession of the flats to the complainant at the earliest.
15. In conclusion it is submitted by respondents that their project is near completion and is on final stage. Therefore, the complainant cannot be allowed to withdraw from the same, as per the law settled in various cases and also as per the principles of equity as further hindrance will be caused to the respondent in completing the project.

E. ORAL SUBMISSIONS OF LEARNED COUNSEL FOR COMPLAINANT AND RESPONDENT:

16. During oral arguments, learned counsel for the complainant reiterated the facts mentioned in para 3-12 of this order and submitted that there is no progress at the site and project cannot be completed in near future. He further submitted that captioned complaint is identical to complaint no. 503 of 2023 which has already been adjudicated by Authority vide order dated


R. K. Pathe

23.08.2023 and prayed that the same may also be decided in terms of complaint no. 503 of 2023.

17. Learned counsel for respondent reiterated the facts mentioned in para 14-15 of this order. He submitted that the facts that are stated in his written submissions vide reply dated 28.03.2024, may be taken as his oral submissions.

F. ISSUES FOR ADJUDICATION:

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

G. OBSERVATIONS OF THE AUTHORITY:

19. After considering facts and circumstances of the case and going through oral as well as written submissions, Authority observes that flat buyer agreement between complainant and respondents was executed on 14.01.2014. Total sales consideration was agreed to be Rs.33,92,244/- for each unit against which complainant had paid Rs.30,63,546/- each for both the units by year 2018. After paying almost 90% of sales consideration amount, legitimate expectations of complainant would be that possession of the apartment will be delivered within time as stipulated in flat buyer agreement, however possession has not been delivered till date.



20. As per clause 8(8.1) (a) of the flat buyer agreement dated 14.01.2014, possession was to be delivered within 60 months from date of signing agreement plus 90 days as grace period for applying and obtaining the occupation certificate in phases in respect of different towers of group housing complex. Ld. counsel for respondent has submitted that they had made every endeavor to complete the project work and handover the possession of the flat to complainant at earliest, however it was only due to force majeure and covid 19 pandemic that there was a delay. Further he submitted that in the present case repeated orders were passed by Hon'ble NGT, New Delhi whereby construction work in entire NCR was stayed on many occasions which was duly intimated to complainant. Authority observed that due date of possession was in 2019 i.e. on 14.01.2019, whereas covid 19 lockdown was imposed later in the month of March, 2020. And for delay in construction due to outbreak of Covid-19, 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 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.

... 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 an excuse for non-performance of contract for which deadline was much before the outbreak itself. ”

Therefore, respondent cannot be given the benefit of halt in work due to covid-19 pandemic. Secondly, there is no document placed on record to prove as to when and for how much period ban by NGT due to pollution imposed on construction, halted their work. In absence of such proof, benefit of such circumstances also cannot be awarded to respondent builder. Respondent cannot be allowed to take the plea of force majeure conditions towards delay caused in delivery of possession as the same is considered to be without any basis and the same is rejected. Hence, the deemed date of possession comes out to be 14.01.2019 i.e. 60 months from the date of execution of flat buyer agreement without any grace period of 90 days.

21. Further facts set out in the preceding paragraphs demonstrate that construction of the project had been delayed beyond the time period stipulated in the flat buyer agreement. Authority observes that respondent has failed to fulfil its obligation stipulated in BBA dated 14.01.2014.


Rattuee

Possession of unit should have been delivered by 14.01.2019. Now, even after a lapse of more than 5 years, respondent is not in a position to offer possession of the unit since respondent company has yet to receive occupation certificate in respect of the unit. Therefore, complainant has in exercise of his right under section 18 of the Act, filed complaint before the Authority and seeks refund of the amount that he has paid to respondent builder. Section 18 of the Act is reproduced as under:

"Section 18. Return of amount and compensation.

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

(a) in accordance with the terms of the agreement for sale or, as the case may be, duly completed by the date specified therein; or

(b) due to discontinuance of his business as a developer on account of suspension or revocation of the registration under this Act or for any other reason, he shall be liable on demand to the allottees, in case the allottee wishes to withdraw from the project, without prejudice to any other remedy available, to return the amount received by him in respect of that apartment, plot, building, as the case may be, with interest at such rate as may be prescribed in this behalf including compensation in the manner as provided under this Act:

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

Pattar

(2) The promoter shall compensate the allottees in case of any loss caused to him due to defective title of the land, on which the project is being developed or has been developed, in the manner as provided under this Act, and the claim for compensation under this subsection shall not be barred by limitation provided under any law for the time being in force.

(3) If the promoter fails to discharge any other obligations imposed on him under this Act or the rules or regulations made thereunder or in accordance with the terms and conditions of the agreement for sale, he shall be liable to pay such compensation to the allottees, in the manner as provided under this Act."

As per section 18 of the Act of 2016, in case promoter fails to handover possession of the unit duly completed by dates specified in the agreement for sale, then the allottee has right to either continue with the project and claim possession along-with interest or withdraw from the project and demand refund of the amount paid by them along-with interest. In the present complaint, promoter has failed to deliver the possession of the flat within the prescribed time period, and complainant also does not want to continue with the project and seeks refund of the amount paid, therefore, authority deems it proper that it is a fit case to grant refund as prayed for.

22. Furthermore, Authority observes that the relief of refund was allowed in similar cases against the same project of the respondent where the facts and issues were similar. Vide order dated 07.12.2022 passed in lead complaint



no. 389 of 2021 titled "*Meenakshi Kamboj vs. Choice Real Estate Developers Pvt. Ltd.*", Authority has specifically stated that respondent has failed to deliver the possession to the complainants even after inordinate delay from the due date of possession. Allottees cannot be made to wait for an indefinite period of time for a unit for which the allotment and BBA dates back to 2013. Relevant part of the order dated 07.12.2022 is reproduced below:

"6. Counsel for the complainant argued that project is at complete halt and there is no likelihood of its completion in near future. Project has been already delayed by more than 3 years and they further cannot wait for an uncertain amount of time. Therefore, he pressed for refund only. Further in complaint no. 578/2020, complainant also stated that he has paid more than 85% of the agreed sale consideration by 2016 and there is no progress at project site since 2016. Photographs dated 10.10.2022 shows that there is no work ongoing at the site. No progress has been made at the site in the last 6 years as is clear from comparison of the photographs dated 01.12.2016 and latest photographs dated 10.10.2022.

7. Ld. Counsel for respondent submitted that more than 80% of the work at the project site has already been completed and the project is currently ongoing. Project has been registered with RERA as HRERA-PKL-RWR- 38-2018 and as per it, completion date was 2020 which has been further extended by concerned Authority till December 2022. As the project is still at an ongoing stage, the Occupation Certificate has not been applied till date. He requested for an adjournment to comply with the directions given by Authority vide order dated 11.10.2022.

8. Authority has gone through respective written submissions apart from noting verbal arguments put forth by both the sides Respondents admitted that construction of the project has not been completed. In Real E fact, it is still going on. Further, no

[Handwritten Signature]

specific time period has been committed for its completion. Arguments in respect of force majeure conditions cannot be accepted. and no such conditions have been shown to be applicable. Nothing extraordinary have taken place between the date of executing the BBA and due date of offer of possession, and for that matter even till now. As per the photographs submitted vide application dated 25.11.2022, it is clear that project is at halt and incomplete. Further, Occupation Certificate has not been applied till date and there is no scope the same will be applied by end of this year by which respondent claimed to complete the project as per the registration certificate. Declared policy of this Authority in all such cases where projects are neither complete nor likely to be completed within the foreseeable future and delay has already been caused from the due date of offer of possession, the complainant would not be made to pay the remaining amount.

This right of the complainant to claim refund in case of delay has been made into a more substantial right by way of '**Newtech Promoters and Developers Pvt. Ltd. v. State of UP and Others**2021 (11) ADJ 280. where the Hon'ble Supreme Court has expressly observed that allottee has an unqualified right to claim refund even if there is delay of one day Relevant paragraph is produced 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 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

Ratna

period of delay till handing over possession at the rate prescribed."

In this case, the agreement was entered into on 01.01.2014 by which the due date to handover of possession was set to January 2019. Nearly four years has passed and still there is no certainty that this project will see light of day in the foreseeable future. Thus in such cases complainant would be entitled to relief of refund because they cannot be forced to wait for completion of project for endless period of time.

9. Authority accordingly hereby orders refund of the amount paid by the complainants along with interest in accordance with Rule 15 of the RERA Rules, 2017."

23. Since captioned matter is also based on similar facts, relating to same project of the respondent, this complaint is also disposed of in terms of complaint no. 389 of 2011 titled "Meenakshi Kamboj Vs. Choice Real Estate Developers Pvt. Ltd." and Authority allows the prayer for refund in favor of complainant. As per Section 18 of Act, interest shall be awarded at such rate as may be prescribed. Rule 15 of HIRERA Rules, 2017 provides for prescribed rate of interest which is as under: 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

Rathee

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 which is reproduced below for ready reference:

“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”.

24. Consequently, as per website of State Bank of India i.e. <https://sbi.co.in>, the marginal cost of lending rate (in short MCLR) as on date i.e. 15.08.2024 is 9.10%. Accordingly, the prescribed rate of interest will be MCLR+2% i.e. 11.10%.
25. Accordingly, respondents will be liable to pay the complainant interest from the date amounts were paid by them till the actual realization of the amount.

Ratna

Hence, Authority directs respondents to refund to the complainant the paid amount of ₹30,63,546/- for each unit 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 11.10% (9.10% + 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 at the rate of 11.10% till the date of this order as per detail given in the table below:

Unit no. 106:

Sr. No.	Principal Amount	Date of payment	Interest Accrued till 27.08.2024 (in Rs.)	TOTAL (in Rs.)
1.	4,00,000/-	2013-08-10	4,90,955/-	8,90,955/-
2.	3,33,550/-	2013-10-01	4,04,120/-	7,37,670/-
3.	3,80,603.50/-	2013-11-11	4,56,383/-	8,36,987/-
4.	4,27,117/-	2014-09-29	4,70,333/-	8,97,450/-
5.	2,00,151/-	2015-01-20	2,13,524/-	4,13,675/-
6.	2,00,151/-	2015-03-17	2,10,116/-	4,10,267/-
7.	1,51,274/-	2015-05-02	1,56,689/-	3,07,963/-
8.	1,51,875.50/-	2015-08-25	1,52,001/-	3,03,877/-
9.	1,51,876/-	2016-01-04	1,45,905/-	2,97,781/-

Pattee

10.	1,52,059/-	2016-02-15	1,44,138/-	2,96,197/-
11.	3,06,686/-	2016-11-21	2,64,596/-	5,71,282/-
12.	11,375/-	2016-12-12	9,741/-	21,116/-
13.	1,96,828/-	2018-04-18	1,39,108/-	3,35,936/-
Total	30,63,546/-		32,57,609/-	63,21,155/-

Unit no.206:

Sr. No.	Principal Amount	Date of payment	Interest Accrued till 27.08.2024 (in Rs.)	TOTAL (in Rs.)
1.	4,00,000/-	2013-04-22	5,04,335/-	9,04,335/-
2.	3,33,550/-	2013-10-01	4,04,120/-	7,37,670/-
3.	3,80,605/-	2013-11-08	4,56,732/-	8,37,337/-
4.	4,27,115/-	2014-09-12	4,72,539/-	8,99,654/-
5.	2,00,151/-	2015-01-20	2,13,524/-	4,13,675/-
6.	2,00,151/-	2015-03-17	2,10,116/-	4,10,267/-
7.	1,51,274/-	2015-05-02	1,56,689/-	3,07,963/-
8.	1,51,876/-	2015-08-25	1,52,001/-	3,03,877/-
9.	1,51,876/-	2016-01-04	1,45,905/-	2,97,781/-
10.	1,52,059/-	2016-02-15	1,44,138/-	2,96,197/-
11.	3,06,686/-	2016-11-21	2,64,596/-	5,71,282/-



12.	11,375/-	2016-12-12	9,741/-	21,116/-
13.	1,96,828/-	2018-04-18	1,39,108/-	3,35,936/-
Total	30,63,546/-		32,73,544/-	63,37,090/-

26. Further, the complainant is seeking sum of ₹1,75,000/- and Rs.30,00,000/- as compensation for cost of litigation expenses and for having suffered mental harassment, mental agony etc. respectively. 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:

27. 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 amounts along with interest of @ 11.10% to the complainant as specified in both the tables for both units as provided in para 25 of this order.

(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.

28. Captioned complaint is, accordingly, **disposed of**. File be consigned to the record room after uploading orders on the website of the Authority.


.....
CHANDER SHEKHAR
[MEMBER]


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