



HARYANA REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY PANCHKULA

Website: www.haryanarera.gov.in

Date of Decision	09.12.2024
------------------	------------

Name of the Builder		RAHEJA DEVELOPERS LTD		
Project Name		KRISHNA HOUSING SCHEME		
Sr. no.	Complaint no. and date of filing	Title of the case	Appearance on behalf of complainant	Appearance on behalf of respondent
1.	2021 of 2023 14.09.2023	Jaswant Singh Ahlawat S/o Jai Singh Ahlawat, R/o House no.1222, Sector-38, Islampur, Gurugram-122018. Vs. M/s Raheja Developers Ltd through its Managing Director/Director/Authorized Representative, Regd. Address: W4D,204/5,Keshav Kunj, Western Avenue,Cariappa Marg, Sainik Farms, New Delhi- 110062. Corporate Office: Raheja Mall, 3 rd floor, Sector-47, Sohna Road, Gurugram-122001.	Mr. Sajal Dhawan, counsel for the complainant through VC.	None appeared on behalf of respondent.
2.	2091 of 2023 05.10.2023	Smt. Pooja Merani, W/o Sh. Jitin Merani R/o Flat No.6, 27 th road,	Mr. Nikhil Kataria, proxy for Amit Kumar, counsel for the complainant	None appeared on behalf of respondent.

		Karol Building, Bandra West, Mumbai-400050. Vs. Raheja Developers Ltd, Through its Director W4D,204/5,Keshav Kunj, Western Avenue,Cariappa Marg, Sainik farms, New Delhi- 110062.	through VC.	
3.	2146 of 2023 18.10.2023	Baishali Sarkar H.No. D-89, 1 st floor, South City-2, Block D, Gurugram-122018. Vs. Raheja Developers Ltd W4D,204/5,Keshav Kunj, Western Avenue,Cariappa Marg, Sainik farms, New Delhi- 110062.	Mr. Pankaj Chandola, counsel for the complainant, through VC.	None appeared on behalf of respondent.

CORAM: Nadim Akhtar
Chander Shekhar

Member
Member

ORDER (NADIM AKHTAR-MEMBER)

1. This order shall dispose off all the above three captioned complaints filed by the complainants before this Authority under Section 31 of the Real Estate (Regulation & Development) Act, 2016 (hereinafter referred as RERA, Act of 2016) read with Rule 28 of the Haryana Real Estate (Regulation & Development) Rules, 2017 for violation or contravention of the provisions of the Act of 2016 or the Rules and Regulations made thereunder, wherein it is inter-alia prescribed that the promoter shall be responsible to fulfil all the obligations, responsibilities and functions towards the allottee as per the terms agreed between them.



2. The core issues emanating from the above captioned complaints are similar in nature. The complainants in the above referred Complaint No. 2021 of 2023 and other captioned complaint are allottees of the project namely; “Krishna Housing Scheme” being developed by the same respondent/ promoter, i.e., Raheja Developers Ltd. The fulcrum of the issue involved in the above captioned cases pertains to failure on the part of the respondent/promoter to deliver timely possession of the unit in question and both the complainant(s) are now seeking refund of their paid amount along with the interest. Despite giving various opportunities, respondent failed to file replies in both the above captioned cases.

A. UNIT AND PROJECT RELATED DETAILS

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

Krishna Housing Scheme

Possession Clause 5.2 in Builder Buyer Agreement:

“The Company shall sincerely endeavour to complete the construction and offer the possession of the said unit within forty eights (48) months from the date of the receiving of environment clearance or sanction of building plans whichever is later (“Commencement Period”), but subject to force majeure clause of this Agreement and timely payments of instalment by the Allottee(s).....”



Sr. no.	Complaint no./Title	Reply Status	Unit no.	Allotment letter	Date of execution of builder buyer agreement	Total sale consideration (TSC) and amount paid by the complainant (Paid amount)	Offer of possession given or not given	Relief sought
1.	2021 of 2023 Jaswant Singh Ahlawat Vs. Raheja Developers Ltd	Not filed	9003, 9 th floor, Tower B2	08.08.2016	08.08.2016	TSC: ₹12,80,380/- Paid amount: ₹9,97,215/- as per the receipts and ledger attached	Not given	(i) Refund of paid amount along with interest.
2.	2091 of 2023 Pooja Merani Vs. Raheja Developers Ltd	Not filed	6005, 6 th floor, Tower D1	10.07.2015 (provisional allotment letter)	24.02.2016	TSC: ₹15,24,022/- Paid amount: ₹14,67,916/-	Not given	(i) Refund of paid amount along with interest. (ii) Direct the respondent to pay 5,00,000/- as compensation for mental agony and harassment.
3.	2146 of 2023 Baishali Sarkar Vs. Raheja Developers Ltd	Not filed	5006, 5 th floor, Tower F	18.10.2016	18.10.2016	TSC: ₹16,57,258/- Paid amount: ₹13,67,343/-	Not given	(i) Refund of paid amount along with interest. (ii) Direct the respondent to pay ₹1,00,000/- as legal cost.

B. COMPLAINT NO. 2021 OF 2023 IS TAKEN AS LEAD CASE AND

BRIEF FACTS OF THIS COMPLAINT ARE AS UNDER:

- (i) Case of the complainant is that complainant booked IBIK flat in project "Krishna Housing Scheme" situated in Sector 14, Sohna, Nuh



(Gurugram), Haryana by paying an amount of ₹78,556/- on 26.12.2014 as booking amount in respect of 1BHK flat. Thereafter, respondent allotted unit no.9003, 9th floor, in Tower B2 having carpet area of 345.45 sq.ft on 08.08.2016 in the project of the respondent governed by Affordable Housing Policy 2013. Copy of allotment letter is annexed as Annexure P3.

(ii) That on 08.08.2016, Builder Buyer's Agreement (BBA) was executed inter-se the respondent promoter and the complainant which is annexed as Annexure P4. As per clause 5.2 of said agreement, the builder proposes to complete the construction and offer of the possession of the said unit within forty-eight (48) months from the date of receiving of environment clearance or sanction of building plans whichever is later. However, till date respondent had not offered the possession of the unit.

(iii) That as per the payment schedule attached with the agreement executed between the parties, the complainant made regular payments of installments on demand raised by the respondent builder from time to time. Copies customer ledger and receipts are attached with complaint file. However, respondent failed to honour its contractual liabilities till date.

(iv) That main grievance of the complainant in the present complaint is that despite the fact that complainant had paid ₹9,97,215/-, the respondent has miserably failed to deliver the possession of fully constructed and



developed unit as per the specifications promised in BBA. That there is an inordinate delay in handing over the possession of the unit.

- (v) Now complainant wants to withdraw from project. Therefore being aggrieved person, filing the present complaint before this Hon'ble Authority.

C. RELIEFS SOUGHT

4. Complainant has sought following reliefs :

- i. Pass an appropriate award directing the respondent to refund the total amount paid till date of ₹9,97,215/- with interest.
- ii. Pass an appropriate award directing the respondent to give the legal, peaceful and physical possession of the unit.
- iii. Any other relief/direction that Hon'ble Authority deems fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the present complaint.

D. REPLY ON BEHALF OF RESPONDENT

5. Notice was served to the respondent on 18.09.2023 which got successfully delivered on 20.09.2023. Despite giving three opportunities respondent failed to file his reply on time. Therefore, Authority deems it fit to struck off the defence of the respondent and decide it ex-parte, as per record available on the file.



E. ARGUMENTS OF LEARNED COUNSEL FOR COMPLAINANT

6. Counsel for complainant reiterated the facts of the complaint and requested the Authority to grant the relief of refund of the paid amount along with interest and decide the case ex-parte as respondent has failed to file his reply. None has appeared on behalf of respondent to assist the Authority.

F. ISSUE FOR ADJUDICATION

7. Whether the complainants in above captioned complaints are entitled to refund of the amount deposited by them along with interest in terms of Section 18 of RERA Act of 2016?

G. OBSERVATIONS AND DECISION OF AUTHORITY

8. The Authority has gone through the facts of complaint as submitted by the complainants. In light of the background of the matter, Authority observes as follows:

- (i) That complainants booked and allotted a unit in the project “Krishna Housing Scheme” which is an Affordable Housing Scheme being developed by the promoter namely; Raheja Developers Ltd. and complainant was allotted unit no.9003, 9th floor, tower B2, in said project at sector-14, Sohna, Haryana. The builder buyer agreement was executed between the parties on 08.08.2016. Complainant had paid a total of ₹9,97,215/- against the total sale price of ₹12,80,380/-.



(ii) As per clause 5.2 of agreement respondent/developer was under an obligation to hand over possession to the complainants within 48 months from the date of approval of building plans or grant of environment clearance whichever is later. Relevant clause is reproduced as under :

“The Company shall sincerely endeavour to complete the construction and offer the possession of the said unit within 48 months from the date of the receiving of environment clearance or sanction of building plans whichever is later (“Commitment Period”) but subject to force majeure clause of this agreement and timely payments of instalment by the allottee(s).”

It came to the knowledge of the Authority while dealing with other cases against the same respondent namely; M/s Raheja Developers Ltd, respondent/ developer received approval of building plans on 27.04.2015 and got the environment clearance on 09.03.2015. That means, as per possession clause, a period of 48 months is to be taken from 27.04.2015 and therefore, date of handing over of possession comes to 27.04.2019.

(iii) Period of 4 years is a reasonable time to complete development works in the project and handover possession to the allottees, however, respondent failed to hand over possession to the complainant. After paying his hard earned money, legitimate expectations of the complainant would be that possession of the unit



will be delivered within a reasonable period of time. However, respondent failed to fulfill their obligations as promised to the complainants. Thus, complainant is at liberty to exercise his right to withdraw from the project on account of default on the part of respondent to offer legally valid possession and seek refund of the paid amount along with interest as per section 18 of RERA Act, 2016.

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

"25. The unqualified right of the allottee to seek refund referred under Section 18(1)(a) and Section 19(4) of the Act is not dependent on any contingencies or stipulations thereof. It appears that the legislature has consciously provided this right of refund on demand as an unconditional absolute right to the allottee, if the promoter fails to give possession of the apartment, plot or building within the time stipulated under the terms of the agreement regardless of unforeseen events or stay orders of the Court/Tribunal, which is in either way not attributable to the allottee/home buyer, the promoter is under an obligation to refund the amount on demand with interest at the rate prescribed by the State Government including



compensation in the manner provided under the Act with the proviso that if the allottee does not wish to withdraw from the project, he shall be entitled for interest for the period of delay till handing over possession at the rate prescribed.”

The decision of the Supreme Court settles the issue regarding the right of an aggrieved allottee such as in the present case seeking refund of the paid amount along with interest on account of delayed delivery of possession. The complainant wishes to withdraw from the project of the respondent, therefore, Authority finds it fit cases for allowing refund in favour of complainant.

(v) 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;



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

“Rule 15. Prescribed rate of interest- (Proviso to section 12, section 18 and sub-section (4) and subsection (7) of section 19] (1) For the purpose of proviso to section 12; section 18, and sub sections (4) and (7) of section 19, the "interest at the rate prescribed" shall be the State Bank of India highest marginal cost of lending rate +2%. Provided that in case the State Bank of India marginal cost of lending rate (MCLR) is not in use, it shall be replaced by such benchmark lending rates which the State Bank of India may fix from time to time for lending to the general public”.

(vii) 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., 09.12.2024 is 9.10%. Accordingly, the prescribed rate of interest will be MCLR + 2% i.e., 11.10%.

(viii) From above discussion, it is amply proved on record that the respondent has not fulfilled its obligations cast upon him under RERA Act, 2016 and the complainant(s) are entitled for refund of deposited amount along with interest. Thus, respondent is liable to pay the complainants interest from the date the amounts were paid till the actual realization of the amount.

(ix) Therefore, Authority allows refund of paid amount along with interest to the complainants 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 amounts along with interest as per detail given in the table below:

Sr. no.	Complaint no.	Amount paid	Interest till 09.12.2024	Total amount to be refunded to the complainant
1.	2021 of 2023	₹9,97,215/-	₹9,48,199/-	₹ 19,45,414/-
2.	2091 of 2023	₹14,67,916/-	₹13,25,311/-	₹27,93,227/-
3.	2146 of 2023	₹13,67,343/-	₹11,78,188/-	₹25,45,531/-

(x) It is pertinent to mention that in complaint no.2021 of 2023, complainant claimed refund of ₹9,96,091 along with interest, however, perusal of customer ledger and receipts attached total amount comes to ₹9,97,215/-. Therefore, order is passed with respect to amount of ₹9,97,215/- in present complaint.

(xi) Further, the complainants in complaints nos. 2091 of 2023 and 2146 of 2023 are seeking compensation on account of mental agony, litigation cost and physical harassment caused to the complainants. 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 PvL 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 complainants are advised to approach the Adjudicating Officer for seeking the relief of litigation expenses.

H. DIRECTIONS OF THE AUTHORITY

9. Hence, the Authority hereby passes this order and issue 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 amount to the complainants as specified in the table provided in para- 8(ix) of this order. It is further clarified that respondent will remain liable to pay the interest to the complainants till the actual realization of the amount.
- (ii) Respondent is also directed to deposit the costs of ₹15000/- payable to the Authority and ₹7000/- payable to the



complainants in each complaints. (Total cost of ₹45,000/- payable to the Authority and ₹21,000/- payable to the complainants).

- (iii) 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.

Disposed off. Files be consigned to the record room after uploading of the order on the website of the Authority.


.....
CHANDER SHEKHAR
[MEMBER]


.....
NADIM AKHTAR
[MEMBER]