

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

Complaint no. : 3086 of 2023
Date of complaint : 12.07.2023
Date of order : 28.08.2024

1. Veena Anand,
2. Raj Kumar Anand,
Both R/o: - H. No. 593C, Off Celebrity Homes,
Palam Vihar, Gurugram.

Complainants

Versus

Raheja Developers Limited.
Regd. office: W4D, 204/5, Keshav Kunj,
Cariappa Marg, Western Avenue,
Sainik Farms, New Delhi- 110062.

Respondent

CORAM:
Ashok Sangwan

Member

APPEARANCE:
Maninder Singh (Advocate)
Garvit Gupta (Advocate)

Complainants
Respondent

ORDER

1. This complaint has been filed by the complainant/allottees under section 31 of the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016 (in short, the Act) read with rule 28 of the Haryana Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Rules, 2017 (in short, the Rules) for violation of section 11(4)(a) of the Act wherein it is *inter alia* prescribed that the promoter shall be responsible for all obligations, responsibilities and functions under the provisions of the Act or the Rules and regulations made thereunder or to the allottees as per the agreement for sale executed *inter se*.

A. Unit and project related details

2. The particulars of unit details, sale consideration, the amount paid by the complainants, date of proposed handing over the possession, delay period, if any, have been detailed in the following tabular form:

| S. N. | Particulars | Details |
|-------|--|---|
| 1. | Name of the project | "Raheja's Aranya City", Sectors 11&14, Sohna Gurugram |
| 2. | Project area | 107.85 acres |
| 3. | Nature of the project | Residential plotted colony |
| 4. | DTCP license no. and validity status | 25 of 2012 dated 29.03.2012 valid up to 28.03.2018 |
| 5. | Name of licensee | Ajit Kumar and 22 Others |
| 6. | RERA Registered/ not registered | Registered vide no. 93 of 2017 dated 28.08.2017 |
| 7. | RERA registration valid up to | 27.08.2022 |
| 8. | Plot no. | E-109 [page no. 21 of complaint] |
| 9. | Unit area admeasuring | 304.74 sq. yds. (Page no.21 of the complaint) |
| 10. | Allotment letter | Not provided |
| 11. | Date of execution of agreement to sell | 22.06.2016 (page 19 of complaint) |
| 12. | Possession clause | <p>4.2 Possession Time and Compensation</p> <p><i>That the Seller shall sincerely endeavor to give possession of the plot to the purchaser within thirty-six (36) months from the date of the execution of the Agreement to sell and after providing of necessary infrastructure specially road sewer & water in the sector by the Government, but subject to force majeure conditions or any Government/Regulatory authority's action, inaction or omission and reasons beyond the control of the Seller. However, the seller shall be entitled for compensation free</i></p> |

| | | |
|-----|--|---|
| | | <p><i>grace period of six (6) months in case the development is not completed within the time period mentioned above. In the event of his failure to take over possession of the plot, provisionally and /or finally allotted within 30 days from the date of intimation in writing by the seller, then the same shall lie at his/her risk and cost and the Purchaser shall be lie at his/her risk and cost the purchaser shall be liable to pay @ Rs.50/- per sq. Yds. of the plot area per month as cost and the purchaser shall be liable to pay @ Rs.50/- per sq. Yards. Of the plot area per month as holding charges for the entire period of such delay....."</i></p> <p>(Page no. 38 of the complaint).</p> |
| 14. | Grace Period | <p>Allowed As per clause 4.2 of the agreement to sell, the possession of the allotted unit was supposed to be offered within a stipulated timeframe of 36 months plus 6 months of grace period. It is a matter of fact that the respondent has not completed the project in which the allotted unit is situated and has not obtained the part completion certificate by June 2019. As per agreement to sell, the construction and development work of the project is to be completed by June 2019 which is not completed till date. Accordingly, in the present case the grace period of 6 months is allowed.</p> |
| 15. | Due date of possession | <p>22.12.2019 (as per possession clause)</p> |
| 15. | Total sale consideration | <p>Rs. 1,02,41,183/- (as per payment plan on page 42 of complaint)</p> |
| 16. | Amount paid by the complainant | <p>Rs. 93,02,091/- (as per customer ledger on page 15 of complaint)</p> |
| 17. | Occupation certificate /Completion certificate | <p>Not received</p> |

| | | |
|-----|---------------------|-------------|
| 18. | Offer of possession | Not offered |
|-----|---------------------|-------------|

B. Facts of the complaint

3. The complainants have made the following submissions in the complaint: -

- I. That the complainants were allotted a plot bearing E109 admeasuring 304.74 sq. yds. in the project of the respondent named "Raheja's Aranya City", situated at Sector-11 and 14, Sohna, Gurugram vide buyer's agreement dated 22.06.2016 for a basic sale price of Rs.1,02,71,583/- against which a sum of Rs.93,02,091.00/- has been paid by them in all to the respondent as and when demanded by it from time to time.
- II. That according to clause 4.2 of the agreement, the promised date of delivery of the said plot was 36 months from the date of execution of the agreement, but the respondent has not even constructed and handed over the said plot as per its promise.
- III. That the conduct on the part of the respondent has cleared the dust on the fact that all the promises made by it at the time of sale of said plot were fake and false.
- IV. That the complainants are senior citizen and they had to face all these financial burdens and hardship from their limited income resources, only because of the respondent's failure to fulfill its promises and commitments.

C. Relief sought by the complainants:

4. The complainants have sought following relief(s).
 - i. Direct the respondent to hand over the possession of the plot and to pay the interest on the total amount paid by the complainants as per the Act of 2016.
5. On the date of hearing, the authority explained to the respondent/promoter about the contraventions as alleged to have been committed in relation to section 11(4) (a) of the Act to plead guilty or not to plead guilty.

D. Reply by the respondent

6. The respondent contested the complaint on the following grounds: -
- i. That the complaint is neither maintainable nor tenable and is liable to be outrightly dismissed. The agreement to sell was executed between the parties prior to the enactment of the Act, 2016 and the provisions laid down in the said Act cannot be enforced retrospectively. Although the provisions of the Act, 2016 are not applicable to the facts of the present case in hand yet without prejudice and in order to avoid complications later on, the respondent has registered the project with the authority under the provisions of the Act of 2016, vide registration no. 93 of 2017 dated 28.08.2017.
 - ii. That the complaint is not maintainable for the reason that the agreement contains an arbitration clause which refers to the dispute resolution mechanism to be adopted by the parties in the event of any dispute i.e., clause 13.2 of the buyer's agreement.
 - iii. That the complainant after checking the veracity of the project namely, 'Raheja Aranya City' Sector 11 & 14 Sohna, Gurugram had applied for allotment of plot vide their booking application form. The complainants agreed to bound by the terms and conditions of the booking application form. The complainants were aware from the very inception that the plans as approved by the concerned authorities are tentative in nature and that the respondent might have to effect suitable and necessary alterations in the layout plans as and when required.
 - iv. That based on the Application for booking, the respondent vide its allotment offer letter allotted to the complainants plot no. E-109. The complainants signed and executed the agreement to sell and the complainants agreed to be bound by the terms contained therein.

- v. That the respondent raised payment demands from the complainants in accordance with the mutually agreed terms and conditions of allotment as well as of the payment plan and the complainants made the payment of the earnest money and part-amount of the total sale consideration and are bound to pay the remaining amount towards the total sale consideration of the plot along with applicable registration charges, stamp duty, service tax as well as other charges payable at the applicable stage.
- vi. That the possession of the plot is supposed to be offered to the complainants in accordance with the agreed terms and conditions of the buyer's agreement.
- vii. Despite the respondent fulfilling all its obligations as per the provisions laid down by law, the government agencies have failed miserably to provide essential basic infrastructure facilities such as roads, sewerage line, water, and electricity supply in the sector where the said project is being developed. The development of roads, sewerage, laying down of water and electricity supply lines has to be undertaken by the concerned governmental authorities and is not within the power and control of the respondent. The respondent cannot be held liable on account of non-performance by the concerned governmental authorities. The respondent company has even paid all the requisite amounts including the External Development Charges (EDC) to the concerned authorities. However, yet, necessary infrastructure facilities like 60-meter sector roads including 24-meter-wide road connectivity, water and sewage which were supposed to be developed by HUDA parallely have not been developed.
- viii. That the time period for calculating the due date of possession shall start only when the necessary infrastructure facilities will be provided by the governmental authorities and the same was known to the complainants from

the very inception. Non-availability of the infrastructure facilities is beyond the control of the respondent and the same also falls within the ambit of the definition of 'Force Majeure' condition as stipulated in clause 4.4 of the agreement to sell.

ix. That the development of the township in which the plot allotted to the complainants is located is 50% complete and the respondent shall hand over the possession of the same to the complainants subject to the complainants making the payment of the due installments amount and on availability of infrastructure facilities such as sector road and laying providing basic external infrastructure such as water, sewer, electricity etc. as per terms of the application and agreement to sell. It is submitted that despite the occurrence of such force majeure events, the respondent has completed the part development of the project and has already been granted part completion certificate on 11.11.2016. Under these circumstances passing any adverse order against the respondent at this stage would amount to complete travesty of justice.

7. Copies of all the relevant documents have been filed and placed on the record. Their authenticity is not in dispute. Hence, the complaint can be decided on the basis of these undisputed documents and submissions made by the parties.

E. Jurisdiction of the authority

8. The authority observed that it has territorial as well as subject matter jurisdiction to adjudicate the present complaint for the reasons given below.

E. I Territorial jurisdiction

9. As per notification no. 1/92/2017-1TCP dated 14.12.2017 issued by Town and Country Planning Department, Haryana the jurisdiction of Haryana Real Estate Regulatory Authority, Gurugram shall be entire Gurugram district for all purposes. In the present case, the project in question is situated within the

planning area of Gurugram district. Therefore, this authority has complete territorial jurisdiction to deal with the present complaint.

E. II Subject-matter jurisdiction

10. Section 11(4)(a) of the Act, 2016 provides that the promoter shall be responsible to the allottee as per agreement for sale. Section 11(4)(a) is reproduced as hereunder:

Section 11

.....

(4) The promoter shall-

(a) be responsible for all obligations, responsibilities and functions under the provisions of this Act or the rules and regulations made thereunder or to the allottees as per the agreement for sale, or to the association of allottees, as the case may be, till the conveyance of all the apartments, plots or buildings, as the case may be, to the allottees, or the common areas to the association of allottees or the competent authority, as the case may be;

Section 34-Functions of the Authority:

34(f) of the Act provides to ensure compliance of the obligations cast upon the promoters, the allottees and the real estate agents under this Act and the rules and regulations made thereunder.

11. So, in view of the provisions of the Act quoted above, the authority has complete jurisdiction to decide the complaint regarding non-compliance of obligations by the promoter.

F. Findings on the objections raised by the respondent.

F.I. Objection regarding jurisdiction of authority w.r.t. buyer's agreement executed prior to coming into force of the Act.

12. The respondent has raised an objection that the authority is deprived of the jurisdiction to go into the interpretation of, or rights of the parties inter-se in accordance with the buyer's agreement executed between the parties prior to the enactment of the Act and the provision of the said Act cannot be applied retrospectively. The authority is of the view that the Act nowhere provides, nor can be so construed, that all previous agreements will be re-written after coming into force of the Act. Therefore, the provisions of the Act, rules and agreement have to be read and interpreted harmoniously. However, if the Act

has provided for dealing with certain specific provisions/situation in a specific/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. Numerous provisions of the Act save the provisions of the agreements made between the buyers and sellers. The said contention has been upheld in the landmark judgment of **Neelkamal Realtors Suburban Pvt. Ltd. Vs. UOI and others. (W.P 2737 of 2017)** decided on 06.12.2017 which provides as under:

"119. Under the provisions of Section 18, the delay in handing over the possession would be counted from the date mentioned in the agreement for sale entered into by the promoter and the allottee prior to its registration under RERA. Under the provisions of RERA, the promoter is given a facility to revise the date of completion of project and declare the same under Section 4. The RERA does not contemplate rewriting of contract between the flat purchaser and the promoter.....

122. We have already discussed that above stated provisions of the RERA are not retrospective in nature. They may to some extent be having a retroactive or quasi retroactive effect but then on that ground the validity of the provisions of RERA cannot be challenged. The Parliament is competent enough to legislate law having retrospective or retroactive effect. A law can be even framed to affect subsisting / existing contractual rights between the parties in the larger public interest. We do not have any doubt in our mind that the RERA has been framed in the larger public interest after a thorough study and discussion made at the highest level by the Standing Committee and Select Committee, which submitted its detailed reports."

13. Also, in appeal no. 173 of 2019 titled as **Magic Eye Developer Pvt. Ltd. Vs. Ishwer Singh Dahiya**, in order dated 17.12.2019 the Haryana Real Estate Appellate Tribunal has observed-

"34. Thus, keeping in view our aforesaid discussion, we are of the considered opinion that the provisions of the Act are quasi retroactive to some extent in operation and will be applicable to the agreements for sale entered into even prior to coming into operation of the Act where the transaction are still in the process of completion. Hence in case of delay in the offer/delivery of possession as per the terms and conditions of the agreement for sale the allottee shall be entitled to the interest/delayed possession charges on the reasonable rate of interest as provided in Rule 15 of the rules and one sided, unfair and unreasonable rate of compensation mentioned in the agreement for sale is liable to be ignored."

14. The agreements are sacrosanct save and except for the provisions which have been abrogated by the Act itself. Further, it is noted that the builder-buyer agreements have been executed in the manner that there is no scope left to the allottee to negotiate any of the clauses contained therein. Therefore, the authority is of the view that the charges payable under various heads shall be payable as per the agreed terms and conditions of the agreement subject to the condition that the same are in accordance with the plans/permissions approved by the respective departments/competent authorities and are not in contravention of any other Act, rules, statutes, instructions, directions issued thereunder and are not unreasonable or exorbitant in nature. Further, as per submissions made by the parties as well as documents available on record it is evident that OC/CC has not been issued to the project in question by the competent authority till date. Therefore, the project will be treated as an ongoing project as per section 3 of the Act of 2016 and the provisions of the Act as well as Rules are duly applicable on it. The same view has also been upheld by the Hon'ble Appellate Tribunal in case titled as *Emmar MGF Land Ltd. Vs. Ms. Simmi Sikka and Ors. (Appeal no. 52 & 64 of 2018) dated 03.11.2020*. Hence, in view of the same, objection w.r.t to jurisdiction of the authority stands rejected.

F.II Objection regarding agreements contains an arbitration clause which refers to the dispute resolution system mentioned in agreement.

15. The agreement to sell executed between the parties on 22.06.2016 contains a clause 13.2 relating to dispute resolution between the parties. The clause reads as under: -

"All or any disputes arising out or touching upon in relation to the terms of this Application/Agreement to Sell/ Conveyance Deed including the interpretation and validity of the terms thereof and the respective rights and obligations of the parties shall be settled through arbitration. The arbitration proceedings shall be governed by the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 or any statutory amendments/ modifications thereof for the time being in force. The arbitration

proceedings shall be held at the office of the seller in New Delhi by a sole arbitrator who shall be appointed by mutual consent of the parties. If there is no consensus on appointment of the Arbitrator, the matter will be referred to the concerned court for the same. In case of any proceeding, reference etc. touching upon the arbitrator subject including any award, the territorial jurisdiction of the Courts shall be Gurgaon as well as of Punjab and Haryana High Court at Chandigarh”.

16. The authority is of the opinion that the jurisdiction of the authority cannot be fettered by the existence of an arbitration clause in the buyer's agreement as it may be noted that section 79 of the Act bars the jurisdiction of civil courts about any matter which falls within the purview of this authority, or the Real Estate Appellate Tribunal. Thus, the intention to render such disputes as non-arbitrable seems to be clear. Also, section 88 of the Act says that the provisions of this Act shall be in addition to and not in derogation of the provisions of any other law for the time being in force. Further, the authority puts reliance on catena of judgments of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, particularly in ***National Seeds Corporation Limited v. M. Madhusudhan Reddy & Anr. (2012) 2 SCC 506***, wherein it has been held that the remedies provided under the Consumer Protection Act are in addition to and not in derogation of the other laws in force, consequently the authority would not be bound to refer parties to arbitration even if the agreement between the parties had an arbitration clause. Therefore, by applying same analogy the presence of arbitration clause could not be construed to take away the jurisdiction of the authority.
17. Further, in ***Aftab Singh and ors. v. Emaar MGF Land Ltd and ors., Consumer case no. 701 of 2015 decided on 13.07.2017***, the National Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission, New Delhi (NCDRC) has held that the arbitration clause in agreements between the complainants and builders could not circumscribe the jurisdiction of a consumer. Further, while considering the issue of maintainability of a complaint before a consumer forum/commission in the fact of an existing arbitration clause in the builder buyer agreement, the

hon'ble Supreme Court in case titled as *M/s Emaar MGF Land Ltd. V. Aftab Singh in revision petition no. 2629-30/2018 in civil appeal no. 23512-23513 of 2017 decided on 10.12.2018* has upheld the aforesaid judgement of NCDRC and as provided in Article 141 of the Constitution of India, the law declared by the Supreme Court shall be binding on all courts within the territory of India and accordingly, the authority is bound by the aforesaid view. Therefore, in view of the above judgements and considering the provision of the Act, the authority is of the view that complainant is well within his right to seek a special remedy available in a beneficial Act such as the Consumer Protection Act and RERA Act, 2016 instead of going in for an arbitration. Hence, we have no hesitation in holding that this authority has the requisite jurisdiction to entertain the complaint and that the dispute does not require to be referred to arbitration necessarily.

G. Findings on the relief sought by the complainants.

G. I Direct the respondent to handover possession of the plot and to pay the interest on the total amount paid by the complainants as per the Act of 2016.

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

"Section 18: - Return of amount and compensation

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

.....

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

19. Clause 4.2 of the agreement to sell dated 22.06.2016 provides for handing over of possession and is reproduced below:

4.2 Possession Time and Compensation

*"That the Seller shall sincerely endeavor to give possession of the Plot to the purchaser **within thirty-six (36) months** from the date of the execution of the*



*Agreement to sell and after providing of necessary infrastructure specially road sewer & water in the sector by the Government, but subject to force majeure conditions or any Government/ Regulatory authority's action, inaction or omission and reasons beyond the control of the Seller. **However, the seller shall be entitled for compensation free grace period of +/- six (6) months in case the development is not completed within the time period mentioned above.** In the event of Purchaser's failure to take over possession of the Plot, provisionally and/or finally allotted, within 30 days from the date of intimation in writing by the seller, then the same shall lie at his/her risk and cost and the Purchaser shall be liable pay to @ Rs.50/- per sq. yd. of the Plot area per month as holding charges for the entire period of such delay. It is made clear to purchaser that the holding charges and the late construction charges are distinct and separate to be payable by the Purchaser to the seller. Further, if the seller fails to give possession of the said Plot within Thirty-Six (36) plus aforesaid grace period of six (6) from the date of execution of the Agreement To sell and after providing of necessary infrastructure in the sector by the government or for any reason other than the reason stated above, then the Seller shall be liable to pay the Purchaser compensation @Rs.50/- per sq. yard of the plot area for the entire period of such delay....."*

20. At the outset, it is relevant to comment on the preset possession clause of the agreement wherein the possession has been subjected to providing necessary infrastructure specially road, sewer & water in the sector by the government, but subject to force majeure conditions or any government/regulatory authority's action, inaction or omission and reason beyond the control of the seller. The drafting of this clause and incorporation of such conditions are not only vague and uncertain but so heavily loaded in favour of the promoter and against the allottee that even a single default by the allottee in making payment as per the plan may make the possession clause irrelevant for the purpose of allottee and the commitment date for handing over possession loses its meaning. The incorporation of such clause in the agreement to sell by the promoter is just to evade the liability towards timely delivery of subject unit and to deprive the allottee of its right accruing after delay in possession. This is just to comment as to how the builder has misused his dominant position and drafted such mischievous clause in the agreement and the allottee is left with no option but to sign on the dotted lines.

21. **Admissibility of grace period:** As per clause 4.2 of the agreement to sell, the possession of the allotted unit was supposed to be offered within a stipulated timeframe of 36 months plus 6 months of grace period. It is a matter of fact that the respondent has not completed the project in which the allotted unit is situated and has not obtained the CC/part CC by June 2019. However, the fact cannot be ignored that there were circumstances beyond the control of the respondent which led to delay incompletion of the project. Accordingly, in the present case, the grace period of 6 months is allowed.
22. **Payment of delay possession charges at prescribed rate of interest:** The complainants are seeking delay possession charges at the prescribed rate of interest. Proviso to section 18 provides that where an allottee does not intend to withdraw from the project, he shall be paid, by the promoter, interest for every month of delay, till the handing over of possession, at such rate as may be prescribed and it has been prescribed under rule 15 of the rules. Rule 15 has been reproduced as under:
- Rule 15. Prescribed rate of interest- [Proviso to section 12, section 18 and sub-section (4) and subsection (7) of section 19]**
- (1) For the purpose of proviso to section 12; section 18; and sub-sections (4) and (7) of section 19, the "interest at the rate prescribed" shall be the State Bank of India highest marginal cost of lending rate +2%.:
Provided that in case the State Bank of India marginal cost of lending rate (MCLR) is not in use, it shall be replaced by such benchmark lending rates which the State Bank of India may fix from time to time for lending to the general public.
23. The legislature in its wisdom in the subordinate legislation under the provision of rule 15 of the rules, has determined the prescribed rate of interest. The rate of interest so determined by the legislature, is reasonable and if the said rule is followed to award the interest, it will ensure uniform practice in all the cases.
24. Consequently, as per website of the State Bank of India i.e., <https://sbi.co.in>, the marginal cost of lending rate (in short, MCLR) as on date i.e., 28.08.2024 is

9.10%. Accordingly, the prescribed rate of interest will be marginal cost of lending rate +2% i.e., **11.10%**.

25. The definition of term 'interest' as defined under section 2(za) of the Act provides that the rate of interest chargeable from the allottee by the promoter, in case of default, shall be equal to the rate of interest which the promoter shall be liable to pay the allottee, in case of default. The relevant section is reproduced below:

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

Explanation. —For the purpose of this clause—

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

26. Therefore, interest on the delay payments from the complainants shall be charged at the prescribed rate i.e., **11.10%** by the respondent/promoter which is the same as is being granted to them in case of delayed possession charges.
27. On consideration of the documents available on record as well as submissions made by the parties, the Authority is satisfied that the respondent is in contravention of the provisions of the Act. By virtue of clause 4.2 of the agreement executed between the parties on 22.06.2016, the possession of the subject plot was to be delivered within 36 months from the date of agreement to sell which comes out to be 22.06.2019. As far as grace period is concerned, the same is allowed for the reasons quoted above. Therefore, the due date of handing over possession was 22.12.2019. The respondent has failed to handover possession of the subject plot till date of this order. Accordingly, it is the failure of the respondent/promoter to fulfil its obligations and

responsibilities as per the agreement to hand over the possession within the stipulated period. The authority is of the considered view that there is delay on the part of the respondent to offer of possession of the allotted plot to the complainants as per the terms and conditions of the agreement to sell dated 22.06.2016 executed between the parties. It is pertinent to mention over here that even after a passage of more than 4.8 years neither the construction is complete nor an offer of possession of the allotted plot has been made to the allottees by the builder. Further, the authority observes that there is no document on record from which it can be ascertained as to whether the respondent has applied for completion certificate/part completion certificate or what is the status of construction of the project. Hence, this project is to be treated as on-going project and the provisions of the Act shall be applicable equally to the builder as well as allottees.

28. Accordingly, the non-compliance of the mandate contained in section 11(4)(a) read with section 18(1) of the Act on the part of the respondent is established. As such the complainants are entitled to delay possession charges at prescribed rate of interest @11.10% p.a. w.e.f. 22.12.2019 till valid offer of possession plus 2 months after obtaining completion certificate/part completion certificate from the competent authority or actual handing over of possession, whichever is earlier, as per section 18(1) of the Act of 2016 read with rule 15 of the rules.

H. Directions of the authority

29. Hence, the authority hereby passes this order and issues the following directions under section 37 of the Act to ensure compliance of obligations cast upon the promoter as per the function entrusted to the authority under section 34(f):
- The respondent is directed to pay interest to the complainants against the paid-up amount at the prescribed rate i.e., 11.10% p.a. for every month of



delay from the due date of possession i.e., 22.12.2019 till valid offer of possession plus 2 months after obtaining completion certificate/part completion certificate from the competent authority or actual handing over of possession, whichever is earlier, as per section 18(1) of the Act of 2016 read with rule 15 of the rules;

- ii. The arrears of such interest accrued from 22.12.2019 till the date of order by the authority shall be paid by the promoter to the allottees within a period of 90 days from date of this order and interest for every month of delay shall be paid by the promoter to the allottees before 10th of the subsequent month as per rule 16(2) of the rules.
 - iii. The respondent/promoter shall handover possession of the plot to the complainants in terms of Section 17(1) of the Act of 2016.
 - iv. The respondent shall not charge anything from the complainants which is not the part of the agreement to sell dated 22.06.2016.
 - v. The complainant is directed to pay outstanding dues, if any, after adjustment of interest for the delayed period.
 - vi. The rate of interest chargeable from the allottees by the promoter, in case of default shall be charged at the prescribed rate i.e., 11.10% by the respondent/promoter which is the same rate of interest which the promoter shall be liable to pay the allottees, in case of default i.e., the delayed possession charges as per section 2(za) of the Act.
30. Complaint stands disposed of.
31. File be consigned to registry.

(Ashok Sangwan)
Member

Haryana Real Estate Regulatory Authority, Gurugram

Dated: 28.08.2024