

Shine Buildcon Pvt. Ltd.
Vs.
Umesh Vashishth and another
CM.No. 123 of 2025
In Appeal No. 909 of 2024

Argued by: Mr. Akshat Mittal, Advocate for the appellant.

Accompanying appeal has been filed against the order passed by the Authority at Gurugram directing the promoter to pay interest at the rate of 11.10% per annum for every month of delay from the due date of possession i.e. 12.5.2019 till the date of offer of possession i.e. 15.10.2023 plus two months i.e. 15.12.2023.

2. Present application has been moved by the applicant-appellant (Shine Buildcon Pvt. Ltd.) stating therein that no amount in lieu of pre-deposit needs to be deposited for entertaining the instant appeal in view of calculation sheet furnished by the appellant. It is claimed that the order is in the nature of cross decree, thus, if adjustment as shown in the calculation sheet is made, requirement of pre-deposit as contained in proviso to Section 43(5) of the Act would be obviated.

3. Learned counsel for the appellant has vehemently contended that he is not liable to make any pre-deposit in view of grounds taken in the application and calculation sheet annexed therewith. He has also placed reliance on the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Newtech Promoters and Developers Pvt. Ltd. v. State of UP and others, 2022(1) RCR (Civil) 357.***

4. I have heard learned counsel for the appellant and have given careful thoughts to the facts of the case.

5. At the outset, it is necessary to refer to Section 43(5) of the Act, which reads as under:-

“43(5) Any person aggrieved by any direction or decision or order made by the Authority or by an adjudicating officer under this Act may prefer an appeal before the Appellate tribunal having [jurisdiction] over the matter:

Provided that where a promoter files an appeal with the Appellate Tribunal, it shall not be [entertained], without the [promoter] first having deposited with the Appellate Tribunal atleast thirty per cent. of the penalty, or such higher percentage as may be determined by the Appellate Tribunal, or the total amount to be paid to the allottee including interest and compensation imposed on him, in any, or with both, as the case may be, before the said appeal is heard.

6. Aforesaid provision was subject-matter of interpretation in ***Newtech Promoters and Developers Pvt. Ltd.’s case (supra)*** . A plea was advanced therein that the right of appeal cannot remain dependent on fulfilment of pre-deposit, which is otherwise onerous on the builder as this condition has been incorporated for the builders alone, thus, discriminatory in nature. A promoter, who is in financial distress may be incapable of depositing the full computed amount, thus, making his right to file appeal nugatory.

7. Hon'ble Supreme Court considered this plea and held as under:-

“125. The submission in the first blush appears to be attractive but is not sustainable in law for the reason that a perusal of scheme of the Act makes it clear that the limited rights and duties are provided on the shoulders of the allottees under Section 19 of the Act at a given time, several onerous duties and obligations have been imposed on the promoters i.e. registration, duties of promoters, obligations of promoters, adherence to sanctioned plans, insurance of real

estate, payment of penalty, interest and compensation, etc. under Chapters III and VIII of the Act 2016. This classification between consumers and promoters is based upon the intelligible differentia between the rights, duties and obligations cast upon the allottees/home buyers and the promoters and is in furtherance of the object and purpose of the Act to protect the interest of the consumers vis-a-viz., the promoters in the real estate sector. The promoters and allottees are distinctly identifiable, separate class of persons having been differently and separately dealt with under the various provisions of the Act.

126. Therefore, the question of discrimination in the first place does not arise which has been alleged as they fall under distinct and different categories/classes.

127. It may further be noticed that under the present real estate sector which is now being regulated under the provisions of the Act 2016, the complaint for refund of the amount of payment which the allottee/consumer has deposited with the promoter and at a later stage, when the promoter is unable to hand over possession in breach of the conditions of the agreement between the parties, are being instituted at the instance of the consumer/allottee demanding for refund of the amount deposited by them and after the scrutiny of facts being made based on the contemporaneous documentary evidence on record made available by the respective parties, the legislature in its wisdom has intended to ensure that the money which has been computed by the authority at least must be safeguarded if the promoter intends to prefer an appeal before the tribunal and in case, the appeal fails at a later stage, it becomes difficult for the consumer/allottee to get the amount recovered which has been determined by the authority and to avoid the consumer/allottee to go from pillar to post for recovery of the amount that has been determined by the authority in fact, belongs to the

allottee at a later stage could be saved from all the miseries which come forward against him.

128. At the same time, it will avoid unscrupulous and uncalled for litigation at the appellate stage and restrict the promoter if feels that there is some manifest material irregularity being committed or his defence has not been properly appreciated at the first stage, would prefer an appeal for re- appraisal of the evidence on record provided substantive compliance of the condition of pre-deposit is made over, the rights of the parties inter se could easily be saved for adjudication at the appellate stage.”

8. This Bench does not find any substance in the plea of the appellant to seek adjustment/waiver from making pre-deposit by claiming that impugned order is in the nature of a cross-decree.

9. In our considered view, the plea is entirely misconceived. A perusal of the record shows that complaint before the Authority was preferred by the allottees and the promoter merely rebutted the claim. No counter claim or complaint was filed by the promoter. It is, thus, inexplicable as to how the said order can be termed cross decree in the absence of counter-claim. Besides, the provisions of the special enactment i.e. RERA Act have to be kept in mind while dealing with such a issue. There is no room for doubt that pre-deposit is condition precedent for entertaining the appeal preferred by the builder/promoter under the Act.

10. The calculation sheet submitted by the appellant along with application is merely a document issued post decree. Calculations are made therein by the promoter itself which include heads such as Fire Fighting Charges (FFC) per square feet, Car

Parking charges, Power backup , IFMSD etc. cannot be taken as gospel truth as same would depend upon final adjudication of the appeal.

11. Present is not a case where builder can place reliance only on the calculation sheet submitted by it wherein several demands have been raised. Registry has, however, calculated the amount of pre-deposit on the basis of directions contained in the order passed by the Authority. Same comes to Rs.16,52,783/- in the instant appeal. The appellant is seeking waiver/exemption therefrom which is not permissible. There is no provision in the Act for seeking waiver from pre-deposit.

12. CM No. 123 of 2025 is dismissed being devoid of merits. Thus, appeal, cannot be entertained. Consequently, same is dismissed being not maintainable.

13. Ordered accordingly.

14. Copy of this order be sent to the parties, their counsel and the Authority at Gurugram.

15. File be consigned to the records.

Justice Rajan Gupta
Chairman
Haryana Real Estate Appellate Tribunal

Rakesh Manocha
Member (Technical)

05.04.2025
mk