

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

Complaint no. : 885 of 2024
Date of filing : 15.03.2024
Date of decision : 25.10.2024

Manoj Kumar Dhapola
R/o: -1404 Tower 4 Pyramid Urban Homes - II
Sector 86 , Gurugram

Complainant

Versus

M/s Ocean Seven Buildtech Private Limited
Regd. Office At: - 505-506, B-4, Spaze I Tech Park
Sohna Road, Gurugram- 122018.

Respondent

CORAM:

Shri Vijay Kumar Goyal

Member

APPEARANCE:

Shri Ashwani Kumar Singla
Shri Arun Yadav

Advocate for the complainant
Advocate for the respondent

ORDER

1. The present complaint has been filed by the complainant/allottee 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 there under or to the allottees as per the agreement for sale executed *inter se*.

A. Project and unit 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	The Venetian, Sector- 70, Gurugram, Haryana
2.	Nature of the project	Affordable group housing
3.	Project area	5.10 acres
4.	DTCP license no.	103 of 2019 dated 05.09.2019 Valid up to 04.09.2024
5.	RERA Registered/ not registered	Registered vide no. 39 of 2020 dated 27.10.2020 valid up to 02.09.2024
6.	Unit no.	1508 & Tower-2 (As per page no. 16 of the complaint)
7.	Unit area admeasuring	556.280 sq. ft. (Carpet area) & 90 sq. ft. (balcony area) (As per page no. 16 of the complaint)
8.	Date of allotment	09.03.2021 (As per page no. 16 of the complaint)
9.	Date of apartment buyer's agreement	Not executed
10.	Date of approval of building plan	07.02.2020 (As per DTCP official website)
11.	Date of environmental clearance	Not Provided
12.	Payment plan	Time linked payment plan
13.	Possession clause	N.A
14.	Due date of possession	Cannot be ascertained
15.	Total sale consideration	Not available on record
16.	Amount paid by the complainant	Rs.8,59,811/- (As per receipts from page no. 13-16 of complaint)
17.	Occupation certificate	Not obtained
18.	Offer of possession	Not offered



19.	Surrender by complainant	26.02.2022 (Page 21 of complaint)
-----	--------------------------	---------------------------------------

B. Facts of the complaint

3. The complainant has made the following submissions in the complaint: -
- I. That the respondent floated a group housing project under the name of The Venetian Sector 70 Gurugram. The project was floated under Haryana Affordable Housing Policy 2013.
 - II. That it was reported that there is a land dispute and construction work has not started and as such the respondent has not signed any flat buyer agreement till date.
 - III. That the complainant was allotted a dwelling unit number 1508 Tower 2 on 09.03.2021 and has paid a sum of Rs. 8,59,811/- .
 - IV. That the respondents have not constructed the unit so-far .The respondent has mis utilized the payments made by the complainant and whenever the complainant visit their office, they are always making lame excuses. There is also no information available on web site about RERA registration, plan approval, environment clearance or construction stage.
 - V. That the complainant requested refund vide letter dated 26.02.2022 but no refund has been made.
 - VI. The respondent is under legal obligation to pay these charges on the said date. The complainant is entitled to further interest @10.25% p.a. or prescribed rate of interest, compounded at monthly intervals from 16.03.2024 till date of actual payment.

C. Relief sought by the complainant: -

4. The complainant has sought following relief(s):



- I. Direct the respondent to refund the entire paid-up amount along with prescribed rate of interest from the date of each payment till its realization.
- II. Direct the respondent to pay litigation cost of Rs. 50,000/-
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 is contesting the complaint on the following grounds:
 - I. That this hon'ble authority lacks jurisdiction to adjudicate upon the present complaint. Both parties have executed an arbitration clause, clearly outlined in the agreement, empowering either party to seek resolution through arbitration. As per the said arbitration clause, any disputes arising out of the agreement shall be submitted to an arbitrator for resolution. Therefore, the present matter be referred to arbitration in accordance with the terms set forth in the agreement.
 - II. That as expressly stipulated in the agreement to sale, the parties, herein, the complainant and respondent, have unequivocally agreed to resolve any disputes through arbitration. This agreement to sell is fortified by clause 16.2 wherein it is stated that all or any disputes arising out of or touching upon or relating to the terms of this agreement to sell/conveyance deed including the interpretation and validity of the terms hereof and the respective rights and obligations of the parties, which cannot be amicably settled despite best efforts, 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 company in Gurgaon by a sole arbitrator who shall be appointed by the company. The cost of the arbitration proceedings shall be borne by the parties equally. The language of arbitration shall be in English. In case of any proceeding, reference etc. touching upon the arbitration subject including any award, the territorial jurisdiction of the courts shall be Gurgaon, Haryana as well as of Punjab and Haryana High court at Chandigarh. That the respondent has not filed his first statement before this court in the subject matter.

- III. That the complainant is a willful defaulter and deliberately, intentionally and knowingly have not paid timely installments. The complainant is a defaulter under section 19(6) & 19(7) of the Act. It is humbly submitted that the complainant failed to clear his outstanding dues despite several reminders that were issued by the respondent.
- IV. That the complainant's motives are marred by malafide intentions. The present complaint, founded on false, fabricated, and erroneous grounds, is perceived as an attempt to blackmail the respondent. The complainant, in reality, is acting as an extortionist, seeking to extract money from the respondent through an urgent and unjustified complaint. This action is not only illegal and unlawful but also goes against the principles of natural justice.
- V. That there is every apprehension that the complainant in collusion with any staff member of the respondent company including ex-employee or those who held positions during that time may put forth the altered and fabricated document which is contradictory to the

affordable housing policy & should not be considered binding on the company in any manner whatsoever.

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 submission made by the parties.

E. Jurisdiction of the authority

8. The authority observes 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, the jurisdiction of Real Estate Regulatory Authority, Gurugram shall be entire Gurugram District for all purpose with offices situated in Gurugram. In the present case, the project in question is situated within the planning area of Gurugram District. Therefore, this authority has complete territorial jurisdiction to deal with the present complaint.

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 leaving aside compensation which is to be decided by the adjudicating officer if pursued by the complainant at a later stage.
12. Further, the authority has no hitch in proceeding with the complaint and to grant a relief of refund in the present matter in view of the Judgement passed by the Hon'ble Apex Court in **Newtech Promoters and Developers Private Limited Vs State of U.P. and Ors. 2021-2022 (1) RCR (Civil), 357** and reiterated in case of **M/s Sana Realtors Private Limited & other Vs Union of India & others SLP (Civil) No. 13005 of 2020 decided on 12.05.2022** wherein it has been laid down as under:

"86. From the scheme of the Act of which a detailed reference has been made and taking note of power of adjudication delineated with the regulatory authority and adjudicating officer, what finally culls out is that although the Act indicates the distinct expressions like 'refund', 'interest', 'penalty' and 'compensation', a conjoint reading of Sections 18 and 19 clearly manifests that when it comes to refund of the amount, and interest on the refund amount, or directing payment of interest for delayed delivery of possession, or penalty and interest thereon, it is the regulatory authority which has the power to examine and determine the outcome of a complaint. At the same time, when it comes to a question of seeking the relief of adjudging compensation and interest thereon under Sections 12, 14, 18 and 19, the adjudicating officer exclusively has the power to determine, keeping in view the collective reading of Section 71 read with Section 72 of the Act. if the adjudication under Sections 12, 14, 18 and 19 other than compensation as envisaged, if extended to the adjudicating officer as prayed that, in our view, may intend to expand the ambit and scope of the powers and functions of the adjudicating officer under Section 71 and that would be against the mandate of the Act 2016."

13. Hence, in view of the authoritative pronouncement of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the cases mentioned above, the authority has the jurisdiction to entertain a complaint seeking refund of the amount and interest on the refund amount.

F. Findings on objections raised by the respondent

F.I Objection regarding complainant is in breach of agreement for non invocation of arbitration.

14. The respondent has submitted 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. 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.

15. Further, in **Aftab Singh and ors. vs. 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 complainant.

G.I Direct the respondent to refund the entire paid-up amount along with prescribed rate of interest from the date of each payment till its realization.

16. The complainant was allotted a unit bearing no. 1508, in Tower-2 having carpet area of 556.280 sq. ft. along with balcony with area of 90 sq. ft. in the project of respondent named "Venetian" at Sector 70, Gurugram under the

Affordable Housing Policy, 2013 vide allotment letter dated 09.03.2021. No, builder buyer agreement was executed between the parties in respect of the subject unit. As per clause 1(iv) of the policy of 2013, all projects under the said policy shall be required to be necessarily completed within 4 years from the date of approval of building plans or grant of environmental clearance, whichever is later. Thus, the possession of the unit was to be offered within 4 years from the approval of building plans (07.02.2020) or from the date of environment clearance (not obtained yet). Therefore, the due date of possession cannot be ascertained. As per record, the complainant has paid an amount of Rs.8,59,811/- to respondent. Due to failure on the part of the respondent in obtaining environment clearance from the concerned authority and inordinate delay on part of the respondent to start construction of the project in question, the complainant has surrendered the unit/flat vide letter dated 26.02.2022.

17. As per the clause 5 (iii)(h) of the Affordable Housing Policy, 2013 as amended by the State Government on 05.07.2019, the relevant provision regarding surrender of the allotted unit by the allottee has been laid down and the same is reproduced as under:

Clause 5(iii) (h) of the Affordable Housing Policy, 2013

"A waiting list for a maximum of 25% of the total available number of flats available for allotment, may also be prepared during the draw of lots who can be offered the allotment in case some of the successful allottees are not able to remove the deficiencies in their application within the prescribed period of 15 days. [On surrender of flat by any successful allottee, the amount that can be forfeited by the colonizer in addition to Rs. 25,000/- shall not exceed the following: -

Sr. No.	Particulars	Amount to be forfeited
(aa)	In case of surrender of flat before commencement of project	Nil

(bb)	Upto 1 year from the date of commencement of the project	1% of the cost of flat
(cc)	Upto 2 year from the date of commencement of the project	3% of the cost of flat
(dd)	After 2 years from the date of commencement of the project	5% of the cost of flat

Such flats may be considered by the committee for offer to those applicants falling in the waiting list. However, non-removal of deficiencies by any successful applicant shall not be considered as surrender of flat, and no such deduction of Rs 25,000 shall be applicable on such cases. If any wait listed candidate does not want to continue in the waiting list, he may seek withdrawal and the licensee shall refund the booking amount within 30 days, without imposing any penalty. The waiting list shall be maintained for a period of 2 years, after which the booking amount shall be refunded back to the waitlisted applicants, without any interest. All non-successful applicants shall be refunded back the booking amount within 15 days of holding the draw of lots”.

18. In the present matter, the subject unit was surrendered by the complainant-allottee vide letter dated 26.02.2022 due to failure on the part of the respondent in obtaining environment clearance and has requested the respondent to cancel the allotment and refund the entire amount paid by him along with interest.
19. Clause 5 (iii)(b) of the Affordable Housing Policy, 2013 as amended by the State Government on 22.07.2015 provides that if the licensee fails to get environmental clearance even after one year of holding draw, the licensee is liable to refund the amount deposited by the applicant along with an interest of 12%, if the allottee so desires. The relevant provision is reproduced below for ready reference:

“The flats in a specific project shall be allotted in one go within four months of the sanction of building plans. In case, the number of applications received is less than the number of sanctioned flats, the allotment can be made in two or more phases. However, the licensee will start the construction only after receipt of environmental clearance from the competent authority.



The licensee will start receiving the further installments only once the environmental clearance is received. Further, if the licensee, fail to get environmental clearance even after one year of holding of draw, the licensee is liable to refund the amount deposited by the applicant alongwith an interest of 12%, if the allottee so desires."

20. Also, the respondent has raised an objection that complainant allottee is a wilful defaulter and has failed to make payment of the instalments and has thus violated provisions of section 19(6) & (7) of the Act. In this regard, the authority observes that as per clause 5(iii)(b) of the Affordable Housing Policy, 2013, the licensee will start receiving the further installments only once the environmental clearance is received. As delineated hereinabove, the respondent has failed to obtain environmental clearance till date, thus, are not entitled to receive any further payments. Hence, the objection raised by the respondent is devoid of merits.
21. Further, as per amendment dated 09.07.2018 in Affordable Group Housing Policy, 2013, the rate of interest in case of default shall be as per rule 15 of the Haryana Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Rules, 2017. Rule 15 of the rules is 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]
- 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.*
22. The legislature in its wisdom in the subordinate legislation under the 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.

23. Thus, the complainant-allottee is entitled to refund of the entire amount deposited along with interest at the prescribed rate as per aforesaid provisions laid down under Affordable Housing Policy, 2013.
24. Hence, the respondent/promoter is directed to refund the entire paid-up amount as per clause 5(iii)(b) of the Affordable Housing Policy, 2013 as amended by the State Government on 22.07.2015, along with prescribed rate of interest i.e., @11.10% p.a. (the State Bank of India highest marginal cost of lending rate (MCLR) applicable as on date +2%) as prescribed under rule 15 of the Haryana Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Rules, 2017 from the date of each payment till the actual realization of the amount within the timelines provided in rule 16 of the Haryana Rules 2017 ibid.

G.II Direct the respondent to pay litigation cost of Rs. 50,000/-

25. The complainant is seeking above mentioned relief w.r.t. compensation. Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in civil appeal nos. 6745-6749 of 2021 titled as *M/s Newtech Promoters and Developers Pvt. Ltd. V/s State of Up & Ors. (supra)*, has held that an allottee is entitled to claim compensation and litigation charges under sections 12,14,18 and section 19 which is to be decided by the adjudicating officer as per section 71 and the quantum of compensation and litigation expense shall be adjudged by the 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. Therefore, the complainant is advised to approach the adjudicating officer for seeking the relief of compensation.


H. Directions of the authority

26. Hence, the authority hereby passes this order and issue the following directions under section 37 of the Act to ensure compliance of obligations

casted upon the promoter as per the functions entrusted to the authority under section 34(f) of the Act:

- i. The respondent is directed to refund the entire paid-up amount of Rs.8,59,811/- as per clause 5(iii)(b) of the Affordable Housing Policy, 2013 as amended by the State Government on 22.07.2015, along with prescribed rate of interest i.e., @11.10% p.a. as prescribed under rule 15 of the Rules, 2017 from the date of each payment till the actual realization of the amount.
 - ii. A period of 90 days is given to the respondent to comply with the directions given in this order failing which legal consequences would follow.
27. The complaints stand disposed of.
28. Files be consigned to registry.

Dated: 25.10.2024



V.I. Goyal
Vijay Kumar Goyal

Member

Haryana Real Estate
Regulatory Authority,
Gurugram

HARERA
GURUGRAM