BEFORE THE HARYANA REAL ESTATE REGULATORY AUTHORITY, GURUGRAM

Complaint no. : **8131 of 2022**
Date of decision : **18.03.2025**

Mr. Ajay Singh
R/o: - House No. 116, Housing Board Colony, Sector-7, Extension, Gurugram Haryana- 122001. **Complainant**

Versus

M/s Ocean Seven Buildtech Private Limited
Regd. office at: - 505-506, 5th Floor, Tower-B4, Spaze I-Tech Park, Sohna Road, Gurugram-122018. **Respondent**

CORAM:

Shri Arun Kumar **Chairman**
Shri Vijay Kumar Goyal **Member**
Shri Ashok Sangwan **Member**

APPEARANCE:

Shri Harshit Batra (Advocate) **Complainant**
Shri Arun Yadav (Advocate) **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. No.	Particulars	Details
1.	Name of the project	Expressway towers, Sextor-109, Gurugram
2.	Project area	7.5 acres
3.	Nature of project	Group housing colony
4.	RERA registered/not registered	Registered vide 301 of 2017 dated 13.10.2017 till 12.10.2021
5.	DTPC License no.	6 of 2016 dated 16.06.2016
	Validity status	15.06.2021
	Name of licensee	Shree Bhagwan in collaboration with Ocean Seven Buildtech Pvt. Ltd.
6.	Building plan approval dated	26.09.2016
7.	Environment clearance dated	30.11.2017
8.	Unit no.	1201, 12th floor, Tower-5 [Page no. 24 of complaint]
9.	Unit measuring	644 sq. ft. [Carpet area] [Page no. 24 of complaint]
10.	Date of Booking	29.10.2016
11.	Allotment Letter	Not annexed
12.	Date of execution of apartment buyer agreement	29.09.2017 [as per agreement at pg. 22 of complaint]
13.	Possession clause as per buyer's agreement	***5.2 Possession Time*** *"The Company shall sincerely endeavour to complete the construction and offer the possession of the said unit* ***within five years from the date of the receiving of license ("Commitment Period"),*** *but subject to force majeure clause of this Agreement and timely payment of installments by the Allottee(s), However In case the Company*

		completes the construction prior to the period of 5 years the Allottee shall not raise any objection in taking the possession after payment of remaining sale price and other charges stipulated in the Agreement to Sell. The Company, on obtaining certificate for occupation and use by the Competent Authorities shall hand over the said unit to the Allottee for his/her/their occupation and use, subject to the Allottee having complied with all the terms and conditions of the said Policy and Agreement to Sell and payments made as per Payment Plan. It is further agreed by the Allottee that the Developer shall not be liable for delay in completion of construction, in case of force majeure condition and/or the delay is caused due to non-completion of construction of said Complex/building/unit. In the event if a number Allottee(s) are not paying due installments on time or a number of Allottee(s) has withdrawn their application after allotment of unit or a number of units has been cancelled due to non-payment of due installments or otherwise....." [Page no. 34 of complaint]
14.	Possession clause as per affordable group housing policy	***1(IV) of the Affordable Housing Policy, 2013*** *"All such projects shall be required to be necessarily completed within* ***4 years from the approval of building plans or grant of environmental clearance****, whichever is later. This date shall be referred to as the "date of commencement of project" for the purpose of this policy. The licenses shall not be renewed beyond the said 4 years period from the date of commencement of project."*
15.	Due date of possession	30.05.2022 (Calculated as 4 years from date of approval of environment clearance i.e., 30.11.2017 being later as per policy, of 2013 + 6 months as per HARERA notification no. 9/3-2020 dated

		26.05.2020 for the projects having completion date on or after 25.03.2020.)
16.	Date of approval of Building plan	26.09.2016 [as per data available on DTCP website]
17.	Total sale consideration	Rs.26,26,200/- [as per BBA at page no. 27 of complaint]
18.	Total amount paid by the complainant	Rs.23,46,363/- [As alleged by the complainant in his brief fact at page no. 19 of complaint]
19.	Occupation certificate	Not obtained
20.	Offer of possession	Not offered
21.	Loan vide Tri-partite agreement dated 21.12.2017 with SBI Bank and builder-promoter	Rs.21,76,000/-

B. Facts of the complaint

3. The complainant has made the following submissions in the complaint: -

I. That relying on the representations, warranties, and assurances of the respondent about the timely delivery of possession, the complainant booked an apartment in the real estate development of the respondent, known under the name and style of "Expressway Towers" at Sector 109, Gurugram, under the Affordable Housing Policy, 2013. That since the booking of the unit of the complainant till date, the complainant(s) had been continuously harassed by the defaulting conduct of the respondent, which shall be noted as under.

II. That the complainant was allotted an apartment bearing no. 1201, 12th floor, in Tower 5 having 644 sq. ft. carpet area and 100 sq. ft. balcony area in project of respondent named "Expressway Towers" at Sector 109, Gurugram, under the Affordable Housing Policy, 2013 through a builder buyer agreement was 29.09.2017 executed between the parties herein.

III. That after the acceptance of the booking, a builder buyer agreement was given to be executed. That the complainant was made to sign the one-sided arbitrary agreement the terms and conditions of which were fixed and could not have been altered. That the respondent had deviated from the terms and conditions of the Affordable Housing policy, under the said agreement and had malafidely attempted to force its own terms and conditions over the Complainant. For instance, the due date of possession has been malafidely extended over and above the timelines mentioned in the Affordable Housing Policy, 2013. In case of delay in payment, 15% of interest is charged from the complainant under clause 4.5 however, no payment of interest has been noted in case of delay by the respondent. The respondent takes away the right for raising objections in case of alteration in layout plan and design under clause 4.8 of the agreement. Labour cess, VAT and WTC have been noted under clause 4.9(iii), however, the same cannot be legally charged. That succumbing to the one-sided and arbitrary conduct of the respondent, the complainant, who booked the unit with dreams and aspiration of owning his own house, executed the arbitrary agreement. At the outset, it is reiterated that the respondent had unilaterally, unlawfully and arbitrarily extended the due date under the agreement by going beyond the Affordable Housing Policy, 2013, which, under no circumstance whatsoever, can be accepted.

IV. That under the Sec 1(iv) of the Affordable Housing Policy, 2013, the possession of the unit was to be delivered within 4 years from the approval of building plan or grant of environmental clearance, whichever is later. Hence, the due date needs to be computed from the Affordable Housing Policy, 2013. Hence, the due date from 26.09.2020 (building plan) it comes out to be 26.09.2020.

V. That till date, the possession has not been offered and the project is far from being completed. It is a matter of record that no occupancy certificate has been applied till date and the essential services are incomplete in the project. The entire aim of creating affordable living has been miserably violated by the respondent, due to its inordinate delay.

VI. That the respondent failed in complying with all the obligations, not only with respect to the agreement with the complainant but also with respect to the concerned laws, rules, and regulations thereunder, due to which the complainant faced innumerable hardships. Moreover, the respondent made false statements about the progress of the project as and when inquired by the complainant. It is further submitted that taking advantage of the dominant position and malafide intention had restored to unfair trade practices by harassing the complainant by way of delaying the project by diversion of the money from the innocent and gullible buyer.

VII. That in case of delay in the offer of possession, the complainant has a right under proviso of section 18 of the Act to seek delay possession charges till the actual handover of possession. That accordingly, the respondent is bound to make the payment of interest on the amount deposited by the complainant till the actual handover of possession. That the complainant has a statutory right under section 18 of the Act, which, cannot go unnoticed. Hence, for the delay caused in offering the possession, the respondent is liable to pay the complainant the delay possession charges under section 18(1) of the Act r/w rule 15 of Haryana RERA Rules and section 11(4) of the Act, from the due date of possession i.e., 26.09.2020 till actual handover of physical possession after the receipt of occupancy certificate.

VIII. That it is the failure of the promoter to fulfil his obligations, and responsibilities as to hand over the possession within the stipulated period. 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 complainant is entitled to delayed possession at the prescribed rate of interest from the due date till the physical handover of possession as per provisions of section 18(1) of the Act.

IX. That the respondent has utterly failed to fulfil its obligation to deliver the possession of the apartment in time and adhere to the contentions of the agreement which has caused mental agony, harassment, and huge losses to the complainant, hence the present complaint.

X. That the complainant had availed loan facility from SBI bank for a sum of Rs.21,76,000/- and a tripartite agreement was executed on 21.12.2017. That the bank had to disburse the payments to the builder as per the agreed payment plan.

XI. That however, in complete contravention of the same, the respondent demanded monies in complete violation of the agreed payment plan, i.e., before having reached the respective milestone, the respondent demanded the monies from the complainant, which the bank has duly denied. At this instance, it needs to be categorically noted that that as per the RBI rules and regulations, SBI can only disburse the payment to the respondent in accordance with the construction and not otherwise.

XII. That upon the denial being made by the bank, the complainant continuously requested the bank for disbursing the requisite amount as evident from the email dated 28.07.2020, 27.07.2020 and 10.09.2021. However, the bank has categorically refused to do the same because of the premature and invalid demand of the builder which is also evident from the construction linked

payment plan. That the pending/last demand was to be made after the procurement of occupancy certificate only after offer of possession. The bank has communicated to the complainant vide emails dated 26.06.2020 and 28.07.2020, that for disbursal of the remaining amount the offer of possession is required as per the construction linked payment plan, however, to no avail, the respondent kept going on with its *malafide* activity of demanding the payment and threatening the complainant to cancel the unit in case of non-payment of their illegal demand.

XIII. That in such facts and circumstances, it becomes evident that until and unless the development of the project is undergone, no payment can become due. It is a settled matter of law that where the construction of the project is not being done, the allottee is not liable to make the payments. However, the respondent unilaterally, arbitrarily, and wrongfully cancelled the unit on 02.09.2021. The complainant duly replied to the respondent vide email dated 02.09.2021 requesting to recall the cancellation letter and again noting that SBI would release the last instalment only after OC is procured. That however, despite the same, the highly unilateral, arbitrary and wrongful cancellation letter was not set aside by the respondent.

XIV. That the cancellation of the unit of the complainant was highly unilateral for the reasons stated as under:

- Cancellation was done on the basis of non-payment of last installment, demand of which was invalid and premature as the respondent did not received any OC;
- No public notice was issued by the respondent, i.e., violating clause 5(iii)(i) of the Affordable Housing Policy, 2013;
- No refund was ever paid to the complainant, i.e., violating clause 5(iii)(i) of the Affordable Housing Policy, 2013;
- Despite email requesting the withdrawal of cancellation letter, the same was never done by the respondent.

XV. That in the above facts and circumstances of the case, the cancellation letter of the respondent is bound to be set aside and the allotment of the unit.

XVI. That it is a matter of fact that the GST was implemented on 01.07.2017. Thereafter, w.e.f. 01.04.2019, the rates of imposition of GST were revised. For an Affordable Housing Project, the rate that can be charged from the allottee:

- 1% without input tax credit **or**
- 8% with input tax credit;

XVII. That the respondent's demand letter shows that before 2019, 8% GST has been credited. However, no input tax credit benefit has been offered to the complainant. The respondent has been acting in utmost malafide and depriving the complainant from enjoying the benefits reserved to him in law and by the government. That the respondent has always attempted to financially crunch the complainant and take undue benefits over wrongful gain to the complainant, all of which cannot be accepted, under any circumstance whatsoever.

XVIII. That as per the Affordable Housing Policy, 2013 (read with amendment dated 04.01.2021 vide Memo No. PF-27(VOL-III)/2020/2-TCP/41), the parking space is to be provided at the rate of half equivalent car space (ECS) for every unit, and it is unclear as to what amount of parking charge has been levied. Looking at the utter malafide activities of the respondent, the complainant seeks clear bifurcation of the total sale price, including the charge of parking. That in the circumstance, it is seen that an excessive charge is being demanded by the respondent, this Authority may kindly be pleased to direct the respondent to refund the same.

XIX. That moreover, as per the amended Affordable Housing Policy, additional car parking can be provided/sold after deriving consent of 2/3rd of the

allottees. That in complete violation of the same, the builder has been selling the car parking at exorbitant rates and encroaching upon the common areas of the project. That the builder should be restrained from carrying such illegal, *malafide* and unlawful activities in violation of the Affordable Housing Policy, 2013.

XX. That it is a settled position of law that in affordable housing projects, the builder is bound to maintain the project for a span of 5 years from the date of occupancy certificate. Further, the respondent, under the clause 4.9(iii) and (iv) of the agreement has demanded:

- Labour Cess;
- VAT;
- Work Contract Tax;
- Power Backup charges.

XXI. That the respondent seeks to put the additional burden of these costs over the complainant when the same is bound to be paid by the respondent only. Accordingly, the respondent be restrained from raising any such demand from the complainant.

XXII. That the conduct of the respondent has been *malafide* since the very beginning. Despite having gravely defaulted in the construction of the unit, the material being used for construction is sub-par, excess monies are being collected from the allottees, the builder has been committing misappropriation of funds, and stands in violation of the DTCP norms and the mandatory compliance under the Act of 2016. Further, in September 2022, the DTCP had also recommended the cancellation of the license of the projects of the respondent due to its continuous non-compliance.

XXIII. That thereafter, vide another meeting of the allottees, conducted on 04.11.2022, with the Chairman, STP, Gurugram, all of the said issues were categorically highlighted. The Chairman had also suggested the allottees to

approach HRERA for redressal of bilateral issues i.e., forensic financial audit etc. Additionally, the respondent was directed to not sell car parking over the common areas and was required to submit the approved site plan, showing the parking space.

XXIV. That in light of the above, in order to safeguard the interests of the complainant and save the complainant from being wrongfully prejudiced by the unlawful conduct of the respondent and in line with the suggestion of the Chairman, STP, it is most humbly requested that a local commissioner be appointed to carry on the following tasks:

- To ascertain the stage of construction of the project;
- To verify if the construction quality is sub-par;
- To verify the illegal car parking being sold by the respondent;
- To verify is the development is in accordance with the site plan;

XXV. Additionally, a forensic audit of the books of accounts be conducted to verify;

- The total amount of monies collected by the allottees of the project;
- The total amount of monies yet to be collected from the allottees;
- The total amount of monies utilised towards the construction /development of the project;
- The expenditure yet to be incurred towards the construction development of the project;
- If the fund from the allottees is being maintained in the escrow account or not;
- The records of the accountant verifying the disbursement of monies towards expenditure done for the construction/development of the project till date;
- Ascertain whether 70% of the deposit by the allottees was being deposited in a separate bank account.

XXVI. That the registration of the project has been expired since 12.10.2021 and the same has not been renewed till date. That accordingly, the respondent had committed default of section 6 of the RERA Act and hence, penal proceedings in this regard be initiated against the respondent. Moreover,

after an inordinate delay in the project, no specific date for handing over of the possession has been undertaken by the respondent and hence, the respondent should be directed to provide on affidavit, the date by when the valid and legal offer of possession shall be made by the respondent.

C. **Relief sought by the complainant: -**

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

I. To restrain the respondent from creating third party interest in the unit.
II. To set aside the cancellation letter dated 02.09.2021, and restore the allotment of the unit.
III. To appoint a local commissioner to carry out the tasks as mentioned in para 39 of the complaint;
IV. To conduct a forensic audit of the books of accounts of the respondent as per task mentioned in para 40 of the Complaint;
V. To direct the respondent to provide on affidavit, a date till which a valid offer of possession shall be given. If the Respondent fails to provide the same, penal proceedings for violation of section 4(2)(l)(C) be initiated against the respondent.
VI. To direct the respondent to provide a valid physical possession after receipt of occupancy certificate;
VII. To direct the respondent to give delayed possession charges @ MCLR+2% from 26.09.2020 till the date of actual physical possession at the prescribed rate of interest;
VIII. To direct the respondent to give anti-profiteering credit/input tax credit to the complainant;
IX. To direct the respondent to execute the conveyance deed after offering valid offer of possession to the complainant;
X. To restrain the respondent from demanding Labour Cess, VAT, Work Contract Tax and Power Backup charges;
XI. To direct the respondent to give bifurcation of the total sale price including the clarification of cost of parking under the Affordable Housing Policy, 2013;

XII. To restrain the respondent from charging any maintenance charges in future as the complainant is not bound to pay the same under the Affordable Housing Policy, 2013;

XIII. To restrain the respondent from demanding car parking charges from the Complainant;

XIV. To take action for violation of section 6, i.e., non-extension of registration of the Act;

XV. Grant any other relief as this Hon'ble Authority deems fit in the peculiar facts and circumstances of the present complaint.

5. The present complaint was filed on 30.01.2023. Despite multiple opportunities to the respondent, the respondent has failed to file reply and in view of the same, the defence of the respondent was struck of by the authority vide order dated 13.08.2024.

D. Written submission by the respondent

6. The respondent is contesting the complaint on the following grounds:

I. That this Authority lacks jurisdiction to adjudicate upon the present complaint as vide clause 16.2 of the builder buyer agreement both the parties have unequivocally agreed to resolve any disputes through arbitration.

II. That the complainant is a willful defaulter and deliberately, intentionally and knowingly have not paid timely instalments.

III. That starting from February 2023, the construction activities have been severely impacted due to the suspension of the license and the freezing of accounts by the DTCP Chandigarh and HRERA Gurugram, respectively. This suspension and freezing of accounts represent a force majeure event beyond the control of the respondent. The suspension of the license and freezing of accounts, starting from Feb 2023 till date, have created a zero-time scenario for the respondent. Further, there is no delay on the part of

the respondent project as it is covered under clause number 5.5 force Majeure, which is beyond control of the respondent.

IV. That the final EC is CTE/CTO which has been received by the respondent in February 2018. Hence the start date of project is Feb 2018 and rest details are as follows.

Covid and NGT Restrictictions	
Project completion Date	Feb-22
Covid lock down waiver	18 months
NGT stay (3 months approx. for every year)i.e. 6*3	18 months
Total Time extended to be extended (18+18) months	36 months
Accounts freezed & license suspended	Feb 2023 till date
further time to be extended till the unfreezing of the accounts i.e. Feb- Nov 2023 (10 months)	Nov-23
Final project completion date (in case project is unfreezed) further time would be added till unfreezing the accounts	Nov-25

As per the table given above, the final date for the completion of construction is Feb 25 in case the accounts are unfreezed by the competent authority on the date of filing this reply. From Feb 2023, the license has been suspended and accounts have been freezed by the DTCP Chandigarh and HRERA Gurugram.

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 complainant.

8. The complainant and respondent have filed the written submissions on 12.02.2025 and 13.02.2025 respectively, which is taken on record and has been considered by the Authority while adjudicating upon the relief sought by the complainant.

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 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

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) 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.

F. Findings on objections raised by the respondent in the written submission:-

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

13. 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.

14. 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.

F.II Objections regarding force majeure.

15. The respondent/promoter has raised the contention that the construction of the project has been delayed due to force majeure circumstances such as ban on construction due to orders passed by NGT, major spread of Covid-19 across worldwide, suspension of license by the DTCP, Chandigarh and freezing of accounts by HRERA Gurugram etc. which is beyond the control of the respondent and are covered under clause 5.5 of the agreement. The respondent has further submitted that suspension of the license and freezing of accounts, starting from Feb 2023 till date have created a zero-time scenario for the respondent. Furthermore, the final EC is CTE/CTO which has been received by the respondent in February 2018, hence the start date of project is Feb 2018. Moreover, the respondent company has filed the representation that the final

completion date (incase project is unfreeze) further time would be added till unfreezing the accounts as the due date of possession may be considered as March 2026. The counsel for the respondent during proceeding dated 19.11.2024, stated that the due date of possession may be calculated from the date of 'consent to establish' i.e. 05.02.2018 which comes out to be 05.02.2022 and further requests to allow the grace period due to force majeure circumstances i.e., Covid-2019, ban imposed by NGT from time to time. Moreover, the delay was happened due to agitation by the members of Association of allottees who obstruct the construction work at site as a result the DTCP has cancelled the license on 23.02.2023, vide Memo No. LC-3089-PA(VA)-2023/5475 and even the Authority had frozen all the bank accounts of the respondent company. The counsel for the respondent has placed on record a report of Chartered Engineer dated 14.05.2024 vide which bringing out the financial losses caused by the delayed payments and escalated material costs due to delayed payment by the allottees. However, all the pleas advanced in this regard are devoid of merits. The Authority is of considered view that the provisions of zero period is neither provided in the Act of 2016 nor in the Affordable Group Housing Policy 2013. Therefore, the due date of possession is calculated as per clause 1(iv) of the Affordable Housing Policy, 2013 it is prescribed that *"All such projects 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. This date shall be referred to as the "date of commencement of project" for the purpose of this policy.* The respondent has obtained environment clearance and building plan approval in respect of the said project on 30.11.2017 and 26.09.2016 respectively. Therefore, the due date of possession is being calculated from the date of environmental clearance, being later. Further, an extension of 6 months is granted to the respondent in

view of notification no. 9/3-2020 dated 26.05.2020, on account of outbreak of Covid-19 pandemic. Therefore, the due date of possession was 30.05.2022. As far as other contentions of the respondent w.r.t delay in construction of the project is concerned, the same are disallowed as firstly the orders passed by NGT banning construction in the NCR region was for a very short period of time and thus, cannot be said to impact the respondent-builder leading to such a delay in the completion. Secondly, the license of the project of the respondent was suspended by DTCP, Haryana vide memo dated 23.02.2023, due to grave violations made by it in making compliance of the terms and conditions of the license. In view of the same and to protect the interest of the allottees, the bank account of the respondent related to the project was frozen by this Authority vide order dated 24.02.2023. It is well settled principle that a person cannot take benefit of his own wrong.

G. **Findings on the relief sought by the complainant.**

G.I To restrain the respondent from creating third-party interest in the unit.

G.II to set aside the cancellation letter dated 02.09.2021 and restore the allotment of the unit.

16. The complainant was allotted a unit bearing no. 1201, 12th floor, in tower-5, in the project of the respondent at the sale consideration of Rs.26,26,200/- under the Affordable Group Housing Policy 2013. A buyer's agreement was executed of the said allotted unit of the complainant on 29.07.2017. The possession of the unit was to be offered within 4 years from the approval of building plans (26.09.2016) or from the date of environment clearance (30.11.2017), whichever is later, which comes out to be 30.11.2021 calculated from the date of environment clearance being later. Further, as per HARERA notification no. 9/3-2020 dated 26.05.2020, an extension of 6 months is granted for the project having completion date on or after 25.03.2020. The completion date of the aforesaid project in which the subject unit is being allotted to the complainant

is 30.11.2021 i.e., after 25.03.2020. Therefore, an extension of 6 months is to be given over and above the due date of handing over of possession the due date of possession in view of notification no. 9/3-2020 dated 26.05.2020, on account of force majeure conditions due to outbreak of Covid-19 pandemic. Therefore, the due date of handing over of possession comes out to be 30.05.2022. The complainant has paid a sum of Rs.23,46,363/- towards the subject unit, and the complainant is ready and willing to retain the allotted unit in question.

17. That the counsel for the respondent stated that the complainant was default in making payment after giving demand notice cum reminders letter. But in spite of repeated reminders, the payment of outstanding amount was not made leading to cancellation of the unit on 02.09.2021. The OC of the unit has not been obtained by the respondent and no offer of possession was made prior to the cancellation.

18. Upon perusal of documents and submissions made by the complainant, it has been found that allotment of the subject unit was cancelled by the respondent on 02.09.2021 due to non-payment. The foremost question which arise before the Authority for the purpose of adjudication is that "whether the said cancellation is valid or not?

19. The Authority observes that clause 5(i) of the Affordable Group Housing Policy, 2013 deals with the cancellation and the relevant clause is reproduced below: -

> *"If any successful applicant fails to deposit the installments within the time period as prescribed in the allotment letter issued by the colonizer, **a reminder may be issued to him for depositing the due installments within a period of 15 days from the date of issue of such notice**. If the allottee still defaults in making the payment, the list of such defaulters may be published in one regional Hindi newspaper having circulation of more than ten thousand in the State for payment of due amount within **15 days from the date of publication of such notice, failing which allotment may be cancelled. In such cases also an amount of Rs.25,000/-** may be deducted by the coloniser and the balance amount shall be refunded to the applicant. Such flats may be considered by the committee for offer to those applicants falling in the waiting list".*

20. On 21.07.2021, the respondent raised a demand for an amount of Rs.3,68,263/- (page no. 73 of complaint) to be paid within a period of 15 days from the date

of said letter. The respondent vide letter dated 02.09.2021, cancelled the allotted unit of the complainant. The Authority observes that the complainant has paid approx. 90% of the sale consideration and the respondent was required to handover the possession of the unit on or before 30.05.2022 including grace period of 6 months, the respondent failed to complete the construction of the project. More than two years later, the project remains incomplete and the respondent has not obtained the occupation certificate. Further, the interest accrued during the delay period significantly reduces the amount payable by the complainant. Upon adjustment of this interest, the respondent would, in fact be liable to pay the complainant. Despite this, the respondent chose the cancel the unit on grounds of non-payment, while neglecting its own obligations. Such actions by the respondent displays bad faith, as it failed to adjust the delay period interest. Further, the respondent failed to fulfil the prerequisite of publishing the due notice in the daily newspaper. Therefore, the prescribed procedure as per clause 5(iii)(i) of the policy of 2013 had not been followed by the respondent to cancel the unit of the complainant. In light of these findings, the cancellation of the allotment on 02.09.2021, is deemed invalid and hereby quashed as issued in bad faith.

G.III Direct the respondent to give delayed possession charges at the prescribed rate i.e., MCLR+2% from 26.09.2020 till the date of actual physical possession at the prescribed rate of interest.

G.IV Direct the respondent to execute the conveyance deed after offering valid offer of possession to the complainant.

21. The complainant intends 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."

22. As per clause 5.2 talks about the possession of the unit to the complainants, the relevant portion is reproduce as under:-

> ***"5.2 Possession Time***
> *The Company shall sincerely endeavor* ***to complete the construction and offer the possession of the said unit within five years from the date of the receiving of license ("Commitment Period"), but subject to force majeure clause of this Agreement and timely payment of installments by the Allottee(s).*** *However in case the Company completes the construction prior to the period of* ***5 years the Allottee shall not raise any objection in taking the possession after payment of remaining sale price and other charges stipulated in the Agreement to Sell.*** *The Company on obtaining certificate for occupation and use by the Competent Authorities shall hand over the said unit to the Allottee for his/her/their occupation and use, subject to the Allottee having complied with all the terms and conditions of the said Policy and Agreement to sell and payments made as per Payment Plan."*

23. At the outset, it is relevant to comment on the preset possession clause of the agreement wherein the possession has been subjected to all kinds of terms and conditions of this agreement and application, and the complainant not being in default under any provisions of these agreements and compliance with all provisions, formalities and documentation as prescribed by the promoter. 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 allottees that even a single default by the allottees in fulfilling formalities and documentations etc. as prescribed by the promoter may make the possession clause irrelevant for the purpose of allottees and the commitment date for handing over possession loses its meaning. The incorporation of such clause in the buyer's agreement by the promoter is not only in grave violation of clause 1(iv) of the Affordable Housing Policy, 2013, but also deprive the allottees of their 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 allottees are left with no option but to sign on the dotted lines.

24. Clause 1(iv) of the Affordable Housing Policy, 2013 provides for completion of all such projects licenced under it and the same is reproduced as under for ready reference:

> *1 (iv)*
> *"All such projects 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. This date shall be referred to as the "date of commencement of project" for the purpose of the policy."*

25. **Due date of handing over of possession:** As per clause 1(iv) of the Affordable Housing Policy, 2013 it is prescribed that *"All such projects 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. This date shall be referred to as the "date of commencement of project" for the purpose of this policy.* The respondent has obtained environment clearance and building plan approval in respect of the said project on 30.11.2017 and 26.09.2016 respectively. Therefore, the due date of possession is being calculated from the date of environmental clearance, being later. Further, an extension of 6 months is granted to the respondent in view of notification no. 9/3-2020 dated 26.05.2020, on account of outbreak of Covid-19 pandemic. Therefore, the due date of possession comes out to be 30.05.2022.

26. **Admissibility of delay possession charges at 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.

27. 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.

28. 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., 18.03.2025 is 9.10%. Accordingly, the prescribed rate of interest will be marginal cost of lending rate +2% i.e., 11.10%.

29. 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;"

30. Therefore, interest on the delay payments from the complainant shall be charged at the prescribed rate i.e., 11.10% by the respondent/promoter which is the

same as is being granted to the complainant in case of delayed possession charges.

31. On consideration of the documents available on record and submissions made by both the parties, the authority is satisfied that the respondent 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. By virtue of clause 1(iv) of the Affordable Housing Policy, 2013, the respondent/promoter shall be necessarily required to complete the construction of the project within 4 years from the date of approval of building plans or grant of environmental clearance, whichever is later. Therefore, in view of the findings given above, the due date of handing over of possession was 30.05.2022. However, the respondent has failed to handover possession of the subject apartment to the complainant till the 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. Further, there is no document available on record to substantiate the claim of the respondent. Accordingly, the claim of the respondent is rejected being devoid of merits. Moreover, the authority observes that there is no document on record from which it can be ascertained as to whether the respondent has applied for 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.

32. 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 allottee shall be paid, by the promoter, interest for every month of delay from due date of possession i.e., 30.05.2022 till valid offer of possession plus 2 months 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.

33. Further, as per section 11(4)(f) and section 17(1) of the Act of 2016, the promoter is under an 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. However, there is nothing on the record to show that the respondent has applied for occupation certificate or what is the status of the development of the above-mentioned project. In view of the above, the respondent is directed to handover possession of the flat/unit and execute conveyance deed in favour of the complainant in terms of section 17(1) of the Act of 2016 on payment of stamp duty and registration charges as applicable, within three months after obtaining occupation certificate from the competent authority.

G.V To appoint a local commissioner to carry out the tasks as mentioned in para 39 of the complaint;

G.VI To conduct a forensic audit of the books of accounts of the respondent as per task mentioned in para 40 of the complaint.

G.VII To take action for violation of section 6, i.e., non-extension of registration of the Act.

G.VIII Direct the respondent to provide on affidavit, a date till which a valid offer of possession shall be given. If the respondent fails to provide the same, penal proceedings for violation of section 4(2)(l)(C) be initiated against the respondent.

34. The complainant has sought some other reliefs such as appointment of L.C, conduct forensic audit of the books of accounts of the respondent, initiation of penal proceedings for violation of Section 4(2)(l)(c), Section 6 of the Act, 2016 etc. The Authority observes that due to several continuing violations of the provisions of the Act, 2016 by the respondent, the Authority has already taken Suo motu cognizance of the project vide complaint bearing no. ***RERA-GRG-1087-***

2023 and freezed the bank account of the respondent related to the project vide order dated 24.02.2023. Therefore, the authority is proceeding to decide only the main relief sought by the complainant in the present complaint i.e., delay possession charges, possession and execution of conveyance deed on the basis of documents available on record as well as submission made by the parties.

G.IX Direct the respondent to provide a valid physical possession after receipt of occupancy certificate.

35. The respondent is legally bound to meet the pre-requisites for obtaining occupation certificate from the competent authority. It is unsatiated that even after the lapse of more than 2 years from the due date of possession the respondent has failed to complete the construction and apply for OC to the competent authority. The promoter is duty bound to obtain OC and hand over possession only after obtaining OC.

G.X Direct the respondent to give bifurcation of the total sale price including the clarification of cost of parking under the Affordable Housing Policy, 2013.

G.XI To restrain the respondent from demanding car parking charges from the complainants.

36. Since, the said project is the affordable housing project and as per the latest amendment dated 04.01.2021 in the said Policy 2013, which it is reproduce as under:-

> 4. *The clause no. 4(iii) of the Affordable Housing Policy dated 19thAugust, 2013 related to parking norms shall be substituted with the following:-*
> *"**4(iii) Parking Norms**:*
> *a. Mandatory non-chargeable 0.5 ECS parking space*
> *i. Mandatory parking space at the rate of half Equivalent Car Space (ECS) for each dwelling unit shall be provided.*
> *ii. Only one two-wheeler parking site shall be earmarked for each flat, which shall be allotted only to the flat-owners. The parking bay of two-wheelers shall be 0.8m x 2.5m unless otherwise specified in the zoning plan.*
> *iii. The balance available parking space, if any, beyond the allocated two-wheeler parking sites, can be earmarked as free-visitor-car-parking space.*

b. *Optional and chargeable parking space at the rate of 0.5 ECS per dwelling unit.*

i. *The colonizer may provide an additional and optional parking space, maximum to the extent of half Equivalent Car Space (ECS) per dwelling unit*

ii. *In case such optional parking space is provided by the coloniser; maximum of one car parking space per dwelling unit can be allotted by the coloniser, at a rate not exceeding 5% of the cost of flat to such allottee.*

c. *Miscellaneous*

i. *In cases where licenses under AHP 2013 already stand granted and building plans stand approved without availing the optional 0.5 ECS per dwelling unit parking space, the coloniser shall be required to submit the consent of at least two thirds of the allottees as per the provisions of Section 14 of Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016, for the purpose of amendment in building plans for availing such additional and optional 0.5 ECS per dwelling unit parking space. Further, this benefit shall not be available for the projects wherein occupation certificate of all the residential towers has already been obtained.*

ii. *Additional parking norms and parameters, if any, can be specified in the zoning plan."*

37. In view of the above provisions, the respondent/promoter is bound to comply the terms and condition of the Affordable Group Housing Policy, 2013 accordingly, no direction w.r.t. the same can be deliberated by the authority at this stage.

G.XII Direct the respondent to give anti-profiteering credit/input tax credit to the complainants.

38. The complainant has sought the relief with regard to direct the respondent to give anti-profiteering credit/input tax credit to the complainants and charge the GST as per rules and regulations, the attention of the authority was drawn to the fact that the legislature while framing the GST law specifically provided for anti-profiteering measures as a check and to maintain the balance in the inflation of cost on the product/services due to change in migration to a new tax regime i.e. GST, by incorporating section 171 in Central Goods and Services Tax Act, 2017/Haryana Goods and Services Tax Act, 2017, the same is reproduced herein below.

"Section 171. (1) Any reduction in rate of tax on any supply of goods or services or the benefit of input tax credit shall be passed on to the recipient by way of commensurate reduction in prices."

39. As per the above provision, the benefit of tax reduction or 'Input Tax Credit' is required to be passed onto the customers in view of section 171 of HGST/CGST Act, 2017. In the event, the respondent/promoter has not passed the benefit of ITC to the buyers of the unit in contravention to the provisions of section 171(1) of the HGST Act, 2017. The allottee is at liberty to approach the State Screening Committee Haryana for initiating proceedings under section 171 of the HGST Act against the respondent-promoter.

G.XIII To restrain the respondent from charging any maintenance charges in future as the complainant is not bound to pay the same under the Affordable Housing Policy, 2013.

40. As per the clarification regarding maintenance charges to be levied on affordable group housing projects being given by DTCP, Haryana vide clarification no. PF-27A/2024/3676 dated 31.01.2024, it is very clearly mentioned that the utility charges (which includes electricity bill, water bill, property tax waste collection charges or any repair inside the individual flat etc.) can be charged from the allottees as per consumptions.

41. Accordingly, the respondent is directed to charge the maintenance/use /utility charges from the complainants-allottees as per consumptions basis as has been clarified by the Directorate of Town and Country Planning, Haryana vide clarification dated 31.01.2024.

G.XIV To restrain the respondent from demanding Labour Cess, VAT, Work Contract Tax and Power Backup charges.

42. The complainant has sought the relief to restrain the respondent from demanding Labour Cess, VAT, WCT and power backup charges. Although, as per record, no demand under the above said heads have been made by the respondent till date, however in clause 4.9 (iii) and (iv) of the buyer's agreement dated 17.06.2017, it has been mentioned that the allottee is liable to pay

separately the above-said charges as per the demands raised by the respondent company. Therefore, in the interest of justice and to avoid further litigation, the Authority is deliberating its findings on the above said charges.

- **Labour Cess:-** The labour cess is levied @ 1% on the cost of construction incurred by an employer as per the provisions of sections 3(1) and 3(3) of the Building and Other Construction Workers' Welfare Cess Act, 1996 read with Notification No. S.O 2899 dated 26.09.1996. It is levied and collected on the cost of construction incurred by employers including contractors under specific conditions. Moreover, this issue has already been dealt with by the authority in complaint bearing no. 962 of 2019 titled ***Mr. Sumit Kumar Gupta and Anr. Vs Sepset Properties Private Limited*** wherein it was held that since labour cess is to be paid by the respondent, as such no labour cess should be separately charged by the respondent. The Authority is of the view that the allottee is neither an employer nor a contractor and labour cess is not a tax but a fee. Thus, the demand of labour cess raised upon the complainants is completely arbitrary and the complainants cannot be made liable to pay any labour cess to the respondent and it is the respondent builder who is solely responsible for the disbursement of said amount.
- **VAT:-** The promoter is entitled to charge VAT from the allottees where the same was leviable, at the applicable rate, if they have not opted for composition scheme. However, if composition scheme has been availed, no VAT is leviable. Further, the promoter shall charge actual VAT from the allottees/prospective buyers paid by the promoter to the concerned department/authority on pro-rata basis i.e. depending upon the area of the flat allotted to the complainant vis- à-vis the total area of the particular project. However, the complainant would also be entitled to proof of such

payments to the concerned department along with a computation proportionate to the allotted unit, before making payment under the aforesaid heads.

- **WTC (work contract tax):-** The complainant is seeking above mentioned relief with respect to restraining the respondent from demanding Work Contract Tax. At this stage, it is important to stress upon the definition of term 'work contract' under Section 2(119) of the CGST Act, 2017 and the same is reproduced below for ready reference:

> *"(119) — works contract means a contract for building, construction, fabrication, completion, erection, installation, fitting out, improvement, modification, repair, maintenance, renovation, alteration or commissioning of any immovable property wherein transfer of property in goods (whether as goods or in some other form) is involved in the execution of such contract;"*

After considering the above, the Authority is of the view that the complainant/allottee is neither an employer nor a contractor and the same is not applicable in the present case. Thus, the complainant /allottee cannot be made liable to pay the same to the respondent.

- **Power Backup Charges:-** The issue of power back-up charges has already been clarified by the office of DTCP, Haryana vide office order dated 31.01.2024 wherein it has categorically clarified the mandatory services to be provided by the colonizer/developer in affordable group housing colonies and services for which maintenance charges can be charged from the allottees as per consumption. According, the promoter can only charge maintenance/use/utility charges from the complainant-allottees as per consumption as prescribed in category-II of the office order dated 31.01.2024.

H. Directions of the authority

43. 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 cancellation letter dated 02.09.2021 is hereby set aside. The respondent is directed to re instate the allotted unit or if the same is not available then allot an alternate unit of the same size, similar location and same price as originally booked by the complainant within a period of 15 days from the date of this order.

ii. The respondent/promoter is directed to pay interest to the complainant(s) against the paid-up amount at the prescribed rate of 11.10% p.a. for every month of delay from the due date of possession i.e., 30.05.2022 till valid offer of possession plus 2 months 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.

iii. The arrears of such interest accrued from 30.05.2022 till the date of order by the authority shall be paid by the promoter to the allottee(s) 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 allottee(s) before 10th of the subsequent month as per rule 16(2) of the rules.

iv. The respondent/promoter is directed to supply a copy of the updated statement of account after adjusting delay possession charges within a period of 15 days to the complainant.

v. The complainant(s) are directed to pay outstanding dues, if any, after adjustment delay possession charges within a period of 30 days from the date of receipt of updated statement of account.

vi. The respondent/promoter shall handover possession of the physical possession of the allotted unit and execute conveyance deed in favour of the

complainant(s) in terms of section 17(1) of the Act of 2016 on payment of stamp duty and registration charges as applicable, within three months after obtaining occupation certificate from the competent authority.

vii. The respondent/promoter shall not charge anything from the complainant(s) which is not the part of the buyer's agreement or provided under the Affordable Housing Policy, 2013.

viii. The rate of interest chargeable from the allottee(s) 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 allottee(s), in case of default i.e., the delayed possession charges as per section 2(za) of the Act.

44. Complaint as well as applications, if any, stand disposed off accordingly.

45. Files be consigned to registry.

(Ashok Sangwan)
Member

(Vijay Kumar Goyal)
Member

(Arun Kumar)
Chairman
Haryana Real Estate Regulatory Authority, Gurugram

Dated: 18.03.2025