

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

Complaint no. : 784 of 2024
Date of filing : 18.03.2024
Date of decision : 13.12.2024

Nipun Asija
R/o: - JFlat no. 311, Apartments Vasundhra Enclave,
New Delhi- 110096.

Complainant

Versus

M/s Green Height Projects Private Limited
Office at: N-71, Panchsheel Park, New Delhi-110017.

Respondent

CORAM:

Shri Ashok Sangwan

Member

APPEARANCE:

Shri Garvit Gupta
Shri Somesh Arora

Advocate for the complainants
Advocate for the respondent

ORDER

1. The present complaint dated **18.03.2024** 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 provision of the Act or the Rules and regulations made there under or to the allottee 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	"Baani Centre Point", Sector - M1D, Urban Complex, Manesar, Gurugram
2.	Project area	2.681 acres
3.	Nature of the project	Commercial
4.	DTCP license no. and validity status	59 of 2009 dated 26.10.2009 valid upto 12.09.2020
5.	Name of licensee	M/s Paradise System Pvt. Ltd.
6.	RERA Registered/ not registered	Registered vide no. 187 of 2017 dated 14.09.2017 valid upto 13.09.2019
7.	Unit no.	GF - 017 (Page 31 of complaint)
8.	Unit area admeasuring	416 sq. ft. (Page 31 of complaint)
10.	Date of allotment letter	01.12.2014 (Page 31 of complaint)
11.	Date of execution of commercial space Buyer agreement	16.09.2019
12.	Possession clause (7)	The Promoter shall abide by the time schedule for completing the project as disclosed at the time of registration of the project with the Authority and

		towards handing over the Premises alongwith parking (if applicable) to the Allottee(s) and the common areas to the association of allottees or the competent authority, as the case may be, as provided under Rule 2(1)(f) of Rules, 2017 (inadvertently mentioned 30.09.3017 including grace period vide proceeding dated 20.09.2024)
13.	Due date of possession	30.03.2018 (Admitted by respondent-builder as determined in other similar cases.
14.	Total sale consideration	Rs.37,41,152/- (at page 24 of complaint)
15.	Amount paid by the complainants	Rs.37,88,008/- (at page 24 of complaint)
16.	Occupation certificate /Completion certificate	Not obtained

B. Facts of the complaint

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

- i. That the complainants, induced by the assurances and representations made by the respondent, decided to book a commercial unit in the project of the respondent as the complainants required the same in a time bound manner for their own use. This fact was also specifically brought to the knowledge of the officials of the respondent who confirmed that the possession of the commercial unit to be allotted to the complainants would be positively handed over within the agreed time frame. it was also confirmed by the representatives of the respondent that the payment plan in question would be 'Construction Linked Plan'.

The complainant signed several blank and printed papers at the instance of the respondent who obtained the same on the ground that the same were required for completing the booking formalities. The complainant was not given chance to read or understand the said documents and they signed and completed the formalities as desired by the respondent.

- ii. That the complainant had made the payment of Rs. 3,26,420/- at the time of booking on 26.02.2013 and accordingly, the same was even highlighted in the booking application form. The respondent allotted a shop no. GF-107 having a super area of 416 sq. ft. at the rate of Rs 7,000 per sq. ft. It is pertinent to mention herein that the said allotted unit was located at a prime location. Moreover, at the time of booking, it was promised and assured by the respondent to the complainant that the agreement would be executed in a short span of time and the said unit would be handed over to the complainant by 30.09.2017.
- iii. That vide provisional allotment letter dated 01.12.2014 i.e., almost after more than 1.5 years from the date of first payment, the respondent allotted a Unit bearing no. GF-017, Ground Floor admeasuring 416 sq. ft. at the rate of Rs 7,000 per sq. ft. After the allotment of the unit by the respondent, the respondent raised the demand dated 01.12.2014 towards the installment against 'Commencement of Work at Site'. The complainant believing the said payment demand to be correct, paid the demanded amount without any delay.
- iv. That on 03.11.2015, the respondent raised a payment demand against 'On Laying of Raft' which was duly paid by the complainant without any delay or default. Payments towards all the instalment demands sent by

the respondent were made by the complainant strictly as per the terms of the payment plan.

- v. That since, the respondent had failed to execute the buyer's agreement with the complainants despite lapse of three years from the date of booking, the complainants visited the office of the respondent in the month of January, 2016 to enquire about the construction status and execution of the agreement in question. The complainant was surprised and anguished with the response of respondent who informed the complainant that the execution of the buyer's agreement would take some more time. However, since, the complainants had made substantial payment towards the total sale consideration of the unit, the complainants had no other option but to believe the said representations of the respondent. The respondent vide demand letter dated 03.02.2016 demanded payment against 'Casting of 3rd Basement Roof Slab'. Subsequently, the respondent vide letter dated 11.04.2016 demanded payment against 'Casting of 2nd Basement Roof Slab'. The complainant without any delay made the payments towards the demanded amount.
- vi. That subsequently, the respondent sent the payment demand dated 20.12.2016 against 'Commencement of 1st Basement Roof Slab' for a net payable amount of Rs. 4,17,491.19. Similarly, the respondent sent a payment demand dated 09.03.2017 against 'Casting of 2nd Floor Roof Slab'. The said payments were duly paid by the complainant.
- vii. That having collected the entire amount in the installments directly and through its intermediary (infratech infrastructures), the respondent was in advantageous position to have provided the buyer's agreement, by inserting the contracts terms which were unreasonably favorable to the

other party and fraudulently inducing the complainant with false assurances. The unilateral contract was grossly unreasonable or unconscionable in the light of business practices of the time and place as to be unenforceable according to its literal terms. There was absence of meaningful choice for the complainant to come to the terms of agreement which were unreasonably favorable, discriminating, unconscionable and one-sided.

- viii. That the complainants made vocal their objections to the arbitrary and unilateral clauses of the commercial space buyer's agreement to the respondent. The complainants repeatedly requested the respondent for execution of a commercial space buyer's agreement with balanced terms. However, during such discussions, the respondent summarily rejected the bonafide request of the complainants and stated that the agreement terms were non-negotiable and would remain as they were. The respondent/ promoter refused to amend or change any term of the pre-printed commercial space buyer's agreement and further threatened the complainants to forfeit the previous amounts paid by them if further payments are not made. The complainants had made substantial payment before the execution of the agreement. Since the complainants had already parted with a considerable amount of the sale consideration, they were left with no other option but to accept the lopsided and one-sided terms of the commercial space buyer's agreement buyer's agreement. Since the complainants had duly paid a huge amount out of their hard-earned money, they felt trapped and had no other option but to sign the dotted lines. Hence the buyer's agreement dated **16.09.2019** was executed.

- ix. That it is pertinent to mention here that despite having made the buyer's agreement dated 16.09.2019 containing terms very much favorable as per the wishes of the respondent, still the respondent miserably failed to abide by its obligations thereunder. The respondent/promoter has even failed to perform the most fundamental obligation of the agreement which was to handover the possession of the commercial within the promised time frame, which in the present case has been delayed for an extremely long period of time. The failure of the respondent and the fraud played by it is writ large.
- x. That it is pertinent to mention herein that the booking was made by the complainant in the year 2013 with an intention and promise that the unit would be handed over in the year 2017. However, it was the respondent who failed to execute the agreement with the complainant and as a result, it is the complainant who is suffering. It is submitted that in case of other similarly situated allottees who had made the booking with the respondent around the same time as of the complainant, the due date to handover the possession of the unit was 30.03.2018 (inclusive of the grace period) . The complainant cannot be bound by the terms of the agreement wherein the due date to handover the unit has been linked with the date submitted by the respondent at the time of registration. Interestingly, the registration certificate of the respondent has also lapsed. Thus, for all purposes, the due date to handover the possession is and can only be 30.03.2018.
- xi. That the complainant has till date made the payment of Rs. 37,88,008/- out of Rs. 37,41,152 strictly as per the terms of the allotment and the development linked payment plan and no default in making timely payment towards the instalment demands has been committed by the

complainant, the said fact is evident from the statement of accounts dated 22.02.2022. It is submitted that the respondent/promoter used to only provide a short time span to make the payment of all the payment demands. Yet, all the payments were made by the complainant without any delay.

xii. That since the time period to handover the possession stated by the respondent in the commercial space buyer's agreement had lapsed, the complainants requested the respondent telephonically, and by visiting the office of the respondent to update them about the date of handing over of the possession. The representatives of the respondent assured the complainants that the possession of the unit would be handed over to them very shortly as the construction was almost over. The respondent has continuously been misleading the allottees including the complainants by giving incorrect information and timelines within which it was to hand over the possession of the unit to the complainants. The respondent/promoter had represented and warranted at the time of booking that it would deliver the commercial unit of the complainants to them in a timely manner. However, the failure of the respondent company has resulted in serious consequences being borne by the complainants.

xiii. That the respondent has miserably failed to send any other legal payment demand for the period of 5 years from the date of issuance of last payment demand for the simple reason that the respondent has not completed the construction within the agreed time frame. There has been virtually no progress and the construction activity is lying suspended since long. The last payment demand 'Completion of Super Structure' was sent by the respondent to the complainants in the year

2018 and the same was paid by the complainants within the time period. The next payment demand as per the terms of the allotment and the construction linked payment plan which was to be raised at the stage of 'Offer of possession' has till date not been issued by the respondent to the complainants because the respondent failed to complete the structure till that stage. Since all the payment demands except the demand to be raised at the time of offer of possession were sent by the respondent to the complainant, then the respondent/promoter should have been in the condition even otherwise to apply for the grant of the occupation certificate in the year 2018 itself. The fact that no intimation regarding the application for the grant of the occupation certificate was given by the respondent to the complainants speaks about the volume of illegalities and deficiencies on the part of the respondent/promoter. There is inordinate delay in developing the project well beyond what was promised and assured to the complainants. This further shows that the demands which were raised by the respondent didn't correspond to the actual construction status on the site.

- xiv.** That the respondent has committed various acts of omission and commission by making incorrect and false statements at the time of booking. There is an inordinate delay of 70 months calculated upto February, 2024 and till date the possession of the allotted unit has not been offered by the respondent to the complainants. The non-completion of the project is not attributable to any circumstance except the deliberate lethargy, negligence and unfair trade practices adopted by the respondent/promoter. The respondent has been brushing aside all the requisite norms and stipulations and has accumulated huge amount of hard-earned money of various buyers in the project including the

complainants and are unconcerned about the possession of the unit despite repeated assurances.

xv. That the respondent has misused and converted to its own use the huge hard-earned amounts received from the complainant and other buyers in the project in a totally illegal and unprofessional manner and the respondent was least bothered about the timely finishing of the project and delivery of possession of the unit in question to the complainant as per the terms of the buyer's agreement. The respondent has deliberately, mischievously, dishonestly and with malafide motives cheated and defrauded the complainant. It is unambiguously lucid that no force majeure was involved and that the project has been at standstill since several years. The high headedness of the respondent is an illustration of how the respondent conducts its business which is only to maximize the profits with no concern to the buyers.

xvi. That the cause of action for the present complaint is recurring one on account of the failure of the respondent to perform its obligations within the agreed time frame. The cause of action again arose when the respondent failed to hand over the possession and compensation for delay on its part and finally about a week ago when the respondent refused to compensate the complainant with the delayed possession interest amount and compensation. The complainant reserve her right to approach the appropriate Forum to seek compensation

C Relief sought by the complainants: -

4. The complainants have sought following relief(s)

- I. Direct the opposite party to pay interest at the prescribed rate for every month of delay from the due date of possession till date of offer of possession.
 - II. Direct the respondent to handover the possession of the allotted unit to the complainant.
 - III. To execute the conveyance deed in favor of the complainant.
 - IV. Direct the respondent not to raise any payment demand, in violation of the provisions of the Act of 2016/or contrary to the terms of the agreement
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 has contested the complaint on the following grounds: -
- i. That a Collaboration Agreement dated 30.03.2013 was entered into between M/s Paradise Systems Pvt. Ltd. as the original landholder and Green Heights Projects Pvt. Ltd., as the Developer. That various permissions were sought from different authorities by the original landholder and the development was undertaken by the Respondent consequent to those permissions and the commercial project is constructed on the subject land by the respondent duly following the norms and compliances as per law. That the respondent as per the terms of the collaboration agreement paid the amount of Rupees Twenty-Eight crores and Forty lakhs to the landowners i.e. Paradise Systems Private

- Limited by way of cheques and RTGS from the period 27.02.2013 to 03.02.2016.
- ii. That vide letter dated 23.05.2013 the entire External Development Charges and Internal Development Charges in respect of land were paid to Directorate, Town and Country Planning, Haryana.
 - iii. That the construction was initiated in the project and during that process a letter was received from Directorate of Town and Country Planning directing to stop the construction in compliance of the Injunction Order from the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India dated 24.04.2015
 - iv. That the land owner approached the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India for the clarification of the stay order as to whether it is applicable to the land and license however Supreme Court directed it to approach DTCP for clarifications.
 - v. That the Land owner approached DTCP vide various representations however DTCP did not take any decision as the matter was pending in the Supreme Court. It was further represented by DTCP that the original files in respect of land portions of entire 912 acres have been taken by Central Bureau of Investigation of all the projects and till original files are returned by CBI, DTCP will not be in a position to provide clarification in respect of various representations. The Landowner then approached Punjab and Haryana high court for directions to CBI to

- handover original files in respect of the project of Respondent and the High Court by order dated 27.03.2017 passed appropriate directions.
- vi. That the project namely Baani Center Point was registered with Haryana Rera Registration Number 187 of 2017 dated 14.09.2017.
- vii. That vide judgement dated 12.03.2018, the project **BAANI CENTER POINT, SECTOR M1D, MANESAR** of M/s Green Heights Projects Pvt. Ltd. was not included in tainted projects which clearly meant that the respondent could commence construction subject to renewal of licenses and other permissions.
- viii. That shortly after the stay was lifted on 12.03.2018, M/s Paradise Systems Pvt. Ltd. approached DTCP for renewal of license to begin construction which was granted to them on 23.07.2018 and thereafter the Respondent has developed the project **BAANI CENTER POINT, SECTOR M1D, MANESAR** which is almost complete and was left for some finishing works and interiors. It shall be pertinent to mention that while renewing the license the entire period of 24.04.2015 till 12.03.2018 was exempted as Zero period by DTCP.
- ix. That later on the HSIIDC filed an application in the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India dated 01.07.2019 through M.A. No. 50 of 2019 in the matter of Rameshwar & ors Vs. State of Haryana & Ors. CA 8788 of 2015 being "Application for Clarification of Final Judgment dated 12.03.2018 passed by this Hon'ble Court". It is submitted that the Hon'ble Supreme

Court through its order dated 13.10.2020 again granted an injunction on further construction of projects of the parties to the said case including M/s. Paradise Systems Pvt. Ltd.'s project of **Baani Center Point, Sector M1D, Manesar.**

- x. That finally through the judgment on 21.07.2022, the stay on construction was cleared by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in M.A. 50 of 2019 in the matter of **Rameshwar Vs. State of Haryana & Ors.** CA 8788 of 2015.
- xi. That the present dispute is *sub judice* before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India and the Hon'ble Supreme Court has ordered a *status quo* in the construction of the project on a clarification application filed by the state of Haryana in the matter of **Rameshwar Vs. State of Haryana & Ors.** CA 8788 of 2015.
- xii. That the respondent vide letter dated 25.07.2022 has also applied for renewal of license and other permissions from DTCP which is awaited. It is also important to mention that the project was registered with RERA vide registration no. 187 of 2017 and after the judgement of the Hon'ble Supreme Court the respondent has filed an application for extension of the registration under section 7 sub clause 3 dated 04.08.2022.
- xiii. It is further submitted that M/s Green Heights Projects Pvt. Ltd. has made the payments as per the direction of the orders of the Hon'ble Supreme Court and is now taking required approvals from Government

- Authorities so that the offer of possession is given to the Allottees very soon. There is no malafide intention of M/s Green Heights Projects Pvt. Ltd. to get the delivery of the project delayed to the allottees.
- xiv. It is humbly submitted that the Stay on construction order by the Hon'ble Supreme Court is clearly a "Force Majeure" event, which automatically extends the timeline for handing over possession of the Unit. The Intention of the Force Majeure clause is to save the performing party from consequences of anything over which he has no control. It is no more res integra that force majeure is intended to include risks beyond the reasonable control of a party, incurred not as a product or result of the negligence or malfeasance of a party, which have a materially adverse effect on the ability of such party to perform its obligations, as where non-performance is caused by the usual and natural consequences of external forces or where the intervening circumstances are specifically contemplated. Thus, it is most respectfully submitted that the delay in construction, if any, is attributable to reasons beyond the control of the respondent and as such the respondent may be granted reasonable extension in terms of the buyer agreement.
- xv. It is submitted that on 03.10.2023, Paradise vide letter to the DTCP requested the renewal of License No. 59 of 2009 and approval for the transfer of said license. Subsequently, on 18.10.2023, DTCP issued an

office memo granting the renewal of the license. However, DTCP did not process the application for the transfer of the license.

xvi. It is further submitted that since the DTCP did not process the application for the transfer of the license, Paradise sent another letter dated 31.10.2023 to the DTCP, requesting approval for the transfer of License No. 59 of 2009 along with other pending applications.

xvii. That Respondent also sent a letter 04.04.2024 to the Enforcement Directorate, requesting clearance to the DTCP for the transfer of the license and change of developer. However, as of now, the clearance is still awaited.

7. All other averments made in the complaint were denied in toto.
8. 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

9. 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

10. As per notification no. 1/92/2017-1TCP dated 14.12.2017 issued by The Town and Country Planning Department, Haryana 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

11. 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)(a)

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.

12. 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 complainants at a later stage.

F. Findings on the objections raised by the respondent

F.I Objection regarding maintainability of complaint

13. The respondent took a plea that as per the Clause 9 - Force Majeure of the builder buyer agreement "the intending seller shall not be held responsible or liable for failure or delay in performing any of its obligation or undertakings as provided for in this agreement, if such performance is prevented, delayed or hindered by "court orders" or any other cause not within the reasonable control of the intending seller". Therefore, as the project "Baani Centre Point" was under stay orders of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India for 7 years 3 months (24/04/2015 TO 21/07/2022) which was beyond the respondent's reasonable control and because of this no construction in the project could be carried during this period. Hence, there is no fault of the respondent in delayed construction which has been considered by DTCP and RERA while considering its applications of considering zero period, renewal of license and extension of registration by RERA. Due to reasons stated hereinabove it became impossible to fulfil contractual obligations due to a particular event that was unforeseeable and unavoidable by the respondent. It is humbly submitted that the Stay on construction order by the Supreme Court is clearly a "Force Majeure" event, which automatically extends the timeline for handing over possession of the unit. The Intention of the Force Majeure clause is to save the performing party from consequences of anything over which he has no control. It is no more res integra that force majeure is intended to include risks beyond the reasonable control of a party, incurred not as a product or

result of the negligence or malfeasance of a party, which have a materially adverse effect on the ability of such party to perform its obligations, as where non-performance is caused by the usual and natural consequences of external forces or where the intervening circumstances are specifically contemplated. Thus, it was submitted that the delay in construction, if any, is attributable to reasons beyond the control of the respondent and as such the respondent may be granted reasonable extension in terms of the buyer agreement.

14. The complainant states that in the latest judgment M/s Newtech Promoters & Developers Pvt. Ltd. vs. State of UP & Ors. Etc. (Supra), which is the authoritative landmark judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court with respect to the interpretation of the provisions of the Act, the Hon'ble Apex Court has dealt with the rights of the allottees to seek refund and delay possession charges as referred under Section 18(1)(a) of the Act. The Hon'ble Apex Court has laid down as under:-

"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 timestipulated 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."

15. Thus, the allottee has unqualified right to seek delay possession charge referred under section 18 of the Act, which is not dependent on any contingencies. The right of delay possession charge has been held to be 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. On the contrary, the respondent states that Paragraph 25 of the Newtech judgment is a general observation by the Hon'ble Supreme Court as 'Obiter dictum' and not 'ratio decidendi'.
16. In this regard, the Authority is of view that even though the contents of Para 25 of the order passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of M/s M/s Newtech Promoters & Developers Pvt. Ltd. vs. State of UP & Ors. Etc. does not form part of the directions but it cannot be denied that an interpretation of sections 18(1) and 19(4) has been rendered in the order in para 25 in unequivocal terms with respect to the statutory rights of the allottee. Further, the pivotal issue arises from the builder's actions during the period between 24.04.2015 to 1.032018 in question that is despite claiming force majeure due to external impediments, the builder continued construction activities unabated thereafter concurrently received payments from the allottees and even executed buyer's agreement during that time. This sustained course of action strongly suggests that the builder possessed the capability to fulfill their

contractual obligations despite the purported hindrances. Therefore, the builder cannot invoke Force Majeure to justify the delay and consequently, cannot seek an extension based on circumstances within their control. However, during the period 13.10.2020 to 21.07.2022, there were specific directions for stay on further construction/development works in the said project passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in M.A No. 50 of 2019 vide order dated 21.07.2022 which was in operation from 13.10.2020 to 21.07.2022 and there is no evidence that the respondent did not comply with such order. The Authority observes that during this period, there was no construction carried out in the project nor any demands made by the respondent from the allottees. In view of the above, the promoter cannot be held responsible for delayed possession interest during this period. Therefore, in the interest of equity, no interest shall be payable by the complainant as well as respondent from 13.10.2020 to 21.07.2022 in view of the stay order of Hon'ble Supreme Court on further construction/development works on the said project.

G Findings on the relief sought by the complainants.

G. I Direct the respondent to pay delay possession charges alongwith prescribed rate of interest.

17. The respondent states that a collaboration agreement dated 30.03.2013 was entered into M/s Paradise Systems Pvt. Ltd. being the original landholder and Green Heights Projects Pvt. Ltd., being the Developer for the project namely "Baani Center Point". Thereafter, the construction

was initiated in the project and during that process a letter was received from Directorate of Town and Country Planning directing to stop the construction in compliance of the Injunction Order from the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India dated 24.04.2015. Thereafter the respondent builder approached the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India for the clarification of the stay order as to whether it is applicable to the land and license however Supreme Court directed it to approach DTCP for clarifications. The respondent builder approached DTCP vide various representations however DTCP did not take any decision as the matter was pending in the Supreme Court. It was further represented by DTCP that the original files in respect of land portions of entire 912 acres have been taken by Central Bureau of Investigation of all the projects and till original files are returned by CBI, DTCP will not be in a position to provide clarification in respect of various representations. The Landowner then approached Punjab and Haryana high court for directions to CBI to handover original files in respect of the project of respondent and the High Court by order dated 27.03.2017 passed appropriate directions. It is pertinent to mention here that between the periods of 24.04.2015 till 12.03.2018, the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India had passed directions in respect of 912 Acres of land in 3 Villages including the land where the present project (Baani Center Point) is constructed. That vide judgement dated 12.03.2018, the project of Respondent was not included in tainted projects which clearly meant

that respondent could commence construction subject to renewal of licenses and other permissions. Shortly after the stay was lifted on 12.03.2018, M/s Paradise Systems Pvt. Ltd. approached DTCP for renewal of license to begin construction which was granted to them on 23.07.2018 and thereafter the respondent has developed the said project which is almost complete and was left for some finishing works and interiors. It shall be pertinent to mention that while renewing the license the entire period of 24.04.2015 till 12.03.2018 was exempted as Zero period by DTCP.

18. later on, the HSIIDC filed an application in the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India dated 01.07.2019 through M.A. No. 50 of 2019 in the matter of Rameshwar Vs. State of Haryana & Ors. CA 8788 of 2015 being "Application for Clarification of Final Judgment dated 12.03.2018 passed by this Hon'ble Court". It is submitted that the Hon'ble Supreme Court through its order dated 13.10.2020 again granted an injunction on further construction of projects of the parties to the said case including M/s. Paradise Systems Pvt. Ltd. project of Baani Center Point. The relevant portion of the said order stated that: - "Pending further considerations, no third-party rights shall be created and no fresh development in respect of the entire 268 acres of land shall be undertaken. All three aforesaid developers are injuncted from creating any fresh third-party rights and going ahead with development of unfinished works at the Site except those related to maintenance and upkeep of the site". That

finally through the recent judgment on 21.07.2022, the stay on construction was cleared by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in M.A. 50 of 2019 in the matter of Rameshwar Vs. State of Haryana & Ors. CA 8788 of 2015. vide letter dated 26.07.2022 the complainant was informed that the project has been cleared from stay on construction and creation of third-party interests, by Supreme Court vide order dated 21.07.2022. The respondent vide letter dated 25.07.2022 has also applied for renewal of license and other permissions from DTCP which is awaited. It is also important to mention that the project was registered with RERA vide registration no. 187 of 2017 and after the judgment of Supreme Court the respondent has filed an application for extension of the registration under section 7 sub clause 3 dated 04.08.2022.

19. After consideration of all the facts and circumstances, authority is of view that the matter concerns two distinct periods: from 24.04.2015 to 12.03.2018 and from 13.10.2020 to 21.07.2022. The respondent collected payments and executed buyer's agreements during the first period, i.e. 24.04.2015 to 12.03.2018, which indicates their active involvement in real estate transactions. Further, it is important to note that during the "stay period", the respondent -builder raised demands which are reproduced below as:

Demand Raised On	Demand Raised ON Account Of
01.12.2014	On commencement of work at site

03.11.2015	On laying of raft
03.02.2016	On casting of 3 rd basement roof slab
20.12.2016	On casting of 1 st basement roof slab
24.10.2017	On casting of 4 th floor roof slab
08.01.2018	On completion of super structure
21.08.2019	VAT

20. As per aforementioned details, the respondent has raised the demands during the period in which 'stay' was imposed. Also, the builder continued construction activities unabated thereafter concurrently received payments from the allottees and even executed buyer's agreement during that time. This sustained course of action strongly suggests that the builder possessed the capability to fulfill their contractual obligations despite the purported hindrances. Hence, granting them a zero period for the purpose of completion of the project would essentially negate their involvement and the actions they took during that time. Therefore, it is justifiable to conclude that the respondent is not entitled to a zero period and should be held accountable for their actions during the stay period.

21. However, during the period 13.10.2020 to 21.07.2022, there were specific directions for stay on further construction/development works in the said project passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in M.A No. 50 of 2019 vide order dated 21.07.2022 which was in operation from 13.10.2020 to 21.07.2022 and there is no evidence that the

respondent did not comply with such order. The Authority observes that During this period, there was no construction carried out in the project nor any demands made by the respondent from the allottees. In view of the above, the promoter cannot be held responsible for delayed possession interest during this period. Therefore, in the interest of equity, no interest shall be payable by the complainant as well as respondent from 13.10.2020 to 21.07.2022 in view of the stay order Hon'ble Supreme Court on further construction/development works on the said project.

22. In the present complaint, the complainants intend to continue with the project and is 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."

23. As per clause 7 of the buyer agreement, the time schedule for completing the project as disclosed at the time of registration of the project with the Authority and towards handing over the premises alongwith parking to the allottee and the common areas to the association of allottees or the competent Authority, as the case may be, as provided under Rule 2(1)(f) of Rules, 2017. However, the respondent

builder has confirmed that the due date of possession is 30.03.2018, as determined in other similar cases. Therefore, the due date of possession comes out to be 30.03.2018.

24. **Admissibility of delay possession charges at prescribed rate of interest:** The complainants are seeking delay possession charges. 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.

25. 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.
26. 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., 13.12.2024 is 9.10%. Accordingly, the prescribed rate of interest will be marginal cost of lending rate +2% i.e., 11.10%.

27. The definition of term 'interest' as defined under section (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;"*

28. On consideration of the documents available on record and submissions made by both the parties regarding contravention of provisions of the Act, the authority is satisfied that the respondents is in contravention of the section 11(4)(a) of the Act by not handing over possession by the due date as per the agreement. As per clause 7 of the buyer agreement, the time schedule for completing the project as disclosed at the time of registration of the project with the Authority and towards handing over the premises alongwith parking to the allottee and the common areas to the association of allottees or the competent Authority, as the case





may be, as provided under Rule 2(1)(f) of Rules, 2017. However, the respondent builder has confirmed that the due date of possession is 30.03.2018, as determined in other similar cases. Therefore, the due date of possession comes out to be 30.03.2018.

29. It is pertinent to mention over here that even after a passage of more than 6 years neither the construction is complete nor the offer of possession of the allotted unit has been made to the allottee by the respondent/promoters. The authority is of the view that the allottee cannot be expected to wait endlessly for taking possession of the unit which is allotted to him and for which he has paid a considerable amount of money towards the sale consideration. Further, the authority observes that there is no document placed on record from which it can be ascertained that whether the respondents have applied for occupation certificate/part occupation 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.
30. Accordingly, the non-compliance of the mandate contained in section 11(4)(a) read with proviso to section 18(1) of the Act on the part of the respondent is established. As such, the allottees shall be paid, by the promoter, interest for every month of delay from due date of possession i.e., 30.03.2018 till valid offer of possession after obtaining occupation 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. No interest shall be payable by the respondent as well as complainant from 13.10.2020 to 21.07.2022 in view of judgement of Hon'ble Supreme Court wherein this was explicitly instructed to cease any further development in the project.

E.II Direct the respondent to handover the possession of the unit after obtaining occupation certificate from the concerned Authority.

31. Since the possession has not been offered, the respondent builder is directed to handover the possession of the unit after obtaining occupation certificate from the concerned Authority.

E.III Direct the respondent to execute the conveyance deed in favour of the complainant.

32. As per section 11(4)(f) and section 17(1) of the Act of 2016, the promoter is under obligation to get the conveyance deed executed in favour of the complainant. Whereas as per section 19(11) of the Act of 2016, the allottee is also obligated to participate towards registration of the conveyance deed of the unit in question. The respondent is directed to get the conveyance deed executed in favour of the complainant after obtaining occupation certificate from the competent Authority.

E.IV Direct the respondent not to raise any payment demands in violation of the provisions of the Act of 2016/or contrary to the terms of the agreement

33. The respondent builder is directed not to charge anything which is not part of buyer agreement.

H. Directions of the authority

34. 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):

- i. The respondent is directed to pay interest to each of the complainant(s) against the paid-up amount at the prescribed rate of interest i.e., 11.10% p.a. for every month of delay from the due date of possession 30.03.2018 till valid offer of possession after obtaining occupation certificate, plus two months or actual handing over of possession, whichever is earlier as per proviso to section 18(1) of the Act read with rule 15 of the rules. No interest shall be payable by the respondent and complainant from 13.10.2020 to 21.07.2022 in view of the stay order Hon'ble Supreme Court on further construction/development works on the said project.
- ii. The arrears of such interest accrued from due date of possession of each case till the date of this 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 allottee(s) before 10th of the subsequent month as per rule 16(2) of the rules.
- iii. The complainants are directed to pay outstanding dues, if any, after adjustment of interest for the delayed period.

- iv. The respondent-builder is directed not to charge anything which is not part of buyer agreement.
 - v. The respondent is directed to offer the possession of the allotted unit within 30 days after obtaining occupation certificate from the competent authority. The complainants w.r.t. obligation conferred upon them under section 19(10) of Act of 2016, shall take the physical possession of the subject unit, within a period of two months of the occupancy certificate.
 - 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 respondents/promoters 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. No interest shall be payable by the respondent and complainant from 13.10.2020 to 21.07.2022 in view of the stay order Hon'ble Supreme Court on further construction/development works on the said project.
35. Complaint stands disposed of.
36. File be consigned to registry.


Ashok Sangwan
Member

Haryana Real Estate Regulatory Authority, Gurugram

Dated: 13.12.2024